But the real hope of improvement lies, I'm convinced, in the private sector of the forest economy. Simply because so much can be done there.

Take this state, for example. Seventy-eight per cent of Georgia's timberlands are privately held . . . by some 200,000 farmers and businessmen. Fifteen per cent is owned by industry and the remaining seven per cent by federal, state, and local government. Business and government, we can assume, utilize progressive methods of silviculture and so get better than average wood yield. That means that the private sector—about 20 million acres—is producing somewhere under the half cord average for Georgia as a whole.

How can we help to beef up yields of private holdings? One way is to continue and step up what we have been doing . . . spreading the message of good forestry practices.

Our Georgia Forestry Commission does itself proud along these lines. With its assistance in fire fighting and prevention, and its counseling of private landowners on advanced cultivation practices, it ranks with the best public agencies in the nation.

The Future Farmers of America is another group that is doing its share. It is helping to bring an awareness of the importance of trees and increasing know-how and interest in forest cultivation into the classrooms. That will certainly have long-run beneficial impact on private land yields.

And business, including Union Camp I'm happy to say, is actively spreading the word. Like other forest products companies, we have been and are educating everyone who will hold still long enough, cooperating with all other groups in the field, and distributing free seedlings to landowners, youth groups, and others.

These and other educational activities have helped and will continue to help importantly increase yield in the private sector.

Another area that is definitely worth investigating is that of incentives. I would point out that, while industry had been installing improved silviculture practices for years before 1944 when timber production became eligible for capital gains treatment, that incentive did provide much added impetus to such programs. I would suggest that a more equitable ad valorem tax structure applied to forest lands would greatly encourage improved wood yield. I'm sure too that incentives can play a role in important special areas—such as hardwoods cultivation—where very little has been done and which involve inordinate expense for private enterprises or individuals.

It's interesting to note that the Third Forest started during a time of plenty. Companies were improving their forests and wood production 30 years ago, simply as good business practice, with no thought of imminent scarcities. Fortunately, with the help of public and private groups, a good start was made towards the higher wood yields we will need in the future.

Today with wood resources showing their limitations in the face of overwhelming growth in demand coupled with an eroding supply base, it is not too much to say that the Third Forest is as essential to the future progress of the forest products industry as the cotton gin was to the development of the early textile industry.

And I suspect the Third Forest will work in the same way. Just as volume production by the cotton gin put pressure on finding ways to pick cotton—and, incidentally, on increasing cotton yield per acre—so the Third Forest will generate pressure on the means of production.

Take, for example, the trend I described before in the slowed growth of new paper production capacity. If an increased flow of raw material is forthcoming from our lesser acreage, ways will be found—through equipment and processing advances, assuming that additional mills will not be feasible—to produce the greater quantities consistent with demand growth.

In housing, to take another example, production methods applied to the new factory built, modular homes indicate that 20 per cent more dwellings can be built from a given amount of lumber and plywood.

But again, whatever private enterprise can do is based upon the growth of the Third Forest. And that's a cooperative effort, entailing business and individuals, public and private organizations.

That brings up other resources which have become worrisome. Previously I mentioned useable air and water.

I'd like to make some remarks on them from a different viewpoint than that taken by the current chaotic concern. I find some very strong analogies between the need to combat pollution and the need to combat scarcity through the Third Forest.

I could say that the forest products industry has demonstrated concern with pollution long before it became a publicized problem. I could say that my company has spent $10 million over the past decade on preventing pollution and that we're continually upgrading our anti-pollution equipment and techniques.

All that is true, but it's beside the point. It's talking defensively and in no way induces a productive approach to the problem.

In reality, like the imminent scarcity of wood resources, the idea of air and water being in "short supply" has developed suddenly. It has taken us by surprise. Let's admit it. How many people really thought ten years ago that there might be limitations to these resources?

Let's also admit that we are all guilty. The consumer through his wants—and I dare say needs—for automobiles, paper, appliances, and most everything else; the producer through his desire to make a reasonable profit by satisfying these needs; the garbage-generating citizen is guilty; so is the tourist passing through; so is the Communist and the Capitalist, the Democrat and the Republican. We can all cry "Mea culpa!"

Once we get beyond the finger-pointing stage, we can think clearly. Like the Third Forest, combatting pollution of our elements is a collective project. It goes beyond the single company or the single industry, beyond the single state. It's as ridiculous to put a company out of the competitive running by laying on an exorbitant expense for pollution control as it is for a company to argue that it should continue to pollute air and water because it can't afford to install anti-pollution equipment. We don't even find general agreement as to what the most effective pollution control entails.

Conserving our air and water resources is at least a regional problem with strong federal overtones. It requires intensive, broad-based, coordinated action.

Despite the role of villain assigned to us by some groups, industry can be counted on to do its share. Looking at the forest products area, industry has certainly proven its cooperative, responsible attitude. Most companies have over the years, and despite satisfying ever rising consumption, planted millions more trees on the timberlands under thier jurisdiction than they've cut down. Industrial woodlands have consistently promoted the multiple use concept, providing hunting, fishing, and other forest recreational opportunities to more people than ever before.

Those of us who are concerned with growing forests and producing forest products stand at the interface between rising demand and the resources needed to supply it. I think we're in excellent position not only to satisfy greater consumption but also to expand the productive conservation of these resources.

SENATE—*Tuesday, August 18, 1970*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast given us this time in which to live, and in serving this Nation, to work for the betterment of the whole world. Grant us wisdom and strength for this day.

We thank Thee for all who through many generations have labored in this place and have brought strength and healing to the Nation.

We give Thee special thanks for Thy servant, Frederick Brown Harris, and for the sense of Thy presence he brought to this Chamber. We thank Thee for his Christian manhood and his church statesmanship, for his steadfast ministry of prayer and pastoral care, for the mysticism and poetry of his utterance, for his fidelity to truth and his espousal of righteousness, for his piety and patriotism, for the warmth of his friendship and the radiance of his personality.

May the mantle of his gentle and good life fall upon each of us. In sacred memory help us to love Thee more ardently and to serve Thee more faithfully all the days of our lives.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

On August 13, 1970:

S. 1076. An act to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

On August 15, 1970:

S. 3302. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 17, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the acquiescence of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), who is to be recognized at this time, and without losing his right to the floor or any of his time, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed with unobjected-to items on the calendar.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1030 and then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1095, and the rest of the measures in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like once more to point out that the Daily Digest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page D921, now calls attention to the fact that, beginning today, and on each legislative day hereafter, until further notice, there will be a call of the calendar, and the conditions and terms are set out in the RECORD there.

Thus, all Senators are now on notice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Pennsylvania reminded me of that. I was in Montana and returned only last night.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first measure.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS ON THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill H.R. 14213 to amend sections 5580 and 5581 of the Revised Statutes to provide for additional members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "States,", strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "the", strike out "Senate and" and insert "Senate,"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, strike out "Representatives; together with", and insert "Representatives, and"; in line 4, after the word "of", strike out "Washington; and the", and insert "Washington, and"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, strike out "other"; at the beginning of line 5, insert "of whom"; in line 11, after the word "and", insert "the"; in line 12, after the word "the", strike out "Senate and House of Representatives" and insert "Congress.".;" and after line 18, insert:

(d) The second sentence of section 5582 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 44) is amended to read as follows: "The board shall also elect three of their own body as an executive committee, and shall fix the time for the regular meetings of the board; and, on application of any three of the regents to the secretary of the institution, it shall be his duty to appoint a special meeting of the Board of Regents, of which he shall give notice, by letter, to each of the members; and, at any meeting of the board, eight shall constitute a quorum to do business."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1031), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

The Board of Regents is the governing body of the Smithsonian Institution. As established by act of Congress in 1846, the Board of Regents consists of 14 members.

There are eight public members:

The Vice President;

The Chief Justice;

Three Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate; and

Three Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker.

There are in addition six private citizen members of the Board, appointed by the Congress by joint resolution. Of these, two must be residents of the city of Washington, and no two of the remaining four citizen regents may be residents of the same State.

Members of the Board of Regents are reimbursed for necessary traveling and other actual expenses incurred in attending meetings of the Board, but service on the Board is gratuitous.

The bill H.R. 14213 would increase the number of private citizen regents from six to nine, thus increasing the number of members of the Board from 14 to 17.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution of the Committee on Rules and Administration conducted a joint hearing, together with the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration, on H.R. 14213 on September 23, 1969.

Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, testified on behalf of the Board of Regents in support of the legislation.

The committee was informed that the Board considers an expansion of its membership desirable because of the growth of the Institution's responsibilities, the need to reflect on the Board the national character of the Institution, and because of the Institution's interest in soliciting greater support from private, nongovernmental sources.

The committee noted that the number of States in the Union, and the population of the United States, as well as the functions and expenditures of the Smithsonian Institution all have increased substantially since the establishment of the Institution, with no adjustment in the size of the Institution's governing body.

The committee believes that additional members of the Board of Regents would permit a broader national representation in the affairs of the Institution, and would in addition permit members of the Board to contribute more significantly to the management of the Institution by enabling individual members to concentrate their attention on specific problems or opportunities encountered by the Institution.

The committee noted that because of the unique organizational structure of the Smithsonian Institution, the Congress bears a special responsibility in the governing of the Institution. Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives serve as members of the Institution's governing body, and the Congress is the sole authority for appointment of citizen regents. Although the Congress by tradition has acted on recommendations by the Board of Regents in appointing citizen regents, the committee expects appropriate committees of the Congress shall be consulted before the submission of such recommendations.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The Committee on Rules and Administration adopted an amendment to H.R. 14213 to increase the number of members of the Board of Regents required for a quorum to conduct the business of the Smithsonian Institution. The quorum established by existing law is five. The committee amendment would increase the quorum to eight, reflecting the increase in the membership of the Board that would be authorized by H.R. 14213.

In adopting the amendment, the committee noted that the average attendance at the 10 most recent meetings of the Board has been 10 of the 14 members. The larger quorum, with a 17-member board, should therefore present no difficulty in conducting the business of the Institution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 5580, 5581, and 5582 of the Revised Statutes to provide for additional members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and to increase the number of members constituting a quorum."

HEADSTONES OR MARKERS TO MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

The bill (H.R. 6265) to provide that a headstone or marker be furnished at Government expense for the unmarked grave of any Medal of Honor recipient was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1085), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The bill is intended to authorize the furnishing of headstones to mark the graves of Medal of Honor recipients regardless of the character of discharge granted for their last term of service.

PRESENT LAW

Existing law (act of July 1, 1948, 62 Stat. 1215) provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, when requested, to furnish headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the Armed Forces whose last service terminated honorably.

BACKGROUND

According to the testimony as reported in House Report 91–666 dated November 20, 1969, that of 2,198 Medals of Honor awarded as of that time, only 178 recipients were living; and that of those who are deceased, it appeared that only one received a discharge under other than honorable conditions. The committee is in accord with the House that a serviceman who distinguished himself at great personal sacrifice and merited the award of the Medal of Honor, should not be denied a proper grave marker despite any discharge under less than honorable conditions.

COST

The Department of Defense has indicated that enactment of this bill would, to their knowledge, cost no more than $31.

COMMAND OF THE U.S.S. "CONSTITUTION" BY RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE U.S. NAVY

The bill (H.R. 8662) to authorize command of the U.S.S. *Constitution* (IX–21) by retired officers of the U.S. Navy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1086), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

Passage of this bill would permit a retired officer of the U.S. Navy to command the U.S.S. *Constitution*, a historic naval vessel maintained "in commission, active status," and permanently berthed at the Boston Naval Shipyard.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to order to active duty a retired officer of the U.S. Navy for the purpose of commanding the U.S.S. *Constitution* (IX–21).

Under existing law, a retired officer of the U.S. Navy is prohibited from commanding a ship of the U.S. Navy. Since the U.S.S. *Constitution* is in a commissioned status, the law effectively prevents a retired officer from commanding the ship.

The U.S.S. *Constitution*, a historic naval vessel maintained "in commission, active status," and permanently berthed at the Boston Naval Shipyard, has been commanded by junior officers of the U.S. Navy for the past 15 years. However, because of the relative inexperience of those officers and because of their brief tours of duty, the mission of the U.S.S. *Constitution* has not been fully achieved. Because of the mission of the ship and because of her unique status as the sole relic of the earliest years of the Navy, the commanding officer's duties necessarily include those associated with positions of a museum director and curator.

In order that the ship may be fully developed as an extraordinary historical exhibit, it is considered necessary that her commanding officer be mature, possess an extensive knowledge of the ship and the naval period which she represents, and be able to remain associated with the ship for longer periods than the normal tour of duty. It is believed that a carefully selected retired officer of the U.S. Navy would most satisfactorily fulfill these qualifications.

In addition, the U.S.S. *Constitution* is often used for ceremonial purposes by the Navy such as retirement ceremonies and change of command. Therefore, the command of the U.S.S. *Constitution* should be under an experienced officer familiar with duties of command and the ceremonies and responsibilities incident thereto.

This bill is presented in order that the U.S.S. *Constitution* may more effectively fulfill its role through capable and efficient command of a retired U.S. Naval officer.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would result in no additional costs to the Department of Defense.

INTERSERVICE TRANSFERS OF COAST GUARD OFFICERS

The bill (H.R. 9052) to amend section 716 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the interservice transfers of officers of the Coast Guard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1087), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

Section 716 of title 10, United States Code, stipulates that the President may, within authorized strengths, transfer any commissioned officer with his consent from the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps to, and appointment in, any other of those Armed Forces.

This bill will place the Coast Guard officers on the same parity as their counterparts in the military departments.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment of this measure will not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

Letters from the Department of Defense and the Department of Transportation to the House Committee on Armed Services indicate there is no objection to enactment of this bill. A copy of each letter is set forth below and made a part of this report.

PRESENTATION OF U.S. FLAGS TO PARENTS OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

The bill (H.R. 13195) to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that U.S. flags may be presented to parents of deceased servicemen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1088), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 13195 is to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that U.S. flags may be presented to parents of deceased servicemen, in addition to flags presented to the surviving spouse or next of kin.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Under present provisions of law (10 U.S.C. 1482), if a serviceman or woman dies during a period of active service, the Secretary of the military department concerned may pay the necessary expenses of presentation of a U.S. flag to the following categories of persons designated to direct disposition of the remains, in the order named: the surviving spouse of the decedent, blood relatives of the decedent, adoptive relatives of the decedent, or a person standing in loco parentis to the decedent.

The bill as introduced provided that the flag to be presented to the parents of deceased servicemen would be smaller in size than the flag presented to the spouse or next of kin. The House Committee on Armed Services amended the bill to provide that a flag of equal size be presented to the parents for the following reasons: It was considered that presentation of a smaller flag would cause an increase in the administrative procedures in this proposal; and secondly, the presentation of a smaller flag would seem to indicate that the members' parents are in a second-class status, which was considered inequitable.

Interest in this legislation is evidenced by the fact that 60 Members of Congress cosponsored this, or similar legislation.

FISCAL DATA

Any increase in expenditure which might result from enactment of this legislation is estimated to be minimal and could be covered from within available appropriations.

CASA ANGELICA MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITY

The bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Casa Angelica mental retardation facility of Albuquerque, N. Mex., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any provision of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, if the State of New Mexico so desires, any application for a construction grant under part C of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.) may be submitted with respect to the facility known as Casa Angelica, of Albuquerque, New Mexico, and such application shall be treated and acted upon in like manner (insofar as possible) as if construction of such facility had not commenced at the time such application is submitted, except that no grant made under such part C shall be made, as a result of any such application, in an amount in excess of the amount of the indebtedness of such facility which was incurred as a result of the construction thereof and which is outstanding at the time such application is approved, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may condition the payment of such grant on the payment of such indebtedness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1089), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

SUMMARY

As reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 1196 would allow the Casa Angelica Mental Retardation Facility of Albuquerque, New Mexico, to apply for a construction grant under the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act (42 U.S.C.

2671 et seq.) in spite of the fact that construction of the facility has been completed. At present, the State of New Mexico may not accept and act upon a construction grant application with respect to any facility where construction has been completed. S. 1196 would waive this preconstruction submission requirement in the case of this facility.

S. 1196 prohibits any grant to the Casa Angelica Mental Retardation Facility which would be in excess of the outstanding indebtedness of the facility at the time the application is approved.

S. 1196 does not amend any existing statutes.

BACKGROUND

Under pressure of parents with severely retarded children who could not have them admitted to the State facility because of long waiting lists, Casa Angelica did not apply for funds under the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act prior to the commencement of construction. Time was of the essence and construction began in May, 1966, and was completed in January, 1967. Had the facility complied with preconstruction application requirements, the completion and operation of the facility would have been delayed significantly. This failure to submit an application prior to the commencement of construction now precludes this facility from being considered for a grant under the Act. S. 1196 would only allow this facility to submit an application to the State and be given a priority rating by the State Advisory Council and Health and Social Services Board. Casa Angelica would then have to compete with other applicants in the State for the funds to which New Mexico is entitled under the Act.

S. 1196 neither amends the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act nor affects New Mexico's entitlement to Federal funds under the Act.

MEASURES PASSED OVER

The bill, S. 3355, to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases and conditions; House Joint Resolution 264, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; and S. 437, a bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement, were announced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these three bills go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The three bills will be passed over.

FEDERAL FIREFIGHTERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill S. 578 to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 8, strike out:

"SEC. 2. The provisions of section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, shall not be applicable with respect to benefits payable pursuant to the amendment made by this Act."

And on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, change the section number from "3" to "2"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "or are primarily to perform work directly connected with the control and extinguishment of fires or the maintenance and use of firefighting apparatus and equipment".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be applicable only in the case of persons retiring after the date of enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1093), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION

S. 578 extends to Federal employees whose duties "are primarily to perform work directly connected with the control and extinguishment of fires or the maintenance and use of firefighting apparatus and equipment" the same hazardous-duty retirement provisions of title 5, United States Code, now provided for certain Federal law-enforcement officers.

S. 1507, a similar measure for firefighters, passed the Senate unanimously in the 90th Congress. It was reported favorably by the House committee but was recommitted by House floor action and died in that body. The Senate committee believes congressional action to provide firefighters a more equitable retirement program is past due.

Section 8336(c) of title 5 provides for retirement with an immediate annuity at age 50 after 20 years' service for Federal law-enforcement officers who face hazards in the performance of their official duties. These special retirement provisions apply only if the head of the agency recommends such retirement and if the Civil Service Commission approves that recommendation. Thus, an individual determination of retirement eligibility based upon the danger of the employee's duties is made by responsible officials who have access to duty and personnel records. S. 578 amends section 8336(c) to include Federal firefighters, with the same safeguards applying to their early-retirement eligibility. No firefighter who had not in fact been exposed to hazards would be extended the liberalized retirement provisions. Section 8336(c) states:

"The head of the agency and the Commission shall consider fully the degree of hazard to which the employee is subjected in the performance of his duties instead of the general duties of the class of the position held by the employee."

More than 16,000 U.S. marshals, policemen, guards, and FBI and Treasury agents are covered by section 8336(c). Yet more than 11,000 Federal firefighters, whose fatality rate is 2½ times greater than that of policemen, are denied these special benefits. One out of every eight firefighters—or 12.5 per 100 men—sustained a lost-time injury in 1965. Fifty-five percent of firefighters' deaths resulted from heart and lung diseases. Clearly firefighters' duties involve frequent exposure to danger. Moreover, the ability of the average man to avoid and overcome the hazards of this occupation decreases as he gets older. In view of the dangers involved and a normal man's increasing susceptibility to injury with each year on the job, the committee believes firefighters should be offered an opportunity to shorten their careers. Thus, the committee endorses the 50–20 formula with agency recommendation and Civil Service Commission concurrence.

AMENDMENT

The committee has amended S. 578 by the deletion of section 2 of the bill and the appropriate renumbering of section 3. The section deleted related to the old section 8348(g) of title 5, which was repealed by Public Law 91–93. This is a technical amendment having no effect upon the operative provisions of the bill.

COST

The cost of each qualified firefighter's retiring has been estimated at $17,500. If an estimated 200 firefighters retire each year, the additional annual cost would be $3.5 million.

ARIE ABRAMOVICH

The bill (S. 1943) for the relief of Arie Abramovich was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Private Law 87–523 for the relief of Arie Abramovich is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1095), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to repeal Private Law 87–523 in order to restore the beneficiary's immigration status to that which existed prior to the enactment of the said law to make him eligible to apply for suspension of deportation.

MRS. PANG TAI TAI

The bill (S. 3853) for the relief of Mrs. Pang Tai Tai was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(25) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Pang Tai Tai may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report

(No. 91–1098), explaining the purpose of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who cannot read and understand some language or dialect in behalf of the sister of a U.S. citizen.

EAGLE LAKE TIMBER CO.

The bill (H.R. 1749) for the relief of Eagle Lake Timber Co., a partnership of Susanville, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1099), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the Eagle Lake Timber Co., a partnership comprised of Mr. W. Crook, John B. Crook, R. H. Emmerson, and A. A. Emmerson, of Susanville, Calif., $43,690 in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for compensation for losses incurred in connection with the performance of a timber sale contract dated May 25, 1964, No. 11–150, between the company and the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, based on the fact that the company failed, under the provision of the contract for amortizing road costs, to recover a substantial portion of the road construction cost incurred before the contract was terminated by mutual consent of the parties thereto because of a forest fire.

STATEMENT

In its favorable report on the bill, the House of Representatives set forth the facts in the case as follows:

The bill would authorize the payment of $43,690 to a company for the cost of roads which were constructed pursuant to a timber sale contract. The figure stated in H.R. 1749 represents the loss the company suffered since that amount had not been amortized when the contract was canceled due to a forest fire which swept over most of the timber remaining to be cut under the contract. The Department of Agriculture stated that the contract covered the sale of an estimated 25,030 thousand board feet of national forest timber to Eagle Lake Timber Co.

The timber sale was awarded to Eagle Lake Timber Co., after it bid successfully against one other bidder. On September 5, 1966, most of the uncut portion of the sale was burned over by a fire caused by lightning. At the time of the fire, 10,592 thousand board feet of timber had been cut and removed. Most of the remaining timber designated for sale under the contract, totaling an estimated 14,438 thousand board feet, together with intermingled undesignated timber which was intended to be left uncut, was affected by the fire. While both designated and undesignated timber affected by the fire were subject to deterioration, continuing over time, it nevertheless was merchantable. In such situations in California, it is both economically feasible and customary to salvage, log, and manufacture fire-affected timber into lumber products.

Shortly after the fire, Mr. John B. Crook, representing the Eagle Lake Timber Co., met with the Forest Service seeking relief under the sale contract. Mr. Crook was advised of the customary choices available under the contract. They were:

1. Continue operations, buying all fire-affected timber on the sale at contract rates; and

2. Apply to have the contract cancelled without liability for its incompletion.

The Forest Service offered to explore a third possibility whereby Eagle Lake could continue operations buying all affected timber at contract rates, except in portions of the sale area where prefire sale operations had been entirely completed.

In response to Mr. Crook's inquiries, he was told that the Forest Service had no authority under the contract to reduce timber prices or to pay Eagle Lake for the cost of advance roadbuilding not yet recovered by timber cutting. Mr. Crook advised he would recommend his firm that it apply for contract cancellation, and in that event, would seek enactment of a private relief bill. The Forest Service suggested, and it was agreed, that engineers representing each party would meet on the ground and seek to agree on the value of the unamortized road construction.

On October 11, 1966, the purchaser applied for contract cancellation, and this was approved by the Forest Service the following day. The burned-over area was then divided into three salvage sales which were advertised and sold. Eagle Lake Timber Co. purchased one of these sales. It was essential that the completed and uncompleted road work be measured and evaluated before existing work was disturbed or further work was performed under the salvage sale contracts. Forest Service engineers started their fieldwork and evaluations on September 28, 1966, concluding the work by mid-October. During this period, Eagle Lake was invited to participate and was kept informed of results. On October 18, 1966, the Forest Service called Eagle Lake and furnished its final results which are reported herein.

On November 9, 1966, Eagle Lake advised the Forest Service that its subcontractor had hired an engineering firm to make evaluations. Subsequently, on February 21, 1967, the parties met in the local office of the Forest Service to compare results. No agreement was reached.

Results of the Forest Service evaluation are shown in the attached table. They are properly based on the estimated road costs used in the timber appraisal at the time the sale was advertised. Four roads were involved and are identified in the table as roads 28N25, 28N31, 28N35, and 28N02. As shown in the table accompanying the Agriculture report, the amount of road construction work not recovered by Eagle Lake Timber Co. at the time of contract cancellation is $43,690. As has been noted, this is the amount stated in the bill.

The consulting engineer's report to the purchaser's logging contractor presented three alternative estimates of the unamortized portion of the completed road work. One estimate is $71,175, which was the amount originally stated in the bill H.R. 6662 introduced in the 90th Congress. The other estimates are $68,864, and $44,154.

The purchaser's sale contract was similar to hundreds of others in existence at the time. Under them, purchasers are authorized to build roads needed for each sale. Prior to advertising, the Forest Service estimates the costs to an average efficient purchaser of building the roads. Such estimates, along with other estimated sale operating costs, are used in the timber appraisal to set advertised stumpage prices. Prices bid are for purchase of timber, not roadbuilding, and the contract is not considered a road procurement contract. Bidders make their own judgments of profit opportunities, including possible road costs. Also, purchasers customarily build roads ahead of logging needs in order to facilitate needed flow of logs.

In this particular case, the fire was of catastrophic magnitude with more than usual impacts on the purchaser's plans. In turn, the Forest Service was faced with need to reshape its plan to promote salvage of the damaged timber, both to capture value and to prevent an insect epidemic. Contract cancellation enabled the Forest Service to accomplish this expeditiously.

The Department of Agriculture in its report to the committee in the 90th Congress, stated that the road work which had been completed at the time of the fire was a contribution to the speedy and successful salvage of the fire-damaged timber. The Department further noted that the advertised prices in the resales were enhanced by the amount of the appraised value of road construction which had been accomplished at the time of the fire. The result was that the Government realized the monetary benefits of the Eagle Lake Timber Co.'s road construction work which was not amortized because of the fire. Because of this fact and the other aspects of the case noted by the committee, the Department indicated it would have no objection to enactment of the earlier bill if the amount were amended to provide for a payment of $43,690. This is the amount the company would have recaptured for the completed work if the sale had proceeded to conclusion.

The committee also received a report from the Comptroller General of the United States concerning the bill. The comments of the Comptroller General are also set out following this report. The General Accounting Office report indicated that it would not object to the favorable consideration of the earlier bill provided the amount be amended to $43,690, which is the same figure recommended by the Agriculture Department. In this connection, the report of the Comptroller General stated:

"As noted above, contract No. 11–150 made no provision for recovery of road costs other than through amortization as the timber was cut and paid for by the purchaser. Since the Eagle Lake Timber Co. was unable to recover a substantial portion of its road construction costs because the contract was terminated by mutual consent of the parties as a result of a fire in the timber sale area, and since it is reported that the advance construction of the roads by the company did benefit the Forest Service, we would not object if H.R. 6662 were favorably considered by the Congress provided the amount stipulated therein be changed from $71,175 to $43,690."

Both the Department of Agriculture and the Comptroller General reports analyzed the basis for the figure $43,690 now in the present bill, H.R. 1749. The committee is satisfied that this figure represents the actual loss suffered by the company and, therefore, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

The committee has been advised that an attorney has rendered services in connection with this matter. The bill therefore carries the customary limitation on attorney's fees.

The committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives, and recommends that the bill, H.R. 1749, be considered favorably.

ANAN ELDREDGE

The bill (H.R. 2849) for the relief of Anan Eldredge was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1100), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant first preference status to the adopted son of citi-

zens of the United States, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

GLORIA JARA HAASE

The bill (H.R. 12959) for the relief of Gloria Jara Haase was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1104), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the alien daughter adopted by citizens of the United States.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 21-year-old native and citizen of the Phillippine Islands, who presently resides in that country. She was adopted at age 16 by a U.S. citizen member of our Armed Forces and his wife. The beneficiary's mother died when she was 7 months old and the whereabouts of her father are unknown. The adoptive father has been stationed in Ohio since his tour of duty in the Philippines ended in August 1966. The adoptive parents are anxious that their daughter be permitted to join them in this country.

MRS. MARCELLA COSLOVICH FABRETTO

The bill (H.R. 13383) for the relief of Mrs. Marcella Coslovich Fabretto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1106), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the mother of a U.S. citizen to file a petition for naturalization based on the periods of time she has resided in the United States since her lawful admission for permanent residence on December 21, 1955.

VINCENZO PELLICANO

The bill (H.R. 13712) for the relief of Vincenzo Pellicano was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1107), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude in behalf of the son of citizens of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 355 OF REVISED STATUTES

The bill (H.R. 15374) to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, concerning approval by the Attorney General of the title to lands acquired for or on behalf of the United States, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1111), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to substitute revised language for the first seven paragraphs of section 355 of the Revised Statutes having to do with approval of land titles by the Attorney General. The bill provides that the Attorney General is to be responsible for the approval of the sufficiency of titles to land acquired by the United States and that he may delegate this authority to other departments and agencies subject to his general supervision and regulation. The amended bill would preserve the existing law permitting the Tennessee Valley Authority to approve land titles as to land acquired by that Authority. It also provides for appropriate amendments to other provisions of law in order to conform them to the changes made by section 1 of the bill.

STATEMENT

In its favorable report on the proposed legislation, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives set forth the facts of the case as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1. The first section of the bill provides for the repeal of the first seven paragraphs of section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to substitute the revised language contained in section 1. The revised language consists of five paragraphs.

The first paragraph requires that prior to the expenditure of public money for the purchase of land or an interest in land, the Attorney General must give written approval as to the sufficiency of the title. This requires the Attorney General to determine that the tile is sufficient for the purpose for which the property is being acquired by the United States.

The second paragraph provides that the Attorney General may delegate his responsibility as to the approval of land titles to other departments or agencies subject to his general supervision and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him.

The third paragraph provides that when the Attorney General has delegated the responsibility for approving land titles to a department or agency, that department or agency may request the Attorney General to render his opinion as to the validity of titles to land or may request his advice or assistance in determining the sufficiency of titles.

The fourth paragraph provides that unless otherwise authorized by law or provided by contract, the expenses of procuring certificates of title or other evidence of title as required by the Attorney General may be paid out of appropriations for the acquisition of the land or out of appropriations made for contingencies of the acquiring department or agency.

The fifth paragraph, added as a committee amendment, is identical to language now a part of section 355 of the Revised Statutes and makes it clear that the provisions of the section do not change the existing authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority with respect to the acquisition of land or interest in land, including the authority to determine the sufficiency of title.

Section 2. Section 2 of the bill repeals an obsolete provision in an act of March 2, 1889, which requires that all legal services connected with the procurement of titles to sites for public buildings be rendered by U.S. attorneys. This is not consistent with modern practices and is properly deleted.

Section 3. Section 3 of the bill refers to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 962), which is set out as section 517, title 16, United States Code. This section requires the Secretary of Agriculture to secure safe titles to certain lands acquired by the United States and requires that title shall be satisfactory to the Attorney General. The bill would amend the provision by adding the words "or his designee" so as to be consistent with the amendments added by section 1 of the bill.

Section 4. Section 4 of the bill amends section 5 of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1422), which is set out as section 258e of title 40 of the United States Code. This section deals with condemnation proceedings and presently contains an exception concerning the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes. The bill would delete this exception on recommendation of the Department of Justice because it is clear that a determination should be made that there is sufficient title in the United States prior to the expenditure of moneys as is provided in section 258e of title 40.

Section 5. Section 5 of the bill deletes an exception in the present law concerning the application of section 355 of the Revised Statutes. Sections 4776 and 9776 of title 10 presently provide that in an emergency and when the President considers it urgent, a temporary fort or fortification may be built on private land with the consent of the owner. The exception concerning a determination concerning the sufficiency of title under section 355 of the Revised Statutes appears to be surplusage since no title is acquired by the United States under such circumstances and therefore there appears to be no need for an exception for the provisions relating to approval of title.

Section 6. Section 6 of the bill conforms the provisions of section 6 of the act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1223, as amended), which is set forth as section 715e of title 16 by providing that the reference to approval land titles by the Attorney General shall include the words "or his designee." This section concerns the acquisition of land for certain purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and requires title to be approved by the Attorney General. The amendments would be to add the reference "to his designee" to make the language consistent with section 1 of the bill.

STATEMENT

The bill, H.R. 15374, is a revised bill resulting from the committee's consideration of the earlier bill, H.R. 14119. The original bill was introduced in accordance with the recommendation of an executive communication transmitted to the Congress by the Department of Justice. A subcommittee hearing was conducted on the first bill on October 22, 1969. After consideration of the recommendations of the Department and the testimony presented at that hearing, the bill, H.R. 15374 was introduced embodying the recommendations of the subcommittee. A hearing was then held on February 4, 1970, on the revised bill and the representatives of the Department of Justice at that hearing advised the committee that they had no objections to the bill.

The basic difference between the original bill and H.R. 15374 is that the revised bill places primary responsibility for the approval of the sufficiency of land titles in the

Attorney General and this permits him to delegate the authority. The original bill would have vested the authority to approve land titles in the head of all departments and agencies with respect to land acquired by the department or agency for the United States. The committee concluded that the Attorney General as the chief law officer of the United States should retain the primary responsibility for the approval of land titles. It is clear from the executive communication and testimony at the hearings that this authority can be properly exercised by other departments and agencies and in many instances it should be so exercised in the interest of efficient and effective operation. However, the original proposal of a general grant of authority to heads of all departments and agencies by legislative action did not permit a determination of whether an individual agency, in fact, had the capability of exercising the authority or the need for such authority in terms of its actual operation. The committee therefore concluded that a more approprate amendment to secton 355 of the Revised Statutes would be to preserve the primary responsibility for the approval of land titles in the Attorney General with additional authority for the Attorney General to delegate the responsibility to individual departments or agencies. This would make it possible to meet the needs of the departments and agencies actively engaged in land acquisition. They could be granted this authority when the Attorney General deems a delegation to be appropriate. This would result in the authority being exercised by departments and agencies familiar with the requirements concerning sufficiency of title and permits the Attorney General to determine whether the department or the agency has the capability, including the personnel and organization necessary to pass on such titles. Finally, the Attorney General is given a clearly defined role of supervising the exercise of the delegated authority with provision for implementing this supervision by regulations governing its exercise.

Section 355 of the Revised Statutes which would be amended by this bill is set out in three places in the United States Code (40 U.S.C. 255; 33 U.S.C. 733; and 50 U.S.C. 175), and prohibits the expenditure of funds upon land purchased by the United States for a construction site until the Attorney General has approved the title to that land. As has been noted this bill would continue to place the responsibility for the approval of land titles in the Attorney General and would further authorize the Attorney General to delegate this title approval responsibility to other departments and agencies subject to his general supervision and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him.

The basic provisions of section 355 were enacted in 1841 (5 Stat. 469) and have remained in effect since that time. At the time of its original enactment and for a considerable time afterward, title work was a highly specialized legal function. Title opinions were based on abstracts prepared by the examining attorney. These abstracts not only involved a search of the title records but often required many extraneous investigations. The need for searches outside the records subsequently became limited due to the fact that in the first half of the 20th century, the various States improved their title recording requirements and facilities. In the same period, title companies began preparing and certifying abstracts for examining attorneys. More recently and particularly in the past 20 years, certificates of title and title insurance policies have largely displaced abstracts and eliminated much of the need for record searches. In its communication, the Justice Department observed that these developments have gradually changed much title practice so that it now has many of the aspects of administration rather than legal decisionmaking.

These developments and practical considerations have prompted action on the part of both the Department of Justice and the Congress. In 1930, section 355 was amended to permit the Attorney General to accept certificates of title of a title company as evidence of title to land to be acquired by the United States (act of June 28, 1930, 46 Stat. 828). In 1940 the section was further amended to permit approval of a title upon any evidence which the Attorney General deemed satisfactory and to permit the relaxation of standards for the approval of title to low value lands to easements and to rights-of-way (act of Oct. 9, 1940; 54 Stat. 1083).

The Department of Justice in its communication stated that it had concluded that the time has come for an adoption of Government practice to more recent developments associated with land transactions. In recent years more than 93 percent of titles approved by the Department of Justice have been based upon title certificates or title insurance policies. While judgment must be exercised in examining encumbrances in title certificates and exceptions in title policies, this judgment is similar to those involved in determinations concerning other matters related to the effective operation of governmental programs. The Justice Department notes that agency heads must now make determinations concerning real property acquired for these programs. These determinations relate to the propriety, timing and scope of acquisition, as well as the development, use and disposition of such properties. Whether the interest in land, that is the title being acquired, is sufficient for the purpose of a program or presents unwarranted risks for the United States involves a similar sort of determination under current practices. The Justice Department therefore concluded that in many instances this latter determination could appropriately be made by certain acquired agencies in accordance with proper legal standards fixed by the Justice Department.

As has been noted in discussing the provisions of the bill, the committee has recommended an amendment which will have the effect of retaining the present language of section 355 of the Revised Statutes making an exception so that the provisions of the section will not affect existing law concerning the acquisition of lands or interests in land by the Tennessee Valley Authority. The following language is presently found as the first sentence of the seventh paragraph of section 355 of the Revised Statutes:

"The foregoing provisions of this section shall not be construed to affect in any manner any existing provisions of law which are applicable to the acquisition of lands or interests in land by the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Identical language is contained as the committee amendment following line 19 of page 2 of the bill. The committee has concluded that the present legal situation should be preserved so that there will be no question concerning the continuance of the legal basis for the procedures followed by the Tennessee Valley Authority in connection with titles to land and interests in land. It can be noted that this authority has been exercised by the Tennessee Valley Authority for the past 37 years. Under the TVA Act (16 U.S.C. 831 et seq.) TVA has approved titles for the acquisition of property needed for its program. This was approved by the Joint Congressional Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, which in 1938 and 1939 made a detailed examination of all of TVA's operations. When 40 United States Code section 255 was amended in 1940, the provision referred to above was included explicitly preserving TVA's right to approve titles.

The committee has considered this legislation primarily on the basis that it provides for a realistic adjustment of Government procedures to meet modern conditions. The Department in the communication to the Congress noted that this improvement in the law will also result in certain economies to the Government. The proposal recognizes the fact that the assembly of title papers, curative work, closings and related title functions are already performed by the agencies. The considered use of the authority to delegate the functions of the Attorney General will have the effect of avoiding duplication which now exists as to some aspects of title processing by the Government.

In view of the factors described in this report and outlined in the communication of the Department of Justice, it is recommended that the amended bill be considered favorably.

The committee after a review of the foregoing concurs in the action taken by the House of Representatives and recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 15374.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bills, H.R. 13810, for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. Poehlein, and S. 3419, for the relief of Capt. Claire E. Brou, were announced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these two bills go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The two bills will be passed over.

JOHNNY TRINIDAD MASON, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, S. 3529, for the relief of Johnny Trinidad Mason, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Act," strike out "Johnny Trinidad Mason, Junior," and insert "Johnny Mason, Junior (Johnny Trinidad Mason, Junior)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johnny Mason, Junior (Johnny Trinidad Mason, Junior) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of J. D. Mason, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural mother of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1117), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to qualify for first preference status as the unmarried son of a citizen of the United States. The bill has been amended to correct errors in drafting.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Johnny Mason, Junior (Johnny Trinidad Mason, Junior)."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill, H.R. 18127, making appropriations for public works, 1971, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DR. PIO ALBERT POL Y ZAPATA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3129) for the relief of Dr. Pio Albert Pol y Zapata and his wife, Dolores S. Alvarez de Pol, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

S. 3129

That the periods of time Doctor Pio Albert Pol y Zapata has resided in the United States since his lawful admission for permanent residence on February 10, 1962, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–1119), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill as amended is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents. The name of the beneficiary's wife has been deleted, inasmuch as there is no showing of need for citizenship in her case.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Doctor Pio Albert Pol y Zapata."

MEASURES PASSED OVER

The bills H.R. 18110, to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the programs of assistance to the States and localities for comprehensive health planning; H.R. 17570, to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 236, authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of August 1 through August 7 as "National Clown Week"; the bill, H.R. 18725, to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia; the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; and the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 681, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President, were announced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these six measures go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The six bills will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3431) to extend the coverage of sections 13(d), 14(d), and 14(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 in order to provide additional protection for investors, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments. On page 2, after line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(e) (2)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Commission shall have power to make rules and regulations implementing this paragraph in the public interest and for the protection of investors, including exemptive rules and regulations covering situations in which the Commission deems it unnecessary or inappropriate that a purchase of the type described in this paragraph shall be deemed to be a purchase by the issuer for purposes of some or all of the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection."

At the beginning of line 17, change the section number from "2" to "3"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 3, change the section number from "3" to "4"; and at the beginning of line 8, change the section number from "4" to "5"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 3431

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the part of pargaraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(d)(1)) which precedes clause (A) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "section 12 of this title" the following: ", or any equity security of an insurance company which would have been required to be so registered except for the exemption contained in section 12(g)(2)(G) of this title,"; and

(2) by striking out "10 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Commission shall have power to make rules and regulations implementing this paragraph in the public interest and for the protection of investors, including exemptive rules and regulations covering situations in which the Commission deems it unnecessary or inappropriate that a purchase of the type described in this paragraph shall be deemed to be a purchase by the issuer for purposes of some or all of the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "section 12 of this title," the following: "or any equity security of an insurance company which would have been required to be so registered except for the exemption contained in section 12(g)(2)(G) of this title,"; and

(2) by striking out "10 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

SEC. 4. Paragraph 8 of subsection (d) of section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78n(d)(8)) is amended by striking out clause (A) and redesignating clauses (B), (C), and (D) as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

SEC. 5. Subsection (e) of section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. 78n(e)) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "The Commission shall, for the purposes of this subsection, by rules and regulations define, and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent, such acts and practices as are fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by Public Law 90–439, provides for the following disclosures in acquisitions and tender offers for 10 percent of any equity security registered under that act; the identity, background, and plans of the person or group making a tender offer or acquiring the securities; the size of the holdings of the person or group involved; the source of the funds used or to be used to acquire the shares; any contracts or arrangements relating to the shares; and if the purpose of the acquisition is to acquire control of the company, any plans to liquidate the company, sell its assets, merge it with another company, or make major changes in its business or corporate structure.

It also provides for investor protection against fraudulent activities in connection with these acquisitions and tender offers. In addition the Securities and Exchange Commission is authorized to regulate purchases by corporations of their own shares, and to require disclosures when there is a change in the majority of the board of directors of a corporation in conjunction with a 10-percent acquisition of securities or a tender offer.

Public Law 90–439 also substantively protects public investors to whom a tender offer is directed by providing withdrawal rights during the first 7 days and after the first 60 days of the offer. Furthermore it provides for a limited period during which securities must be taken up on a pro rata basis rather than on a first-come, first-served basis, and requires that any increase in the price offered during the period of the tender shall be extended to all persons who have previously tendered their securities.

Over the last 2 years this legislation has been most successful in lifting the veil of secrecy that had previously surrounded tender offers; however, certain legislative adjustments have now become necessary.

Anyone who reads the financial press is aware of the increase in corporate takeovers. Between August 1968 and April 1969 there were 243 filings made with the Securities and Exchange Commission announcing proposed tender offers. In addition, there were 188 acquisitions of more than 10 percent of a company's stock. The dollar amount for tender offers alone was $1.45 billion.

Ten percent of the stock of large corporations, indeed even 5 percent, can involve large amounts of money and can have a significant impact on corporate control.

The Banking and Currency Committee has also been informed of a recent tendency of people contemplating a takeover to terminate their acquisition at the 9-percent level in order to avoid compliance with the act's requirements. Here the need for the full disclosure provisions of the Securities Exchange Act are of the utmost necessity if we are to have adequate investor protection.

S. 3431 would extend the protections of Public Law 90–439 to acquisitions of over 5 percent of a company's stock. It would also extend coverage to shareholders of publicly held insurance companies who are currently at the mercy of secret takeover bids. This disparity in consumer protection is unwarranted and should no longer be tolerated.

The bill does not seek to disturb the decision reached in 1964 to leave periodic reporting, proxy solicitation and regulation of insider trading with respect to securities of insurance companies to the appropriate State authorities. However, in view of the nationwide basis of most tender offers and the fact that they are not presently regulated by State insurance commissioners, it is appropriate to bring within the purview of sections 13 (d) and 14(d) acquisitions of insurance company securities.

The bill would also subject stock-for-stock exchange offers made by means of a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 to the tender offer requirements of the act. Exchange offers involving the offer by a bidder of its own securities, in exchange for the securities of the target company are becoming more and more prevalent. This is particularly true in acquisitions of larger companies due to the enormous amount of money that would be required if a cash tender offer was used in order to gain control.

Exchange offers are presently exempted from the provisions of Public Law 90–439 because they are made pursuant to a registration statement under the Securities Act. This statement furnishes investors with adequate disclosure concerning the offer. However, this exemption also excludes the large groups of public investors to whom exchange offers are made from the act's substantive protections. These protections include the right of depositors under a tender offer to withdraw their shares during the first 7 days of the offer and after the expiration of 60 days; they require that the bidder take up all shares deposited during the first 10 days of the offer on a pro rata basis rather than on a first-come, first served basis; and they require the bidder to extend any increased consideration made in connection with the offer to persons who have already deposited their shares.

In addition S. 3431 would give the Commission rulemaking power with respect to fraudulent, deceptive, and manipulative activities used in tender offers. The techniques currently being used in these offers have become increasingly sophisticated and they change rapidly. This is particularly true when the takeover is resisted by incumbent management. In some instances industrial warefare occurs.

Claims and counterclaims, charges and countercharges are hurled back and forth. Efforts are made to influence the price of the securities involved. By granting this additional rulemaking authority the Congress would allow the Commission to deal promptly and with flexibility with these problems.

In his testimony before the committee, Chairman Budge of the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed an amendment to allow the Commission to adopt appropriate rules and regulations so that distinctions may be drawn between the issuer and its controlling persons in filings required under the act. Section 13(e) of the Securities Exchange Act grants the Commission rulemaking power concerning purchases by certain corporations of their own securities and specifies that for the purposes of section 13(e) a purchase by or for a person in a controlling relationship with the issuer is deemed to be a purchase by the issuer.

In adopting this amendment the committee felt that it was unnecessary to place on persons in a controlled relationship with the issuer all of the burdens of the section's requirements such as giving notice to shareholders after each purchase, which may be appropriate when the issuer purchases its own securities. When a company's funds are not used, the furnishing of information to shareholders does not involve all of the considerations and implications associated with the use of such funds.

Mr. President, this legislation is supported by the securities and Exchange Commission, the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, the National Association of Securities Dealers, the Investment Bankers Association and the Association of Stock Exchange Member Firms all of whom are involved on a daily basis with the problems which this bill attempts to solve.

The attitude of the securities industry towards this legislation is exemplified by a letter which I have received from James W. Walker, Jr., Executive Vice President of the American Stock Exchange. So that all Members of this body may have the benefit of Mr. Walker's views, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be included in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 16, 1970.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: The American Stock Exchange thanks the Subcommittee for this opportunity to comment on S–3431. We wish to commend the Subcommittee for continuing to focus on the matter of disclosure requirements in connection with tender offers and takeover bids.

The Exchange supports the basic principles embodied in Senate Bill S–3431. Mindful of the essential objectives of the Bill, we believe the proposed legislation is in the public interest, and will strengthen the safeguards available to this country's investors.

In addition, the American Stock Exchange wishes to take this occasion to emphasize the importance of early disclosure requirements in tender offers and takeover bids to the protection of the public market. Adequate and timely disclosure requirements are, we believe, vital to the maintenance of the public market. In order to make certain that fair treatment is afforded to all investors sharing the public market, small and large alike, the flow of information necessary to make informed investment decisions must be assured. Above all, confidence in the public market must be preserved, and this confidence comes only when the investing public is certain that it it receiving all of the facts. The Exchange is particularly concerned that information of contemplated actions, if not made publicly available at an early point, can have a disruptive or unfair impact on the public market to the detriment of ordinary investors.

From the standpoint of the investor in the public market, it may be very important to know about a prospective acquisition. If the investor is a stockholder of the aggressor company, the entire nature of his investment could change upon the consummation of the takeover. Furthermore, it can be of equal importance to the stockholder of the target company to be informed at the earliest possible point of the prospective takeover venture since his investment may be radically changed as a result of the market impact of the buying activities in that connection. The information needs of the general investing public also warrant consideration in view of the fact that many of them may be contemplating the purchase of stock in either the aggressor or the target company.

Moreover, a program of purchases by several independent investors through the public market as a prelude to an acquisition, when arranged by a third party having no direct financial participation in such purchases, may be able to circumvent the proposed requirements of the Bill, if care is taken by such third party to see that no one purchaser attains holdings, at an early stage, of 5 percent of the stock of the target company. It may be difficult to prove that the total holdings of the participants in the early stages of such a program would fall within the proposed requirements since there would, of course, be no direct link between the various purchasers. The best interests of the investing public would appear to be served by a full disclosure of the plans—whether definite or conditional—for a takeover venture at the very outset or at an early stage in the implementation of these plans when they are to involve the use of the public market. It may be that legislation directly designed to this end should be considered by the Subcommittee.

A program of purchases, as a prelude to an acquisition, can have an additional significant consequence to the public market in that it may disrupt the fairness and orderliness of the market. As trading in a particular issue becomes concentrated in fewer hands, which would be the inevitable outcome of a program of purchases, it is more difficult to preserve liquidity in the market. An essential element of liquidity is a steady flow of round-lot orders on both sides of the market which may be disrupted if there is a concentration of block trading on the buy side. Furthermore, a fair and orderly market must accurately reflect public supply and demand for stock, whereas if there exists a concentration of large purchases in a given issue, the floating supply can be substantially reduced. The Exchange believes that the dangers to the public market in this method of acquisition cannot be overlooked.

The Exchange is in full accord with the view that further steps are necessary to see that all essential facts are placed in the hands of public investors. Despite the present lull in the number of tender offers and takeover bids, with an uptrend in the stock market and greater availablity of credit the number of tender offers and takeover bids may significantly increase. Conglomerate formations might again increase in both number and scope. It is our view that the growth of conglomerates represents a pooling of assets and diversification of investments not totally unlike the economic philosophy contributing to the growth of investment companies.

There is one additional thought which we would like to present relative to the importance of the objectives of this legislation. There have been expressions of opinions in the past that acquisitions are, in general, healthy to the nation's economy because inefficient management of the target company was replaced by the more capable leadership provided by the acquirer. These opinions were based on the premise that one of the reasons a takeover bid succeeded was because shareholders of the target company

were dissatisfied with incumbent management. However, the utilization of a program of purchases through the public market, even though by several independent investors and arranged by a third party having no direct financial participation in such purchases, may give the aggressor company such a substantial foothold within the target corporation that incumbent management is powerless to prevent the takeover irrespective of the regard in which management is held by the remaining shareholders. It may well be that the target company is selected because of the caliber of incumbent management since in particular a well-run company might be considered a more valuable holding.

The Exchange is in accord with the amendment which widens the scope of Sections 13(d)(1) and 14(d)(1) to include purchases involving equity securities of insurance companies. In addition, the Exchange concurs with the amendment which removes from Section 14(d) the exemption from filing requirements applicable to offers for tenders proposed to be made through a registration statement under the 1933 Act.

We would once again like to express our appreciation to the Subcommittee for this opportunity to comment on Senate Bill S-3431.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. WALKER, Jr.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is our Nation's legitimate businessmen as well as the more than 30 million American shareholders who have the most to gain from this legislation. This bill will put all on an equal footing with respect to the availability of significant facts about a tender offer or a corporate stock purchase program. All will be able to deal in the securities markets knowing that all of the pertinent facts are available. This is the premise under which our securities markets are supposed to work. Following this premise they have thrived and prospered over the years. Now is the time to eliminate the last remaining areas where full disclosure is necessary but not yet available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-1125), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation (S. 3431) would amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide additional investor protection in corporate tender offers and other acquisitions of securities, and would supplement the protections afforded to investors by Public Law 90-439 enacted on July 29, 1968.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by Public Law 90-439, provides for the following disclosures in acquisitions and tender offers for 10 percent of any class of an equity security registered under that act and for the equity securities of closed-end investment companies registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940:

(*a*) the identity, background, and plans of the person or group making a tender offer or acquiring the securities,

(*b*) the size of the holdings of the person or group involved,

(*c*) the source of the funds used or to be used to acquire the shares,

(*d*) any contracts or arrangements relating to the shares,

(*e*) if the purpose of the acquisition is to acquire control of the company, any plans to liquidate the company, sell its assets, merge it with another company or make major changes in its business or corporate structure.

It also provides for investor protection against fraudulent activities in connection with these acquisitions and tender offers. In addition the Securities and Exchange Commission is authorized to regulate purchases by corporations of their own shares, and to require disclosures when there is a change in the majority of the board of directors of a corporation in conjunction with a 10-percent acquisition of securities or a tender offer.

Public Law 90-439 also substantively protects public investors to whom a tender offer is directed by providing withdrawal rights during the first 7 days and after the first 60 days of the offer. Furthermore it provides for a limited period during which securities must be taken up on a pro rata basis rather than on a first-come, first-served basis, and requires that any increase in the price offered during the period of the tender shall be extended to all persons who have previously tendered their securities.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide additional protection for investors by augmenting the provisions of Public Law 90-439.

The bill would extend the coverage of Public Law 90-439 to encompass acquisitions of and tender offers for equity securities of insurance companies. It would also extend the act's full disclosure provision to acquisitions and tender offers of over 5 percent of a company's stock. Under Public Law 90-439 these provisions only apply to acquisitions and tender offers of over 10 percent.

In addition the bill would extend the substantive provisions of Public Law 90-439 which protects stockholders involved in cash acquisitions and tender offers to stock for stock exchange offers and would give the Securities and Exchange Commission additional rulemaking power to deal with certain types of fraudulent, deceptive, and manipulative practices. Finally, an amendment to the bill would give the Commission rulemaking power to differentiate between control persons and issuers in applying certain requirements of section 13(e) of the Securities Exchange Act.

SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION

First, the bill extends the provisions of sections 13(d) and 14(d) of the Securities Exchange Act to acquisitions of and tender offers for securities of insurance companies. The bill does not seek to disturb the decision reached in 1964 to leave periodic reporting, proxy solicitation and regulation of insider trading with respect to securities of insurance companies to the appropriate State authorities. However, in view of the nationwide basis of most tender offers and the fact that such offers are not presently regulated by State insurance commissioners, it appears appropriate to the committee to bring within the purview of sections 13(d) and 14(d) acquisitions of insurance company securities.

Second, the bill amends sections 13(d)(1) and 14(d)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act to reduce the 10 percent figure in those sections to 5 percent.

Section 13(d)(1) now requires that any person who acquires 10 percent of the equity securities of a company registered under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act or of the equity securities issued by a closed-end investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, file with the Commission certain specified disclosures. These include information pertaining to the identity and background of the person who acquired the securities, the source and the amount of funds used, and the purposes for which the shares were acquired.

Section 14(d)(1) presently makes it unlawful to make a tender offer, for securities in an amount which, if successful, would give the bidder 10 percent or more of that class of securities, unless a statement containing essentially the same information required under section 13(d) is filed with the Commission, sent to the target company and the same equivalent information is furnished to investors who are invited to tender their shares.

The reduction for 10 to 5 percent would provide public disclosure of impending corporate takeovers at a more meaningful level. The Securities and Exchange Commission has informed the committee that in some instances persons or companies undertaking an acquisition have limited their purchases of stock in the open market to 8 or 9 percent as a means of avoiding the disclosure requirements of Public Law 90-439. This practice deprives investors of the material information which is necessary to enable them to make a decision whether to accept or reject the tender offer.

An investment of between 5 and 10 percent of the securities of a company can have a significant impact on the public market for that company's stock. Shareholders of the target company are entitled to full disclosure when over 5 percent of their company's stock is to be acquired by an outside group. These acquisitions may lead to important changes in the management or business of the company and the shareholders should be fully informed. Similarly, management of a target company should be advised of a tender offer under section 14(d) for securities in an amount of over 5 percent of its stock in order to appropriately protect the interests of its security holders.

At the hearings exemptions from sections 13(d) and 14(d) relating to acquisitions by stock exchange specialists, over-the-counter market makers, and investment companies were suggested by various segments of the securities industry. No reason for such exemptions were put forward other than inconveniences to the specialist or market maker. The committee did not include these exemptions in the proposed legislation since the statutory purpose could be evaded if an individual were permitted to accumulate over 5 percent of a company's securities which he could then sell in a block transaction without public notice. Any inconveniences or burdens to specialists or market makers can be appropriately handled by the Commission pursuant to its rulemaking authority which allows it to vary the filing requirements in these areas in order to avoid the repetitious filing of information.

Third, the bill would subject stock-for-stock exchange offers made by means of a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 to the tender offer requirements of section 14(d) of the Securities Exchange Act. Exchange offers involving the offer by a bidder of its own securities, in exchange for the securities of the target company are becoming more and more prevalent. This is particularly true in attempted acquisitions of larger companies due to the enormous amount of money that would be required if a cash tender offer was used in order to gain control.

Exchange offers are presently exempted from section 14(d) of the Securities Exchange Act, because they are made pursuant to a registration statement under the Securities Act. This statement furnishes investors with adequate disclosure concerning the offer. However, this exemption also excludes the large groups of public investors to whom exchange offers are made from the substantive protections of section 14(d) in connection with a cash tender offer. These protections include the right of depositors under a tender offer to withdraw their shares during the first 7 days of the offer and after the expiration of 60 days; they require that the bidder take up all shares deposited during the first 10 days of the offer on a pro rata basis rather than on a first-come, first-served

basis; and they require the bidder to extend any increased consideration made in connection with the offer to persons who have already deposited their shares. Moreover, in the absence of the applicability of section 14(d) to a registered exchange offer, solicitations or recommendations in opposition to such an offer are not subject to regulation.

At the hearing the question was raised as to whether making exchange offers subject to the disclosure requirements of both the Securities Act and the tender offer provisions of the Securities Exchange Act would impose an unnecessary burden of duplicate filings upon registrants. If this problem should arise, the Commission has adequate rulemaking authority to alleviate any unnecessary burden of duplicate filings and the committee would expect the Commission to take such an approach.

Fourth, the bill amends section 14(e) of the Securities Exchange Act to grant the Commission rulemaking power to define and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent fraudulent, deceptive, and manipulative practices. The purpose of this provision is to allow the Commission to deal more effectively with the devices sometimes employed on both sides in contested tender offers. The language of the addition to section 14(e) is identical to that contained in section 15(c)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act concerning practices of broker and dealers in securities transactions in the over-the-counter markets.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

In his testimony before the committee, Chairman Budge of the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed an amendment to the bill. He suggested that the Commission be granted power to adopt appropriate rules and regulations under section 13(e)(2) so that distinctions may be drawn between the issuer and its controlling persons in filings required under section 13(e). Section 13(e) grants the Commission rulemaking power concerning purchases by certain corporations of their own securities and specifies that for purposes of section 13(e) a purchase by or for a person in a controlling relationship with the issuer is deemed to be a purchase by the issuer.

In adopting this proposed amendment the committee felt that it was unnecessary to place on persons in a control relationship with the issuer all of the burdens of the section's requirements such as giving notice to shareholders after each purchase, which may be appropriate when the issuer purchases its own securities. When corporate funds are not used, the furnishing of information to shareholders does not involve the considerations and implications associated with the use of corporate funds. Moreover, a controlling person of a corporation is subject to the tender offer requirements of section 14(d) and the acquisition reporting requirements of section 13(d), whereas the issuer is exempt.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A Bill to amend sections 13(d), 13(e), 14(d), and 14(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 in order to provide additional protection for investors."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR STENNIS TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) be allowed to proceed for not to exceed 20 minutes, following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business with a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements made therein.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF REV. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the passing of Rev. Frederick Brown Harris this morning is a source of grief and sadness to all of us in the Senate and to all of us who have met him and served with him during his tenure as Chaplain of the Senate.

He was a man of God who walked humbly with the Lord, but who always conducted himself joyously as a man, to whom religion was not only a part of his daily life but also something to be lived to the fullest in consonance with his firm trust and faith in the Almighty, and in the powers of the Almighty to guide mankind and to watch over us during our daily goings and comings in this place.

He was a very good man, a very much beloved man, and one whom we shall miss during our own remaining days in the Senate.

I know that all of us join in extending condolences to his family and are happy that he passed from this part of his experience in his sleep, which is equated by the poet with death as a forgetting. He must therefore have passed from one world to another in the gentle transition which accompanies this form of the ending of one's time upon the earth. This is, I think, a final kindness which his Creator bestowed upon him.

We shall miss him and mourn him and shall ever love him and his memory.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the distinguished minority leader has said.

Dr. Frederick Brown Harris was one of the Senate's outstanding Chaplains, a man of deep religious devotion, dedication, and integrity.

It is with sorrow that I have heard of our loss. It is with deep regret that I note this event.

So in response to what the distinguished minority leader has already said, I join in expressing my personal regret and the regret of this body, which he served so well.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for a period not to exceed 45 minutes.

VINCE LOMBARDI, SUPERCOACH—REMARKABLE MAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a remarkable man lies ill. He has come to public knowledge not because he is a man of government or science or the professions. He has come to public knowledge because, as Art Modell, owner of the Cleveland Browns, said, he is the greatest coach in the history of professional football.

Vince Lombardi would have been great had he never played football or coached it. Mr. Lombardi is a remarkable man of dedication, determination, leadership, courage, and humility. He has those qualities in measures seldom seen in most men.

A large segment of the American public—sports fans and those who do not read the sports pages; poor and wealthy; black and white—are truly concerned about Mr. Lombardi. They know, however, that this unusual man is showing the same courage in his present travail as he did that day when, playing on the Fordham line, as a 170-pound guard and as one of the Rams' "Seven Blocks of Granite," an opposing tackle's repeated jabs opened a wound inside his mouth that required 30 stitches to close.

Vince Lombardi has always said that physical pain is something that is in the mind. He convinced the Packers and the Redskins that he coached that this is true.

We in Wisconsin hold Vince Lombardi in special admiration. Green Bay, the city the Packers represent, is not one of the 20 large metropolis centers in the country. It is viewed by many as a relatively small city. It is a city which had relatively little success with its football team in the years before Mr. Lombardi came. As a matter of fact, the year before he came to the Packers, the Packers had won only one game.

I remember when former Senator and former President John F. Kennedy came to Wisconsin to campaign for me that the Green Bay Packers had had one losing season after another. He said that what the Packers needed was a quarterback and that until they got a good one they would not win in professional football.

Lots of people debated whether they needed a good quarterback or better players or whether the management should have more money with which to buy outstanding players.

I think that Vince Lombardi proved that what it takes above all is a great football coach. He took over a football team that had had one losing season after another. He brought the Green Bay Packers up from the depths, after having won just one game the preceding season, to perhaps the greatest heights

that any professional football team has ever reached.

Vince Lombardi led the team on the field to unsurpassed triumphs—three straight championships and two straight victories in the Super Bowl. But in his office as general manager, he also made the team solvent and put it on a firm financial footing. Such a combination should not be considered unusual for an unusual man. For, after having graduated magna cum laude in 1937 from Fordham, and while working toward a law degree, Mr. Lombardi taught Latin and science at St. Cecilia's High School in Englewood, N.J., where he also coached football.

Despite his talents, Lombardi remained in relative obscurity until he reached Green Bay in 1959 as head coach and general manager.

He was then 45 years old, having been hired from the New York Giants where he had been assistant coach. So, the Packer offer became that rare combination: the right man in the right spot at the right time.

Just 2 weeks short of 9 years after he had signed that first contract at Green Bay, on January 14, 1968, Vince Lombardi and his Packers won the second Super Bowl, and he stood on the top—king of the sports mountain. In nine seasons at Green Bay he had won five league titles. In a decade that saw professional football boom—from 12 teams to 26 teams—it was Lombardi's Packers who were the winningest club in the pro game. It was Lombardi who put winning above everything but virtue.

In one way, Lombardi is an old-fashioned coach. He does not believe in razzle-dazzle. He believes in doing the basics well—not just well, but perfect. It was the fundamental running game—power sweeps, the off-tackle plays—that made the Packers. The secret was precise execution. That could come only by stressing perfection. And Lombardi, if he is anything, is a perfectionist.

I think one would have to have been in Green Bay during those remarkable years to understand the impact that the Packers and Lombardi made. Professional football players are like any group of young athletes. They are carefree and relaxed and they get into trouble as young men do everywhere. There was something different about the Packers after he took over. He convinced them that they had an obligation to the community to constantly comport themselves as gentlemen, to be respectful and respectable in the best sense; not that they did not still love life, but one would never see a Packer leaning against a bar in a tavern and one would never see a Packer engaged in any kind of activity that could bring criticism on the town, on the city, on the game, or on the Packers. It takes a remarkable quality to instill this in young athletes. It takes an unusual man to do this and at the same time have the team so devoted to him and to their cause that they not only were great football players but also remarkable emissaries of good will and good conduct.

As a coach at Green Bay, Lombardi was a taskmaster, and he was gruff. Yet he gained the affection of his players. I suppose no one ever organized a practice as he did. Vince Lombardi did not believe in long practices, but his practices were tightly organized and every single minute was well spent and well organized in such a way that the players and the coaches got the most out of practices.

In his book "Instant Replay," all-pro guard Jerry Kramer wrote:

> Vince is driving us like a madman; he never lets up. It's hard to resist hating him, his ranting, his raving, his hollering. But damn him, he's a great coach.

And Kramer was one of the players Lombardi made into a star. He along with another all-time great guard, Fuzzy Thurston, led the sweeps that became a Lombardi hallmark of "run to daylight."

Willie Wood came to camp as a free agent, and Lombardi made him All-Pro. Incidentally, Willie Wood is from a high school here in Washington. Paul Hornung became a star under Lombardi. As everyone who is interested in sports knows, Hornung was a Heisman trophy winner at Notre Dame as a quarterback but never seemed to be able to "get with it" in professional football. He was a playboy and a lover of life. He came under the discipline of Vince Lombardi and became a remarkable player, a great star, and broke all records for scoring; and it was largely because Vince Lombardi recognized what it took to make Paul Hornung into an outstanding football player.

Jim Taylor was the same way. Bart Starr came off the bench to become one of the best signal callers and passers in either league, again because of Vince Lombardi. I think many people feel that Bart Starr is one of the finest quarterbacks the game ever produced, along with John Unitas, and others.

But Lombardi has not sought to produce stars. Rather his aim has always been the success of his team. One of his players, Henry Jordan, is quoted in a book by Chuck Johnson, sports editor of The Milwaukee Journal, as saying:

> I don't think we have better players than anyone else. But we don't keep anyone here who doesn't become a part of the team. When a game is over, it's not how I did, but how the team did.

Bill Gleason wrote last Sunday in his column in the Chicago Sun-Times:

> The Packers of the championship years realize that Lombardi built great teams with the roisterers, the dum-dums, the culls, the malcontents, and the other oddballs that other coaches could not bend to their wills. And those who were roisterers and all those other things appreciate most the fact that the very moral man who was their coach did not try to change them.

There was, perhaps, one way in which Lombardi has changed some players. It is general knowledge now that Mr. Lombardi would not put up with bigotry. When he came to the Redskins there were some vestiges of racial tension on the squad.

I remember reading recently that one Redskin player said that in his view the real contribution Lombardi made to make the Redskins a better team was not in any of the more famous and well-known attributes he brought to the team or in his football technique, which was superb, but the fact that he was successful in abolishing the hostility that had developed on the Redskins between white and black players. Vince Lombardi would just not put up with that. He recognized men were men, and whether they were black or white did not make any difference to him.

Without giving speeches on civil rights or becoming a conspicuous civil rights champion, he was able through much better appreciation, understanding, respect, and affection to bring understanding between players of different colors. But Lombardi is a leader of men, and all the men on his teams are to him just that, men.

He also demands that his charges act like men at all times. Big celebrations in the locker room after a big victory can be seen with some other clubs—not with Lombardi's. No champagne, no horseplay, no throwing the coach into the shower. None of that kid's stuff for Lombardi. He is concerned about the image of professional football. That means the players must be responsible. In Green Bay, Lombardi did not say his players could not drink, but if a player were caught standing at a bar there he was subject to an automatic fine. And the players were expected to comport themselves like gentlemen and dress like gentlemen.

One could take time here to recount the wins and loses of Lombardi teams—an impressive record by any yardstick. But that would make it sound as though that record would not grow even more impressive. We all hope and pray that the winning ways of Vincent Thomas Lombardi will go on for season, after season, after season.

One of the most quotable statements ever made by Lombardi is this, for he often told it to his players:

> Only three things should matter to you: Your religion, your family and the Green Bay Packers, in that order.

That is a philosophy anyone could live by. There is one trouble with it, however, for fans and other football teams—for now, he is undoubtedly saying it to the Washington Redskins, and they will turn into latter-day Packers.

Another sampling of Mr. Lombardi's viewpoint beyond the football field can be found in a speech he made shortly after the Packers won their first Super Bowl.

He said:

> This is an age for heroes. The test of the century is whether we mistake the growth of wealth and power for the growth of strength and character. We've weakened discipline and respect for authority and let freedom of the individual predominate.
>
> It is the obligation of people who are in authority to see that we are awakened once more to the need to develop a strong interest in competitive spirit. Those who are in authority fail in that pursuit unless they preserve what has been an American goal—to win and to be first in whatever we do.

And Lombardi listed these qualities of leadership:

> It takes mental toughness. And it includes humility, Spartanism, love, loyalty, teamwork, respect for the dignity of the individual and charity.

And he gave advice for those who are led:

> We also need followers who will accept authority. In our search for individual freedom, in struggling to liberate ourselves from ancient creeds, we sometimes have idealized freedom against order. It has been the new

against the old, and, by reducing authority, we have lost discipline. Thus the freedom—too much freedom—has had an adverse effect. The strength of a company or a team is in the will of the leaders. If the manager is weak-willed, the company is poorly directed.

That speech was made to the American Management Association's annual personnel conference. But there is a measure of the man in it.

We know that the man in the hospital has the strength of character he needs. But there is a need we can fill, and we will fill it with our prayers.

Mr. President, I am very proud, as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, to pay this tribute to Vince Lombardi. Representative MURPHY of New York led a similar tribute in the House of Representatives a couple of days ago. Representative MURPHY had the great honor of playing under the coaching of Vince Lombardi when he was assistant coach at West Point.

It is unusual for a Senator to take the time of the Senate to pay tribute to a sports leader, but I say this is a most remarkable and unusual man. He has the kind of qualities America needs now as never before. He lies seriously ill, and I feel it is necessary and desirable that we recall these qualities, his record, and his dedication to the attention of our fellow citizens.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator PROXMIRE in tribute to Vince Lombardi, the fine coach of the Washington Redskins, and to wish his recovery from the illness which has kept him from his coaching duties. All football fans, and I count myself one, are the losers when a master coach such as Vince Lombardi is removed from the field of action.

When Mr. Lombardi became coach of the Redskins a wave of optimism swept through the ranks of Redskin fans. This optimism was justified, although the Redskins in their first year under him did not win a championship. The caliber of play seemed to improve magically, and just seeing Lombardi on the bench—or in his usual standing position—seemed worth the price of admission.

Vince Lombardi is an American success story. He won early fame as a member of the Fordham University football, team where he was one of the "Seven Blocks of Granite." He became a highly successful high school coach, then an able assistant to Red Blaik at West Point, and later won his professional spurs as assistant coach of the New York Giants. His success as coach of the Green Bay Packers is legend.

Vince Lombardi bespeaks everything that is good and great about America. He is a fighter—a determined, courageous man who instills those attributes into his players. But—more—he has studied the game of football until he has become one of its great masters. He is a magnificent American and I hope he will soon be back on the football field.

I am pleased to join in the tribute by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I think what few of us realize is that we tend to focus on our own areas, our own narrow interests. The American public in recent years has probably paid more attention to football than to almost any other kind of activity. It has become almost a family joke that wives have been unable to get their husbands to do the chores they should do on Sunday afternoon because they are watching the football games. I suppose we can carry anything to extremes, but I think it has had a wholesome and healthy influence on American life. The terrific competition, the fierce competition in professional football is almost unparalleled anywhere else, when one considers the kind of excellence it takes to win.

So I think the fact that this country has produced a man of these remarkable qualities is something that all of us have reason to be thankful for and to recognize and to acknowledge.

I thank the Senator from Virginia very much.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I say to the senior Senator from Wisconsin that I agree with every statement he has made today. I feel that he is rendering a fine service to millions of those of us who are rooters and fans for different football teams. It is with pleasure that I have listened to him and I desire to join in paying tribute to Vince Lombardi, the general manager of the Washington Redskins.

I hope that within the near future he will resume his duties as head coach of the Redskins.

He has been one of the very great coaches of our Nation. He has become a tradition. Vince Lombardi, in addition, has proven to be a very great American who has molded real men out of boys. He has molded champions out of football players wherever he has coached, from his early days as coach at St. Cecelia's High School, to his period of coaching internship under the great Red Blaik at West Point, to his unmatched success with the Green Bay Packers over the years, with whom he won three straight professional championships.

These are unparalleled achievements.

Mr. President, Vince Lombardi has dedicated himself to the attainment of excellence. I know, in joining with other Senators here and in announcing my views in support of everything that the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin has stated today, all of the football fans of my State of Ohio and around the entire country agree with us when we wish Coach Vince Lombardi a speedy and complete recovery and look forward to his resuming his work as head coach of the Washington Redskins.

I speak as one of those who customarily enjoy spending Sunday afternoons watching television. Whenever the Cleveland Browns and the Washington Redskins play, I am just one of some millions of men and women throughout our country who keep in front of the television screen throughout that afternoon, and we do not want to be interrupted by anyone.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I especially appreciate the tribute of the Senator from Ohio. Ohio has a long and well-deserved reputation for football achievement. I thinks perhaps the only coach who has a record comparable to that of Vince Lombardi's is Paul Brown. Paul Brown had those marvelous years with the Cleveland Browns. Many people thought the Cleveland Browns were named after him. Maybe they were. They won one championship after another. Now Paul Brown has gone to the Cincinnati Bengals, where he is doing a superb job. I know how much Paul Brown thought of Vince Lombardi, and how he deeply admired his qualities of determination and pride, and particularly the notion that professional football has an obligation for its men to deport themselves as gentlemen regardless of where they are.

I think that is the reason why we should be grateful to men like Paul Brown and Vince Lombardi for what they have brought to football. There is no question that they have made a finer and better country.

I appreciate what my friend has had to say. As the Senator has just stated, millions of Americans watch football games constantly, and it has a real effect on their attitudes and their character.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. What the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin says is, of course, true; and the Cleveland Browns were named after Paul Brown.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, were they? I did not realize that.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. They were named after Paul Brown; and it is a fact that Paul Brown and Vince Lombardi are not only close personal friends, but they are outstanding coaches, and they have both done a great deal for all Americans. As an Ohioan, and now as a Washingtonian, I believe that Vince Lombardi ranks as the greatest and has done the most of all American coaches. When we speak of Paul Brown in connection with him, however, we are speaking of the two topmost coaches, it seems to me.

Again, I express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I pointed out earlier, Art Modell, the owner of the Cleveland Browns, with greatest respect for and in no derogation of Paul Brown, said that Vince Lombardi is the greatest football coach who ever lived.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I go along with that. May he have a complete recovery, and soon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to correct one completely inadvertent remark I made, which has been called to my attention. I said that when Lombardi came to Green Bay, that team had only lost one game the year before. They had only won one game. When Lombardi took over, they had a winning season immediately, and the following year were runner-up to the Philadelphia Eagles for the NFL championship. Then they won five championships in the next 7 years, and two superbowls. No other coach has ever accomplished anything like that.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I am sorry that I did

not enter the Chamber until the last few moments, but I know of the subject that has been under discussion. I yield to no man when it comes to enthusiasm for sports. We pride ourselves, in California, that we have more professional baseball teams and football teams, and fine collegiate teams, than any other part of the country, and we are very enthusiastic about the great figures connected with them, and the contribution which they make to the pleasure of the spectators and to the American way of life.

There is one thing that supersedes even the pride that we Californians take in our own home State teams, and that is the respect we have for the outstanding leaders in competitive sports everywhere, even when they might be our rivals. Their spirit reflects the true spirit of our Nation, and we recognize and applaud great leaders and men in public life such as Vince Lombardi.

Truly, not only is he a giant in his chosen field of endeavor but he is, even more, a giant among our national leaders, and the example and leadership he has displayed throughout the years have brought hope and inspiration to young and old alike.

When we Californians speak of such rare individuals, we refer to them as "men to match our mountains," and although Vince Lombardi is not a Golden Stater, we have seen him not only match some of our most formidable sports "mountains" but also, all too frequently, topple them.

As the son of an Olympics coach, I know in a special way the importance of sports in this great Nation and the strength which true sportsmen like Vince Lombardi have contributed to the country.

With my Senate colleagues, I extend my most sincere wishes for a rapid recovery and for many years of health and happiness.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from California. I know that the Senator's father was a crack track coach at Yale and that he himself was an outstanding athlete, and I am sure that Coach Vince Lombardi will deeply appreciate the fine statement he has made.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I have been delighted to hear the tributes paid by the Senator from Wisconsin and others to Coach Vincent Lombardi. I shall not try to add anything to what has been said about him as a coach, but I do feel that he has qualities of character, stamina, courage, and frankness that could well be emulated in public life, not only here in the Senate and in Congress, but back in the States, the cities, the towns, and the local governments. We need more people in public life, as I see it, who have those qualities. I think it would be an answer to the permissiveness and the uncontrolled carrying on of a great many misguided people. It would help add a firmness of purpose and a determination toward the attainment of personal goals, to have more men of the spirit of this truly great coach. I agree that he has added much to American life.

We cannot all be football coaches, but positions of leadership are open in every avenue under our way of life and our system of government, and we laud his qualities, and should try to bring them into focus in other fields, particularly in public life.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I think he has put his finger on exactly the quality that should be stressed here. This man has brought a character, a discipline, and a sense of responsibility and teamwork to football that, as the Senator has said, we need desperately right now throughout American life. In doing this, he has made an extraordinary contribution. I think that now, as he lies seriously ill in Georgetown Hospital, it is most appropriate and desirable that we pay our tribute to him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am most happy that the Senator from Wisconsin has taken the floor to voice his regard and the regard of the Senate for Vince Lombardi. While we have never been close friends, we are friends. We belong to the same club, and I see him very often. In fact, I saw him just the day before his first operation. I was very shocked, the next day, to read that he had gone to the hospital, because he looked his usual healthy, husky self.

I have known of him, of course, ever since he played collegiate football. I think he has brought to the game precisely what the Senator from Mississippi has said. He has brought character, but he has also brought discipline, which is something that has almost vanished from American life. Young people hardly know what discipline is. Older people have known it and forgotten about it. But the secret of his success, to me, was not his superb knowledge of football, but his demand that discipline be followed by his players, and not just by his players, but by everyone associated with the game.

I think many of our young people today, wondering how they can better their lives, might look at the remarkable history this man has made, with mediocre football players in many cases, by making them hew the line to the point that they turned out to be outstanding players. I know many players who have played under him, and this is the first thing they laud about him. He taught these people discipline, and that is the reason he has had such outstanding success in football.

I join with my colleagues in the Senate, and I know with the American people all over the country, in their prayers and wishes for his speedy and complete recovery.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I would like to reinforce what he has said. I agree that discipline, character, and dedication are the hallmarks of Vince Lombardi. At the same time, when he had people who were free spirits such as Paul Hornung, for instance, who loved to have a good time and never stopped enjoying the fun of life, he did not seek to remold them. Hornung was not changed in his essential character, but he was completely a team man. He was absolutely dedicated to the Green Bay Packers, while at the same time recognizing that he had to work with Vince Lombardi and become a part of that Packer spirit and that team spirit.

This is a very difficult element to define. I think the Senator from Arizona has done an excellent job in emphasizing how desperately and urgently it is needed in this country right now. Perhaps, the only way you can get it is by example. You cannot really get it by speeches or by any other method. It is most fortunate for this country that we have a man of such smashing success in this area, in a field which has the attention of literally millions of our young men and of our older men, for that matter, and of all our people.

Mr. President, I simply conclude by wishing fervently—as I am sure all Members of the Senate do—that Vince Lombardi, struggling for life, as I have said, at Georgetown Hospital, will recover and once again give to professional football and to America the great spirit and great example he has demonstrated.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to have the honor of paying tribute to a man whose contribution to the betterment of our society stretches far beyond his brilliant playing and coaching career in college and professional football.

Vince Lombardi is the man I am speaking of today. He has inspired athletes to realize their full potential; he has taught fans and players alike the personal satisfaction realized when a complete effort is given; he has served as an example, not only to our youth but to every person whose life he has touched, of what it means to be a man in the truest sense of the word.

Many have felt the positive influence of Vince Lombardi and certainly all have benefited from it. His life continues to serve as a reminder to all of us that hard work, strict discipline, and complete dedication mold championship character. I can think of no more appropriate words to sum up the life of Vince Lombardi than those echoed by Tennyson in Ulysses when he said: "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield." Certainly, Vince Lombardi's life has been patterned after this meaningful thought by Tennyson.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a friend, Coach Vince Lombardi.

Coach Lombardi came to my State 11 years ago. With him he brought a code of undeviating excellence and a personal determination that did not know the meaning of defeat. In a few years, the Green Bay Packers had become the standard of performance in American football and the inspiration to a generation of athletes.

Much has been said about the victories he won for Green Bay and more recently, for Washington. The record stands for itself and needs no further comment. What is singular about the victories, though, is the iron will behind them—that behind the fanfare is a man who could inspire other men to be great.

No coach, no leader can simply command people to be champions. First, he

must have the soul and the heart of a champion himself. Vince Lombardi led his teams with a tight rein. But what made his teams winners was the respect, admiration, and devotion that made them follow him.

Now Coach Lombardi has been temporarily felled by an adversary that knows no rules of sportsmanship. He is fighting back, after two serious operations, with all the resources of his great heart and his rugged, indomitable will.

I think I can speak for Wisconsin and for all of America in wishing him a quick victory in this contest and a quick return to the playing field. Our prayers and our hopes are with him as he struggles in his lonely battle. Good luck, Coach.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, and in accordance with the previous order, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

C–5A SIGNIFICANT TO SECURITY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak with regard to an amendment which will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin; and because I may not be present when it is offered, I would like to speak to it.

I once again find myself in the position of complimenting the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) on his dedication to economy in Government. I share his zeal for economy and am pleased to work along side him in his endeavors whenever I can. Unfortunately, there are times when I find that I must disagree with his suggested programs. This is not too often, but the amendment which he will offer, No. 680, is one of those cases.

It is, therefore, with regret that I must urge Senators to oppose the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, which would delete the $200 million contingency funds from the authorization of the Committee on Armed Services, which it has included and recommended in its report for the C–5A transport aircraft.

Much as I dislike to disagree with this amendment, I am convinced that it is necessary to do so, and before I turn to the C–5A specifically, I feel that some rather general background on this year's authorization would be appropriate and possibly necessary. The distinguished and dedicated chairman of the Committee on Armed Services—of which I am proud to be a member—the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), recently reported some interesting statistics worthy of reiteration.

Contrary to some of the figures of questionable accuracy which I have heard quoted in this Chamber, total appropriations for Defense will be only about 36 percent of the total Federal budget for fiscal year 1971. The lowest portion, I might add, since 1950. In addition to this, on an overall basis, the committee reduced the administration's $20.3 billion Defense authorization request by $1.3 billion, an unprecedented amount. On a dollar basis, the authorization before us is the lowest since fiscal year 1961—10 years ago. It is factual, then, that Defense spending is decreasing instead of skyrocketing, as some would have us believe. Furthermore, it is most important for Senators to realize and acknowledge that this bill provides—and I quote Chairman STENNIS—"the lowest possible dollar level consistent with the necessity for providing the weapons for our national survival." Chairman STENNIS is well known to choose his words carefully, and I cannot overstress that he has said our national survival depends on passage without further reduction.

As examples of the figures contained in this bill, it has been shown that the Air Force is buying fewer aircraft than at any time since 1935, 6 years before World War II, and it should be well remembered that this nearly did cost us our national survival. As I think back to those days, in reacting to people who said that we did not need armament, it nearly cost the freedom of the entire world, because this was during the period when the Nazis were building up their armaments with a plan to conquer all of Europe, possibly just for a beginning, and we, at the same time, had let our weapons systems fall into disarray because we felt that we would be protected by the Versailles Treaty.

The Navy is, also, buying fewer aircraft this year than at any time since 1946 when we were once again bent on disarming. That, Senators will recall, was just 4 years before the unfortunate situation in Korea which made it necessary, once again, to go to war.

Therefore, without burdening Senators with statistics, suffice it to say that the Armed Services Committee has reduced the administration's request by 6.7 percent to a total of $19.2 billion—to what we consider the bare necessity. In other words, Mr. President, if one really wants to know where the taxpayers dollars are doing, I can furnish that information. Total Government spending has increased 62 percent since fiscal year 1964, and of that total, 90 percent has gone to nondefense Federal agencies. There is one more figure that is significant, and again I quote Chairman Stennis:

> The pay of personnel—
>
> These are paychecks for jobs—
>
> and personnel related expenses now account for 60 percent of defense spending.

In other words, every time we cut $1 of defense spending, we cut approximately 60 percent—60 cents—from the payroll and dollars available for some individual's paycheck. I may be more sensitive to this than other Senators, because at the present time the cuts in the defense spending are being felt in my State probably more severely than in any other. Thus, I hope Senators can see the portion of the DOD budget we are discussing in its real perspective and in its proper context.

When the problem of the C–5A came up last year, I addressed myself to the matter; and I beg the forebearance of Senators if, at the risk of appearing immodest, I repeat what I said at that time.

We all regret cost overruns on this plane. Had we been able to deal on a fair or more clearly understood basis with the Department of Defense over the past 8 years, this might never have happened.

I am acquainted with Lockheed's officials, with many of their employees and with their union officials. I am more than normally aware of their many fine projects of the past. I can recall, back in the old days, when they came up with something called the P–38, when it was badly needed; then the U–2, which was highly publicized—and is still performing a great service lately, according to the press, to give us information which is badly needed about what is actually taking place in the Middle East; and later on the Polaris and Poseidon missiles, and the P–3 antisubmarine airplane, the Agena space vehicles, the fabulous SR–71, the world's fastest and highest flying aircraft, in the long and honorable history of this fine company. This company enjoys an outstanding performance record and deserves respect for its integrity throughout the Government and throughout the aircraft industry over many years. I know something about Lockheed and its reputation for integrity, both as to its people and its product. I was more than normally skeptical about the things being said about Lockheed and its product, the C–5A, things which by implication and innuendo seemed to allege or to create the impression that there was some sort of mischief or dishonesty afoot, that there was at least bad performance, that someone was trying to deceive the Government and the people of the United States, and that there had been sly activities going on.

Fortunately, my committee membership gave me access to information that would provide the complete and balanced in-depth story. I was able, I think, to put together all the pieces, at long last, and get a fairly true, dependable and factual picture of what had happened and what was going on.

Therefore, I must point out, first, that the C–5A contracts, which seem to be the cause of some of the trouble, were let during the McNamara years by the men who conceived the so-called "total package procurement technique," which has, so far, proved to work hardship upon both manufacturers and taxpayers, to say nothing of Members of Congress who took some time to discover and finally, at long last, to understand what the "total package procurement technique" involved.

I might add at this point that they did a good job confusing many of us. The matter of overruns in the contracts should not come as a surprise to Congress this year at this time. There have been warnings as evidence in past years that this was happening and, certainly, I was suspicious of it as far back as 4 years ago. That has passed. That is behind us. We should learn from these unfortunate lessons. But now we have the question of the C–5A, this badly needed aircraft, and what to do about it at the present time.

I do not want to take up the time of the Senate reciting statistics concerning C–5A performance. Suffice it to say that

the C–5A performance is excellent. This, I am sure, is well known to all my colleagues.

It was designed to satisfy the requirement rapidly to deploy fully equipped Army troops anywhere in the world, without the need for intermediate servicing stops, or without the need for sophisticated airport facilities when they arrived at their destination. We can carry an army, fully equipped and ready for operation, with great speed to any place in the world. This was a new concept in military tactics. The C–5A represents a major step forward in improving our capability for global military deployment in support of our national interests, while reducing our dependence on overseas bases. It insures that Army units being deployed will be accompanied by all their heavy equipment and will arrive in minimum time as a fully effective force, ready to go into operation immediately.

Since I spoke on this last year, we have had some concrete proof of capabilities of the C–5A.

The Associated Press reported from Charleston, S.C. on July 14, 1970:

> The giant C–5A military transport plane was given unqualified approval by Air Force personnel today after its first operational flight. "The trip was a most remarkable success," said Col. Harry Spillers, Commander of the Joint Task Force for operational testing of the C–5A.
>
> His comments came at a news conference following the return of the aircraft from a 10-day, 21,000-mile trip from Charleston Air Force Base to the South Pacific. Spillers said that craft took 83,000 pounds—83,000 pounds in one aircraft, Mr. President—of supplies to Vietnam and returned with 100,000 pounds of cargo from Japan. He said 41 C–147 cargo ships would have been needed to carry that load.

Mr. President, this is an amazing aircraft. I have seen it. I have been through it. I have studied it. It is unbelievable. It can carry five Greyhound buses, fully loaded, at one time. It can carry 1,000 troops fully equipped. There has never been an aircraft like it constructed. So, there is really nothing to which to compare it. Therein may lie some of the problems that have evolved from its construction.

Now, insofar as the return of our troops to American soil is concerned—and that is, of course, of great concern to all of us, I am sure we are all for that—I am among those who support the "remote presence" concept so ably articulated and nurtured by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, my friend, STUART SYMINGTON. The Senator has explained, through the use of systems such as the C–5A, that we can bring hundreds of thousands of boys home and keep them home and, yet, we can honor our treaties and our commitments from the United States and maintain our credibility through the ability to redeploy troops and heavy materiel via this massive airlift, to which, I might add, the C–5A is not only essential but is the key instrument.

The remote presence that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) has told us about should save us as much as $2 billion a year in maintaining our Military Establishment. In order to do this, though, we agreed that this massive airlift capability was necessary and, therefore, the Air Force was directed to put their best men on the problem. It was decided that 200 aircraft of the C–5A type would be the proper optimum number. However, the Department of Defense directed that we should construct 120, which would be enough to equip six squadrons. This was then reviewed, and 120 aircraft was the number decided upon by the best planners and, I might say, there was enthusiastic support for it here in Congress. In fact, Senators will remember that the first plan for 200 aircraft was greeted with what might be called exuberance in the Senate. It was an entirely new approach to maintaining our military capability. But today we are trying to provide for the continued production of the C–5A under the agreement, and at least 81 planes are needed.

Now, remembering that the Joint Chiefs of Staff still feel we need 120 aircraft, budgetary restraints have limited us to 81—a lesser number—in the opinion of this Senator, the bare minimum.

Now, the removal of the $200 million contingency fund, as proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin in his amendment, would stop production at the end of this calendar year, with only about 30 airplanes finished. It would force the Secretary of Defense thereby to retain thousands of American boys on foreign soil. I am certain that the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from California would not prefer that.

Our best qualified experts honestly believe, and I do and many other members of the committee do, also, that at least 120 C–5A aircraft are necessary both for our own security and to provide for a remote presence, especially in view of our military commitments around the world, a subject to which the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) addressed himself in this Chamber on July 27.

But once again, the administration and the Congress of necessity are operating under very stringent budgetary restraints. We are still trying to arrest and stop inflation. The Committee of the Armed Services has agreed that we are in a time when such austerity is badly needed.

Mr. President, at the present time if the $200 million contingency fund is deleted from the appropriations bill, the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. will only have a financial capability of manufacturing 31 aircraft—certainly not nearly enough. This is obviously not enough, and the cost under these conditions would be prohibitive. If we had only 31 aircraft and spread the research and development costs, it would amount to $125 million for each aircraft.

With the $200 million contingency fund, the company would be able to continue manufacturing 81 of these aircraft, which all agree is a bare necessity in this new type airlift capability. This would cut the unit cost from $120 million to $56 million.

I would point out that if we went to the original number of 120 aircraft, the cost would again go down to $28 million.

If we were to revert to the original plan as conceived by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Defense experts, of 200 aircraft, the cost would be reduced to $19 million.

Mr. President, I address myself to the $200 million discussed in the amendment. There has been a great deal of confusion as to what this $200 million in so-called contingency funds would actually do. It has been said that this would, somehow, accrue to the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and the General Electric Co. profits. This is not so.

To the contrary, it would only keep the C–5A's coming off the production line and, the reverse of what has been said, would actually guarantee to Lockheed the continuance of its performance in what would seem to be an operating loss. Yet, it would guarantee to the American people and to the Military Establishment the aircraft we so badly need for this new military concept and for our national security.

Our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), has filed an individual report on this issue, and I believe he is misinformed or mistaken in some of his comments in that report which reads in part as follows:

> Congress can no longer allow itself to be lured by defense contractors into approving systems at low prices, and the taxpayers can no longer afford to pick up the tab for cost overruns.

This indicates that there is some sort of a malicious plan. I am sure in this particular case—and I have examined it carefully—that this was not the case.

I continue to quote from the minority report of the Senator from Pennsylvania:

> Deletion of the $200 million item, and official congressional approval of Lockheed's and the Defense Department's request for this new kind of government subsidy can set the proper tone for military procurement policy for some time to come. The "buy-in" and government "bail out" that has occurred with the C–5A is perhaps the most glaring example of the inadequacy of our military procurement system.

He continues:

> There are many other contracts with similar drawbacks. Holding the line at this time can have a healthy influence on all other existing contracts and serve as a deterrent against unrealistically low bids on all future contracts.

One sometimes gets the feeling that the wording of the contract is the important consideration.

I submit that this is not the case. The important consideration is the need of the military and the capability of providing for its needs at the lowest possible and practical available price.

I would point out with respect to this particular contract that it was a new venture. There was nothing to compare it to. There is no way of really knowing whether the management was at fault or whether it was a question of the times and the circumstances.

I happen to know that a good deal of question was brought about because of the particular timing of the contract. It came at a time when many of the contractors and subcontractors who would be necessary to carry out the contract were unavailable. They were busy on another commercial aircraft—and a good one, too, the 707 as well as the 747.

Mr. President, I must disagree with my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania. This $200 million contingency fund is in no way a subsidy. It is merely money that the Department of the Air Force under the auspices of its best and most capable men and the Department of Defense under the auspices of Deputy Secretary Packard will provide to cover only the actual costs of production on one type of aircraft, and in no way will it subsidize any Lockheed program, be it Government or commercial. It certainly does not bail out anyone but the American taxpayer. It will insure a national security. The American taxpayers will lose billions of dollars and great safety if this program is stopped at this particular point.

This brings up another area in the broad view of this entire matter that I think is of great importance and must not be given just cursory attention.

Lockheed Aircraft and the Air Force are currently contenders in a legal dispute of sizable proportion. There is a disagreement about the terms of the contract as drawn by the lawyers. The amount in disagreement involves funds between $500 million and $600 million.

For the purposes of this discussion, my research indicates that the figure $567 million seems to be reasonably close to the amount upon which the contenders agree that they disagree legally. Lockheed claims that this money is properly owed to the company under this contract. The Air Force questions the claim, and the case is in adjudication now.

Should Lockheed be the eventual winner in this dispute by way of a decision from the General Accounting Office or in the courts as a result of litigation, that would very simply mean we could be required to appropriate the full amount since that would be what the Government owes Lockheed according to the contract; in other words, an additional $567 million. Furthermore, by its own timetable the Department of Defense must reach a settlement before next year's appropriation bill comes to the floor. The Department of Defense just does not wish to have this accomplished in the stipulated time. It is so required by its commitment. It must be accomplished.

Suppose Lockheed is right and the $567 million is paid. What happens with the $200 million contingency fund then? Why we would just deduct it from the amount owed. It is a contingency fund pure and simple; not a bail-out. It is merely a contingency fund for the purpose of continuing production, if that is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for such time as may be necessary to conclude my remarks and I estimate that to be in the neighborhood of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. On the other hand, I must agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania when he refers to the inadequacies of our military procurement system. Surely the examples of the TFX, and I have a list of some 28 others, are clear examples that something must be done. The most important thing we should recognize is the inadequacy which is part and parcel of something called "Total Package Procurement," invented by former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. It has taken, as I stated earlier, literally years for Congress to figure out what "Total Package Procurement" is; and now that we understand it we have situations like the TFX and the C–5A on our hands and some of us do not like it and some of us feel there should be a better way. In this I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Wisconsin.

On the question of overruns some persons have thrown up their hands in mock horror. They express shock and surprise. Who is surprised? We have known for at least 3 years we would have overruns in the C–5A and on literally hundreds of other contracts let since 1960.

Furthermore, Congress was advised in advance by the Department of Defense. We have had full disclosure at all times through our appropriate committees.

The plight of Lockheed, of the Air Force, of Congress, and the people, who are the most important of all in this controversy, is the result of this unfortunate "Total Package Procurement."

I intend to go into this subject specifically at another time. I have learned some very interesting things about it.

Let us recognize, however, that Lockheed did not "buy in," and I am not suggesting we "bail out" Lockheed. We are just trying to keep this vital program on the production line and get the aircraft we need at the best possible price under existing conditions.

I hope my colleagues will be aware of something additional at this point which seems to have been overlooked, or perhaps has not been brought forward. All of the manufactured materials for all 81 aircraft provided in this bill, four squadrons, has been delivered and is now in the hands of the contractors. This is important because we are not buying scrap aluminum, bolts, nuts, transistors, or just hardware. We are buying a completion of the manufacture of this aircraft which we need.

As to the airplane itself, it has growing pains similar to those of any aircraft. But as noted in the Bisplinghoff report, it is a good airplane that will do the job. I do not think anyone will disagree on this, especially if Senators have taken the time to read the report.

What is the point of this amendment? It seems there are those who would seize on this opportunity to downgrade our defenses, not believing Congress has been told the entire truth. I believe we heard the truth, certainly from Secretary Packard, himself, in his testimony before the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Packard told us he had established a Department of Defense team which had visited Burbank to search into depth into the company's financial burden. That team, working with Lockheed management, detailed for us Lockheed's sales potential, their cash receipts and disbursements, their work-in-process inventory positions, capital investments in machinery and structures, depreciation cash flow, and tax liabilities.

This is what is generally called a cash-flow analysis, and from such an analysis it can be determined whether the company will have the resources which are necessary to finance the work it has undertaken during the period for which the cash-flow analysis is made. It is possible to make a rather accurate cash-flow analysis for the short term because this involves work covered by contracts which are on hand, and the costs which are to be incurred during the short term are reasonably well known.

From such an analysis, it has been determined that the company has resources available to pay the costs of the work it will be doing through calendar year 1970.

There have been several suggestions put forward by many interested in this and other programs as to how to save Lockheed and it is germain to this discussion in the sense that we acknowledge that buy-ins and bail-outs are not a factor. Possible mergers have been considered, but this takes time plus the approval of the Department of Justice and, further, how many merger partners can there be for a multibillion dollar per year corporation, such as Lockheed?

Receivership has been suggested. Again, it takes a long time to establish such an arrangement. And what would be accomplished?

Broad, long, and deep lines of bank credit may be another answer, but it takes a group of the largest of banks to make such arrangements and, again, a long time to set it up. Thus, we are still left with the questions of what to do about the $200 million. We must buy this fine aircraft at the lowest possible price.

So to summarize some of these things we learned from Secretary Packard, and this Senator agrees, we must have the C–5A regardless of whom or what is at fault in this financial problem. The plant must be kept going. Production must continue. The Government, under the pending bill, is protected. This is a good airplane and will serve its purpose. It is being built under the wrong kind of contract which may be all right for trucks, or shoes or jeeps, but not acceptable for an entirely new weapons system. Lockheed will continue to operate at a loss under the bill and no funds will accrue to the profit of the company of the $200 million.

These funds do not "bail out" anyone but the American citizens, who need this particular aircraft.

There is a possibility that the GAO and the courts will rule in favor of Lockheed in its claim for several hundred million dollars against the Air Force, and should they do so, this debate becomes academic.

Let me point out what that means. Since the contract between the Air Force and the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. is in contest and if, because of the denial of the $200 million contingency funds, Lockheed would be forced to stop production. It would be completely probable that Lockheed would institute a damage suit against the Air Force for an amount of money which Lockheed feels is owed under the contract plus damages which would most certainly result in the event that the company were forced to stop production.

I feel quite certain that this amount of money would far exceed the $200

million discussed in the amendment plus the approximately $350 million which Lockheed claims is owed under the contract plus damages and would, therefore, present the worst possible financial situation for the American taxpayer. We would have received 31 aircraft at an unbelievable price, not to mention the fact that our future national security would have been greatly damaged by this entire unfortunate suggestion. And we would have to pay a tremendous damage claim should Lockheed win the case in the courts.

So, to summarize some of the things we learned: We must have the C–5A. We must have it at the lowest possible price.

As Secretary Packard put it:

We must seek ways to assure its continued production and at the same time protect the Government's and the taxpayers' interest. We already have a large investment, over $2 billion, in the program to date, largely development and early production costs. If the program is cancelled now, we would have about 20 to 30 planes for the money. To abandon the production now would appear illogical in light of the incremental future cost to achieve the needed 81 airplanes.

Abandonment of the program now, in other words, would be stupid financial management on our part, and is unthinkable, and I believe Senators understand this. This Senator can go even further than that. 30 C–5's will be finished and delivered by the end of the year. But, what is not generally realized is that the remaining 51 C–5's are, in fact, in a partial state of completion—all 51 of them. The costs have largely already been incurred on these 51. In fact, the 31st C–5A is presently 98 percent complete. But even more importantly, the 81st C–5A is 50 percent complete on a costs incurred basis.

With these facts in mind, knowing 200 aircraft were originally planned, 120 absolutely needed, 81 underway on a really less than acceptable austerity basis, then to stop at 30, as this amendment would force us to do, to anyone who has studied both sides of the matter, is financial folly, unwise, and beyond any comprehension.

So, we must recognize that the question we face is one of choosing between prudent continuation of a vital program under sound guidance or throwing taxpayers dollars away needlessly by deleting the $200 million contingency fund, and getting only 31 aircraft which may cost us far more than even my records have indicated.

Mr. President, we need the C–5A, and we need it as quickly as we can get it. The only way to get it is to continue its manufacture at the present time and let it go on uninterrupted. The only way to avoid stopping production at this time is to provide the $200 million contingency fund, which is purely a contingency fund to be used only for that purpose, to keep the production of the aircraft going.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN):

S. 3547. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colo., and for other purposes.

H.R. 5655. An act for the relief of Low Yin (also known as Low Ying);

H.R. 12400. An act for the relief of Tae Pung Hills;

H.R. 12446. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Jose Gauldalupe Esparza-Montoya;

H.R. 13265. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon L. Cpl. Frank E. Krea;

H.R. 13895. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Elosia Pardo Hall;

H.R. 13971. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Compact; and

H.R. 13997. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon S. Sgt. Ryuzo Somma.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to previous order, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE SENATE AND THE ABM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to concur with my colleague from Kansas, Senator PEARSON, who stated last Wednesday:

President Nixon, Ambassador Smith, and the other U.S. negotiators assert, in the strongest terms, that congressional approval of the committee proposal is needed and is, in fact, essential; and that such congressional action offers the greatest chance for success of the SALT talks. It is against that assertion by the highest authority that I judge the path of my responsibility to be a resolution of whatever doubts I have in their behalf and to act in support of their position.

My senior colleague was addressing himself to the controversial ABM.

Mr. President, it is true that the Congress is a branch of the Government equal to the executive, but it is also true that the executive, because of its unique nature, is often in a better position to garner all the information needed to make a correct decision.

In general, we recognize that fact here in the Congress, and so long as we can have trust and confidence in the Chief Executive, we are prone to accede to his wishes in those areas where he has the greater expertise or is charged under the Constitution with the greater responsibility.

NO CREDIBILITY GAP

Certainly, today there is no reason for any Member of the Congress not to trust the President. There is no credibility gap.

The President is unwinding the war and bringing American soldiers home in accordance with what he has told the American people he would do.

The President brought American troops out of Cambodia on schedule.

The President has initiated a cease-fire in the Middle East.

He has abided by his principles in matters both foreign and domestic, and he has kept his word with the American people.

Mr. President, there are some who would substitute their judgment for that of the President even though it is doubtful that they have the knowledge the President has on which to reach a superior judgment.

All of those with differing views perhaps are of the best intentions, though a few, for reasons unknown to me, appear to seek what amounts to surrender in Southeast Asia.

Some efforts of ABM opponents are, in my opinion, detrimental to the defense of the United States and could cause a needless expenditure of Federal funds.

A prime consideration is the credibility of this administration. It is the Nixon credibility that is making possible real progress toward peace.

That progress is best illustrated by the most recent news stories to the effect that the United States has offered to give up its ABM deterrent entirely if the U.S.S.R. will do the same thing and will limit its numbers of offensive weapons.

This offer was made at the strategic arms limitation talks and was given in background form to the press. I am pleased, as all Senators are, at the general note of optimism that prevails today.

However, I am convinced we would not have a reason for optimism if three things had not happened. First, and perhaps most important, is the reinstillment throughout the world of a belief in the credibility of the President of the United States. Not only Americans, but world leaders everywhere know now that the President means what he says. They know he is not a tiger. They know he is determined that the United States remain strong enough both to defend itself and to live up to its commitments throughout the world.

Second, is the fact that the Senate—narrowly, you will recall—voted last year to approve the first two ABM sites.

Third, is the fact that the President has asked this year for enlargement of the program. If nothing else, this has given the U.S.S.R. the word that the President of the United States will take whatever political risks necessary to defend this Nation and its credibility as a deterrent to aggression.

In light of this, it is most difficult to understand how anyone can doubt that the ABM is a bargaining chip of the greatest importance.

BROOKE AMENDMENT

Let me now address myself to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE).

That amendment, as proposed, says that:

Funds authorized pursuant to this act for the procurement of antiballistic missile defenses may be used only for defense of strategic forces deployed at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, and Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana.

The words of this proposed amendment, Mr. President, seem simple and clear. But it is difficult to determine their intent. Does, for instance, the Senator seek to add one more Safeguard site, but at Grand Forks or Malmstrom instead of at the proposed new base at Whiteman?

Does he seek to provide a Minuteman defense capability at Grand Forks and

Malmstrom equal to that the modified phase II defense would supply?

Does he seek reduction in the protection that can be provided for our strategic bomber force?

PURPOSE?

In other words, Mr. President, we have yet to learn the purpose behind the Brooke amendment. It obviously does not call for less money, only for less defense at the same price.

Does this make sense to those who seek a vast reordering of our priorities?

Certainly it does not make sense to those of us who have no intention of reordering our defense priority out of existence.

Nor does it make sense to those of us who wish to spend our defense money wisely.

Nor does it make sense to those of us who wish to provide the President with the best hand possible at the vital SALT talks.

I believe, Mr. President, it makes sense only to those who seek to reduce the effectiveness of America's defenses.

Because, in all candor, that is all the Brooke amendment will do. It will give us less defense at the same price. Mr. President, I believe we need more, not less, defense, but if we are to settle for less defense—and the devil take the consequences—then we should also cut back on the amount of funds to be spent.

The Brooke amendment does not do this.

Mr. President, I believe the Brooke amendment is ill-considered and illogical, from every standpoint that is in the best interests of our Nation's defense and our Nation's chances to reach agreement on limiting strategic arms.

I will vote against it, and urge other Members of the Senate to vote against it also.

Finally, Mr. President, I have a fact sheet that analyzes the possible effects of the Brooke amendment which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FACT SHEET

Subject: A Comparison of the Modified Phase 2 Defense of Minuteman With the Possible Effects of the Brooke Amendment.

FACTS

1. If, like Modified Phase 2, the intent of the Brooke amendment is to add one more Safeguard site, but at Grand Forks or Malmstrom instead of Whiteman then the impact on schedule, cost and effectiveness is as follows:

a. The operational availability of the third site would be delayed by about 12 months. This is because no analysis or survey work has been done for a second Safeguard site at either Grand Forks or Malmstrom. In contrast, significant analysis has been conducted of the Whiteman site under the old Sentinel program.

b. For a program cost approximately equal to that of Modified Phase 2, a third site at either Grand Forks or Malmstrom would result in reduced capability to defend Minuteman. This is due to two factors. First, because of the shape of the Minuteman fields the number of Minuteman silos that could be protected by a third site at Grand Forks or Malmstrom would be about 70 percent of the number protected by a site at Whiteman. Second, for an equal cost program, fewer interceptors could be deployed with the third site at Grand Forks or Malmstrom. This further reduction resulting in only about 35 percent of the interceptors at the Whiteman site is caused by the necessity to compensate for the program stretchout costs resulting from the delayed availability of a third site at Grand Forks or Malmstrom.

2. If, alternatively, the intent of the Brooke amendment is to provide a capability to defend Minuteman equal to that of the Modified Phase 2 defense of Minuteman (the two Phase 1 sites and Whiteman) then the impact on cost and schedule would be as follows:

a. Instead of three Safeguard sites, four sites would be required if deployment is constrained to Grand Forks and Malmstrom. The increased equipment requirements and the program stretchout would result in an increased program cost of $0.5B to $0.7B to provide equal capability. The fourth site is necessary to provide a sufficient number of Sprint protected Minuteman silos.

b. This four site defense will not be available until 15 or more months after the Whiteman site can be available.

3. Another consideration of restricting the Safeguard deployment to only Grand Forks and Malmstrom is the reduction in the protection that can be provided for our strategic bomber force. The Modified Phase 2 defense of Minuteman also can provide protection to fifteen to twenty percent of the strategic bomber force bases. A defense of Minuteman constrained to Grand Forks and Malmstrom would, in constraint, protect about five percent of the strategic bomber bases.

4. In summary the results of the Brooke amendment are:

a. to provide reduced Minuteman defense capability for equal cost or to provide equal Minuteman defense capability at increased cost.

b. to provide less protection of the strategic bomber bases.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, an editorial published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star entitled "Safeguarding SALT" touches on the so-called Brooke amendment. The editorial in part states:

The Brooke amendment strikes us as even more nonsensical than Cooper-Hart, lacking as it does the minimal virtue of saving money while gambling with the nation's security. The Massachusetts senator's proposal would provide the full $1.3 billion requested by the administration for Safeguard, but would limit its expenditure to the existing ABM sites in Montana and North Dakota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SAFEGUARDING SALT

The Senate did well when, by a 52–47 vote, it defeated the Cooper-Hart amendment, which would have pared $322 million from the $1.3 billion anti-ballistic missile authorization and blocked Safeguard's deployment to two new sites.

We are all for an end—or at least a limitation—to the international arms race. But that has to be achieved jointly through negotiations with the Russians at the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) in Vienna and Helsinki; it cannot with a reasonable respect for the nation's security be brought about through unilateral disarmament on the Senate floor.

While a 52–47 vote is hardly a convincing demonstration of national unity and resolve, it is an improvement over the 50–50 vote by which last year's amendment to scuttle Safeguard failed. And it may be enough to convince the Russians, when the talks reconvene in Helsinki this fall, that they need to negotiate seriously to reach an agreement.

The Safeguard system, which is designed to protect Minuteman missiles in their underground silos from a first strike by the 300 giant SS–9 missiles which the Russians have deployed or have under construction, is not yet out of the woods. This week, yet another anti-ABM amendment, this one sponsored by Senator Brooke, will come up for a vote in the Senate.

The Brooke amendment strikes us as even more nonsensical than Cooper-Hart, lacking as it does the minimal virtue of saving money while gambling with the nation's security. The Massachusetts senator's proposal would provide the full $1.3 billion requested by the administration for Safeguard, but would limit its expenditure to the existing ABM sites in Montana and North Dakota.

By blocking the expansion of the system to Missouri and Wyoming, the nation would, in essence, be paying the same amount of money for a lesser degree of security, while at the same time depriving our SALT negotiators of an important bargaining point.

When the Russians agree to a mutual and verifiable limitation on strategic arms, it will be time to reduce expenditures on the missiles which are our best guarantee of national survival. That time is not yet. The Brooke amendment, like Cooper-Hart, should be defeated.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, also in yesterday's Evening Star there appeared a particularly interesting letter to the editor, written by Max P. Friedman, of Arlington, Va., with reference to the "Bloodbath Potential in Vietnam."

We shall be discussing the bloodbath potential in Vietnam as we get into the amendment to end the war or, as I prefer to call it, the amendment to lose the peace—or perhaps the amendment to extend the war, because the sponsors may now add 6 more months to the amendment.

I understand that one of the crucial issues will be whether or not there will be a bloodbath in South Vietnam if there should be a precipitate withdrawal. The facts indicate that that is very likely. The sponsors of the amendment would offer asylum to refugees at some place in this country yet to be designated—perhaps South Dakota, perhaps Oregon, perhaps Kansas; I have yet to learn where the asylum would be.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter to the editor written by Max P. Friedman and published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

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

BLOODBATH POTENTIAL IN VIETNAM

ARLINGTON, VA.

SIR: In a recent column, Clayton Fritchey challenged the Nixon administration on its predictions of a massive bloodbath if the United States precipitously withdrew from South Vietnam ("Nixon Figures on North Viet Purge Challenged"). Mr. Fritchey then went on to make the following statement about President Nixon and the Rand report on probable killings if the Communists took over the South (Hosmer report): "They both inflicted wild and unsupported guesses on an unsuspecting public." If this ridiculous claim is true, then every respectable and noted authority on Vietnam is guilty of the same thing because they all back the "bloodbath theory" of the 1954 "political purge" which Mr. Fritchey, on his own authority, states never happened.

Let's look at facts, not dreams. Ho Chi

Minh, in his "Letters to the Peasants and Cadres on the Successful Completion of Land Reform in the North (August 18, 1956)," told of how his Communist reformers committed errors and wrongly convicted (executed) party members, cadres, and others. Defense Minister Vo Nguyen Giap (Nhan Dan, Oct., 1956) said: "We executed too many honest people . . . seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror which became far too widespread. . . . Worse still, torture came to be regarded as a normal practice during party reorganization."

The following Vietnam authorities have written about the Communist purges in the North from 1954–56, giving the death toll a conservative low of 50,000 to a possible high of 500,000: Douglas Pike, "The Viet Cong Strategy of Terror," 1970; Bernard Fall, "Le Viet Minh"; Joseph Buttinger, "Vietnam: A Dragon Embattled"; Lucien Bodard, "The Quicksand War"; George K. Tanham, "Communist Revolutionaary Warfare: The Viet Minh in Indochina"; (especially pertaining to the land reform program) Harvey Smith et al, "Area Handbook for North Vietnam"; Hoang Van Chi (a Communist official in Ho's government who escaped in 1955) "From Colonialism to Communism"; Donald Lancaster, "The Emancipation of French Indo-China"; Dennis Duncanson, "Government and Revolution in Viet-Nam"; Bernard Fall, "The Two Vietnams," "Vietnam Witness," and "The Vietminh Regime"; J. Mallin, "Terror in Vietnam"; Chester A. Bain, "Vietnam: The Roots of Conflict"; and George A. Carver, Jr., "The Faceless Viet Cong," (Foreign Affairs, April, 1966). Columnist Jack Anderson who wrote two excellent articles on the subject of Communist terror in Vietnam, "Hanoi's Purges Curb U.S. Concessions" (Sept. 19, 1969) and "Hanoi, VC Kill Civilians Regularly" (Dec. 6, 1969).

Further confirmation of Hanoi's bloodbath potential was revealed by the statements of a North Vietnamese defector, Lt. Col. Le Xuyen Chuyen (Wash. Daily News, Nov. 25, 1969), who estimates that up to 5 million people might die if the Reds captured the South. Other defectors have mentioned the figure of 3 million possible deaths in the takeover and consolidation of power. Readers' Digest writer, John Hubbell, in his November, 1968 article entitled "The Blood-Red Hands of Ho Chi Minh," (besides giving the estimated deaths for the North Vietnam purges of from 50,000 to 100,000, slightly lower than Bernard Fall's estimates) told how Ho Chi Minh crushed, in bloody style, a revolt (one of many) in his own home province of Nghe An and home village of Nam Dam. Here about 6,000 unarmed civilians were killed, about equal to the number killed in a systematic manner in Hue, February, 1968 by the North Vietnamese-Viet Cong invaders.

So much for Mr. Fritchey's charge that both President Nixon and Stephen Hosmer (author of the Hosmer report) "inflicted wild and unsupported guesses on an unsuspecting public." The public is not so unsuspecting as one thinks, and obviously neither are the 15 other authorities or knowledgeable writers on Vietnam who are mentioned in this letter. It is Mr. Fritchey who is trying to put something over on the American public.

MAX P. FRIEDMAN.

Mr. DOLE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nixon Moving Quietly Toward Disengagement," written by Richard Wilson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, August 17, 1970, which refers to disengagement not just in Southeast Asia, but around the world.

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

NIXON MOVING QUIETLY TOWARD DISENGAGEMENT

(By Richard Wilson)

It is a year now since President Nixon flew around the world, stopping in Vietnam and Communist Europe, among other places. In that year, the shape of events has changed. The change has been in the direction indicated by the President a year ago, but something new may have been added.

This new thing is hard to define and largely speculative, but it would appear that the United States is in the first stages of what, in the next several years, may prove to be a large-scale disengagement from what once were considered its unavoidable world responsibilities.

That observation at once becomes suspect as an exaggeration. But at least it should be agreed that we are getting out of the fighting in Vietnam and not getting into a new fight anywhere else, including Israel.

That is not all. We are beginning to talk about getting out of South Korea and to think about getting out of Western Europe. Once this process begins, it takes on a velocity of its own as a kind of principle guiding separate actions, a subconscious sense of direction.

That is what has happened in the Nixon administration. And it is not, in practical effect, so much different from what Sen. Mike Mansfield and Sen. J. William Fulbright have been advocating in varying degrees all these years.

The element which threw them off was that in the process of disengagement Nixon does not propose to be badgered or have the United States taken advantage of.

Mansfield and Fulbright could not see Cambodia in that light; they saw it only as an extension of the war and as a reversal of the process of disengagement. Nixon viewed the Cambodia incursion as a modus operandi on the way to disengagement, and saw it as having the secondary effect of giving notice to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations that the United States would not permit itself to be taken advantage of while the process was under way.

The same conditions seem to apply in the matter of deploying anti-ballastic missiles. Nixon is not undertaking to do so on anywhere near the scale projected in the Johnson administration. But because he does so at all, the peace forces in the Senate are blinded to this further modification of previous policy.

Foreign and defense policies have in fact been modified drastically in the year since Nixon flew to Asia and around the world to spread the word of the Nixon Doctrine. It is only a little more than a year ago since he turned American policy around, beginning with the first announced withdrawals from Vietnam.

At this rate he will have completed the turn-around by the fall of 1972. It is at least conceivable that with luck in the Middle East, the United States then will not be engaged anywhere in the world in a direct military confrontation. It could happen that a week would pass without a single American combat death. And if it prayerfully does, the change will have come so slowly that it may be scarcely recognized as the end of direct American involvement in far-off wars.

Crises have a way of presenting themselves at the most inconvenient times, and this vision of the future may be marred by undesired events.

But it is at least moderately possible that in a relatively short period of time there will be no primary cause attributable to Washington for student disorder—the so-called national emergency which Chancellor Heard claims exists.

It is becoming more believable all the time that the military draft will be abolished in favor of a volunteer army. The sense of that comes through in recent congressional debate on other questions such as the women's rights amendment. Advocates contended that by the time the amendment could become operative, there no longer would be a military draft to which women would be subject.

It is even becoming more believable that reforms at the Pentagon may help to reduce military spending and that the Nixon administration will, in fact, reduce the Pentagon budget.

These are changes of considerable magnitude. Nixon's trip around the world signaled them in advance and there is no indication a year later that the signals have been changed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in preparation for what appears to be another extensive debate on the antiballistic missile system, the Senate again concerns itself with the extent to which our country should be made secure.

President Nixon, after carefully weighing all aspects of the ABM from national security to its effect on the arms limitation talks, has decided further development of it is in our best interests.

In a recent editorial entitled "Too Many Coaches," the Detroit News compares President Nixon and the "committee of 100" to a football coach and an alumni advisory group. I believe my colleagues will find this analogy pertinent to the forthcoming ABM discussions and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE JEOPARDIZES ABM GAME—TOO MANY COACHES

Imagine a football team in the big game of the year. And imagine the dilemma of the coach if, having drawn up a game plan based on expert analysis of the scouting reports, he were to get a new set of signals each quarter from a powerful but inexpert alumni committee sitting just behind him in the box seats.

If you can imagine that, you understand President Nixon's position vis-a-vis the United States Senate as he tries to conduct defense and foreign policy effectively and with some continuity of purpose.

The game can be lost if the President is repeatedly thwarted by Senate quarterbacks determined to call all the signals. As Kenneth Crawford observes in a column in Newsweek, "there is serious question about the competence of the Senate to sit as a committee of 100 to direct the nation's course in world affairs in times as dangerous as these."

The "committee of 100" is now prepared to grapple at length once more with the President over the diplomatically delicate and highly technical question of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system. One year ago, the issue apparently had been settled, after long and strenuous debate, in favor of the theory that defense is a good thing in this age of missiles and nuclear warheads.

Pursuing essentially the same logic that dictated the establishment of Safeguard, the administration now seeks to expand it. But the Senate foes of ABM remain as obdurate as before, which means that ABM must be justified all over again and that the logical expansion of the system could be defeated by the shifting and manipulating of one or two votes.

It's no way to run a ball game.

The last thing in the world President Nixon needs is another bruising battle over ABM but he has chosen to risk that battle because expert analysis of the scouting reports tells him that expansion of the system is in the best national interest.

We are willing to accept the judgment that Safeguard will make the nation more secure against enemy attack. If the administration errs in that judgment, at least it errs on the side of safety.

Moreover, it makes sense to proceed with Safeguard as an incentive for the Soviet Union to come to reasonable terms in negotiations for the limitation of defensive and offensive strategic weapons. Abandoning Safeguard would be the same as ordering the star quarterback to the showers with the game tied in the fourth quarter.

The "committee of 100" by its constant interference complicates the making of vital policy and in the case of the ABM jeopardizes the very security of the nation. For a change, the committee should give the coach some freedom to play according to his game plan.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor, and without the time being deducted from my 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from West Virginia without losing my right to the floor and without the time being deducted from my 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the time for the transaction of routine morning business would close at 1 p.m., the unfinished business not be laid before the Senate until special orders for recognition and the transaction of routine morning business have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S VIEWS ON THE McGOVERN-HATFIELD AMENDMENT

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the Vice President of the United States spoke about an amendment which 24 Senators and I are sponsoring in the Senate—an amendment designed to insure responsible military disengagement from Indochina.

If this amendment proposed what the Vice President claimed, I would be the first to oppose it.

The Vice President's remarks evidence little understanding of the amendment and its goals. The unwarranted attack directed at its sponsors inhibits the opportunity for careful consideration of the Nation's most crucial issue.

Those who support the amendment, in Congress and the millions of citizens across the country, will not be intimidated by false and inflammatory charges.

What is needed now is thoughtful, rational discussion about the future of our policies in Vietnam and responsible congressional action to restore the constitutional balance in the conduct of foreign policy.

The Vice President has chosen to speak about the dangers of American military defeat and has talked about seeing this war through to an end.

Does this mean that he is advocating a new policy in Vietnam—one contrary to the President's previous statements?

On May 14, 1969, President Nixon stated:

We have ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield.

On April 20, 1970, the President stated that "a political settlement is the heart of the matter."

But now we see a responsible plan for disengagement attacked with innuendo and emotional rhetoric, and hear pledges that "this Nation will not go down in humiliating defeat on the battlefield of Southeast Asia."

Those words suggest an attempt to seek a military solution to the conflict, and reflect the past, misguided thinking that has resulted in the tragic prolonging of this war.

His words raise an uncertainty about the administration's stated policies.

Even more serious is that the Vice President's speech entails a direct attack on our constitutional process. Apparently, he either fails to comprehend or simply disagrees with the provisions of our Constitution.

The responsibility for war is one that must be borne also by Congress—that is what our Constitution says Congress must assume its constitutional duty for sharing the responsibility for this war, and must now make decisive judgments about terminating our military involvement.

By attacking Congress' attempt to assume its rightful constitutional role, the Vice President is doing a great disservice to the President.

He is making the war "Nixon's war." He is implying that the President's policies for the war must be exercised without regard for Congress, just as President Johnson's policies were. The President could make no more unfortunate mistake than to assume that he alone is responsible for our policy in Indochina, that he alone must bear the burden of responsibility for every American that dies there, and that he alone must chart our course for the future. Yet, that is what the Vice President seems to be saying.

I believe that the Vietnam war should not now become "Nixon's war," in spite of what the Vice President states. I believe that any war must be determined by the people acting through their elected representatives. We, in Congress, must take the responsibility for determining the future course of our policy. That is the heart of the democratic process.

I am committed to see Congress fulfill its constitutional responsibility—regardless of the wishes or the words of the Vice President.

His speech makes this task more difficult, for his words contain information and inferences which are totally incorrect and completely unfounded.

I am sure that the Vice President would never speak in a manner intentionally calculated to deceive or mislead the American people. He may want to call his speech writers and researchers to task, however, for providing him with material containing misleading, false, and inaccurate statements.

The Vice President's lack of comprehension and understanding about these matters, and the goals and effects of the amendment, is evidenced by the fact that he did not recognize errors and correct them himself. I hope he would agree with me that it is as important for the Vice President to be accurate as it is for the New York Times to be objective.

He claimed that:

Should this amendment become law, and all American military operations in Southeast Asia cease by December 31, the immense burden of this war would fall immediately and totally upon South Vietnam.

First, the passage of this amendment would in no way have that effect. It would provide for all military operations necessary to protect our troops in the process of withdrawal.

Second, the amendment would in no way restrict continued military aid even after the date of withdrawal of our troops.

Further, the Vice President infers that our amendment would take risks with the lives of American men. The truth is that it would save American lives.

The central purpose of the amendment is the preservation of human lives—both American and South Vietnamese. As long as American troops remain in Vietnam, as long as we remain committed to staying in South Vietnam indefinitely, Americans and Vietnamese will continue to suffer and die.

The Vice President claims that our amendment restricts the President's power as Commander in Chief. This is false; in no way is the President's power to protect American troops called into question by this amendment.

The Vice President totally distorted the amendment by characterizing it as "a unilateral, precipitous American abandonment of South Vietnam." By phasing out the withdrawal of American troops over many months, in accordance with President Nixon's stated objectives, the amendment provides every possibility for the protection of American lives, and, in fact, assures lower casualties. In addition, the amendment would provide ample time for the South Vietnamese government to broaden the base of its support and encourage its leaders to reach a political accommodation with all factions within its borders.

After 285,000 American casualties and 43,000 deaths, is it "reckless, unwise, unjust, or illogical" to act now to bring this tragic war to an end? Is it precipitous, I must ask, after more than 2 decades of American involvement in Vietnam, for

Congress to stipulate that almost a year from now, with all due caution, American troops will be brought home to stay, which meets the goals of our President.

The Vice President also chose to ignore the amendment's provision for an extension of the timetable. If the President decides that conditions prevent the orderly and responsible withdrawal of American troops within the stated timetable, all that is necessary is Congressional action to provide the needed time. Such a proposal can scarcely be termed precipitous.

The Vice President argues that the amendment would destroy the chances for a negotiated settlement, but a fixed timetable could finally enable the stalemated Paris talks to make progress. With the evidence that America is determined to end the war, both Hanoi and Saigon would be forced to confront the political realities to end their own war. By calling the amendment "a lethal blow to the Paris peace talks," the Vice President assumes that the talks have been productive under present conditions. Other than the shape of the table, what has been produced? As the Secretary of State has already indicated, the possibilities for a negotiated settlement after Cambodia have been greatly reduced. If negotiations will go anywhere, the amendment provides the only impetus for the first real breakthrough between the various antagonists.

By invoking the so-called "blood bath" theory, the Vice President declared that hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese "who placed their faith in us will die for that error in judgment." His authorities for such a claim are the Rand Corporation and Douglas Pike, whom he called "the Nation's foremost authority on the Vietcong," and who is also a career USIA officer. However, the Rand Corporation report which the Vice President referred to also maintains that a new coalition or even an all-communist government would have decisive political reasons for holding down the level of political reprisals. The report continues that any new government would be primarily concerned with political consolidation, and assassinations and repression in an already divided country would only deepen the suspicions and divisions among the Vietnamese. The truth is that the only means of preventing violent reprisals is a broadly-based government in South Vietnam which would secure the support of a loyal population.

Furthermore, those who use the "blood bath" argument fail to recognize the fact that we are engaged in such action now and will continue with an unending commitment of American men to battle.

It should hardly be necesary to counter the Vice President's description of the amendment as isolationist. We desire neither a rejection of America's international responsibilities nor a retreat into a domestic cocoon. Rather, we desperately need a prudent and humane exercise of American power which will aid people in their search for political institutions of their own choice, which will preserve and improve life rather than destroy it, which will make the world safe rather than endanger it. We are not saying that any use of American power is wrong, but in Vietnam it is both unnecessary and futile. A withdrawal from Vietnam would provide us once again with the opportunity to wield moral and political leadership for peace in a divided world.

Since the Vice President attacked the logic of those supporting the amendment, one can properly inquire what kind of logic led him to the conclusion that a withdrawal from Vietnam would cause a rejection of the nonproliferation treaty and stimulate the nuclear arms race.

The issue in Vietnam is not simply one of victory versus defeat. Only the Vietnamese can win the war; only they can lose it. We cannot give them or impose on them what they do not want or will not do for themselves. That is the agonizing lesson of Vietnam, and the Vice President misleads the American public by offering them promises which cannot be fulfilled.

In the previous administration, those who criticized the Vietnam war were subjected to the charge of being unpatriotic. At that time, I believed that such charges achieved nothing, and stifled any rational discussion of the issue. On April 26, 1967, I stated in a speech:

> What kind of men have we at the helm of government who would deliberately coerce the public into accepting their policies on the threat of being branded traitors?

My position today has not changed. It is nonpartisan, and applies equally to the Johnson and Nixon administrations. Now I ask that same question of the Vice President.

The most repressive periods in history have occurred when public debate has been silenced by those who abused positions of political power. This has not been the exclusive domain of demagogs or dictators either on the left or on the right. Nazi Germany, McCarthyism, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, all stand as examples of people intimidated into silence and fear.

Full and rational discussions of vital issues, both here in the Congress and across the country, must not, and cannot, be curtailed by those who cry "Isolationist," "Pacifist," "Blind impatient politicians," or other such divisive intimidations.

I will continue to fight for an open forum that is free from fear, rather than cover to those who would drive dissent from that forum and thereby verify the claims of the revolutionaries.

The real threat to our "American way of life" is within the household of America rather than 10,000 miles away in Indochina.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator on his statement. I know of no precedent, certainly since I came to the Senate, nor have I read of any in history, when the President of the Senate has attacked personally the Members of this body in any fashion comparable to the way the present President of the Senate has attacked the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Arkansas, and a number of others.

I wish to draw attention to the fourth paragraph of the Senator's speech, in which he says:

> Those who support the amendment, in Congress and the millions of citizens across the country, will not be intimidated by false and inflammatory charges.

I wish I shared the Senator's confidence that they will not be or are not intimidated. I think there are enough signs to indicate that they are and have already been intimidated by reports and charges such as those leveled yesterday by the President of the Senate.

I believe that the Senator might compare the difference between the role that the Vice President, who is also President of the Senate, has in our Government and the position of the late Senator from Wisconsin, Joe McCarthy, to whom he referred in the latter part of his speech. It is well known that Joe McCarthy did have a period in which, at least, he intimidated the Senate and the people of this country, until the Senate, after quite a long time, finally censured him.

There is a great difference between Senator Joe McCarthy and the Vice President. As everyone knows, it has happened many times in our history that the Vice President may become the President who would speak for and represent the executive power of this Government.

It strikes me it is far more dangerous, with respect to intimidation, to have a man who could succeed to the Presidency, in case of any unfortunate accident, to be making threats of this kind and charges of this kind against Members of the Senate. I think it is very subversive of the democratic process, very dangerous, and, implicit in his statement, is subversive of the independence of the Senate itself.

It is no small thing to have the President of the Senate going about before the major veterans organizations of this country. Yesterday it was the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the speech he made was reported in the press and was applauded at great length, particularly the attack on individual Senators.

Only a few days before, the President of the Senate made a similar speech before the Air Force Association. He has spoken to many patriotic organizations, arousing their animosity and their hatred against Members of the Senate and the Senate itself as an institution.

I believe that this is a very dangerous development especially when the kind of inflammatory language that is used is used by a person who could be President of the United States, as the Senator knows, and who is, of course, very influential and who now has complete access to all the minds of the people of this country.

I expect that every newspaper in this country, certainly all the local papers, carried the speech. If not in full, some newspapers reported it on their front pages, and I am sure it was on radio and television stations throughout the country.

I, for one, congratulate the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I think

he is very courageous to state what he did this morning in the Senate in the face of the personal reference to the Senator from Oregon.

I think it is far more serious than most people like to believe. We had this same kind of experience with a lesser light, as I say, about 18 years ago, but here, for the first time in our history, we now have the Vice President of the United States attacking one of the principal institutions of our democratic system.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his comments. As he knows, I have been concerned about this issue for a long period of time. It is not a matter that I have taken lightly in any of my statements or comments on the issue of the war.

I recall that at the Republican National Convention in 1964, I think for the first time, in a major public address that I warned about this war. At the National Governors Conference in 1965 and again in 1966 I voted against resolutions to give full carte blanch support to President Johnson's Vietnam policy; the vote was 49 to 1.

So it has not been a Johnny-comelately situation, nor something which I have lightly touched upon, but rather it is a matter to which I have given many years of study.

I feel that as one Senator—I cannot speak for others—it is rather unfortunate that the Vice President should single out by name those with whom he disagrees and ascribe to them by sly rhetoric and sly methods of phraseology that they "do not give a damn"—and I would like to make that a quote—that we possibly "do not give a damn."

I think this is not becoming language for a man of such high public office. I do not believe that even by implication it would represent the views of any Senator, whether I might agree or disagree with him on any issue.

I think that is charging improper motives and creating suspicion and a divisiveness in this country—when people in the public at large see that a Senator of the United States, a man with some position of responsibility and integrity, is subjected to such an unwarranted attack, what does the average citizen feel about his right to stand in a public forum and to disagree with the President of the United States?

I say it is a dangerous situation in this country when any Senator or Representative or citizen concerned about bringing an end to this war fears that he will be charged with being soft on communism or with playing into the hands of the enemy or undermining the war effort in Vietnam or causing American casualties or aiding and abetting Hanoi or giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

This is not in keeping with what I feel to be the great ideals of a pluralistic democratic society where men can hold different views on questions of importance without having their motives undermined or challenged.

Therefore, this speech is not just one instance. This is a pattern. And I think that it is unbecoming to the administration which I fought for in the campaign.

I am proud of the fact that I was asked to be a surrogate candidate. I was asked to campaign in 17 States of the Union, including the States which my candidate for President said were five key States for his victory.

I went into those areas fully committed to the cause that this administration represented—a new purpose and a new change of dignity in the White House that I found lacking in the previous administration.

I think we have maintained that dignity in the President and in the White House. Yet I say that this kind of speech making upon the part of the Vice President may raise money for the campaign coffers and may tickle the audiences and cause them to laugh and applaud, but it is a disservice to the President and to the dignity he has brought to the office.

I do not rise without careful thought to make the statements I have made today. I have remained silent before in this matter. I have not called the statements of the Vice President to the public attention, as others have.

I say they do not represent the kind of Republican tradition and the kind of Republican party I became interested in during the Hoover campaign in 1932, the Willkie campaign in 1940, in the Dewey campaigns in 1944 and 1948, in Mr. Eisenhower's campaigns in 1952 and 1956, in Mr. Nixon's campaign in 1960, in Mr. GOLDWATER'S campaign in 1964, and in Mr. Nixon's campaign in 1968.

I feel compelled, therefore, to rise at this time to express what has been in my heart and mind and what has been greatly disturbing me as to the kind of image and the kind of character that has been given to my party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I feel that this country needs desperately to have a two-party system. We need to attract the black, the young, the poor, the minority groups.

I would ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas what was the genesis of the Republican Party. It was the party giving hope for the first time to the black people, to the ethnic groups, to the poor, to the farmer, to the businessman, to the young people.

Where is today the greatest weakness of the Republican Party insofar as attracting new and broad support? It is within the very groups that I have mentioned.

That is what disturbs not only as a party man, but also as an American first and a Republican second.

I do not feel that it is a disservice. I feel that it is a service I am trying to provide my party today in calling attention to these matters and asking my party leadership, my Vice President, a man I campaigned for, not that he change his viewpoints on this amendment—I do not ask for his agreement on this amendment—but that there be gentlemanliness and discussion in such a way that men do not have fear that their patriotism and their motives are undermined by such sly rhetoric as has been engaged in by the Vice President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Senator from Mississippi is now recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon discussed everything but the amendment. I understood that was what the Vice President was talking about on yesterday. That part of the amendment is only 18 lines long.

It does provide that after December 31, 1970, no money could be expended for any purpose arising from any military conflict.

It does say that money can be expended for asylum. That indicates that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from South Dakota do feel that there might be a blood bath, or that language would not be in the amendment.

It does say that after June 30, 1971, every American must be withdrawn from Vietnam.

I understand there is a move on the part of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from South Dakota to revise the amendment.

I would only say, without any reference to what the Vice President said, that the amendment is very short and should be read.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am very glad, as I said yesterday, that we have obtained agreement now to vote on what I believe is the major ABM amendment.

We have had splendid debate on it. And we will have some controlled time tomorrow. I believe when that matter is disposed of that we will have a new start and a more rapid disposition of the amendments that have been filed to the bill.

I have reason to believe and certainly think that the Members of the Senate can expect things to move along faster. It will take cooperation to get these important unanimous consent agreements.

Mr. President, I will have some remarks to make tomorrow on the Brooke amendment on the ABM. But I want to say a few words today as well as to address myself to another amendment.

It has been very clear to me, Mr. President, that we need Safeguard installations to protect our Minuteman forces not only at Grand Forks and Malmstrom, but also at Whiteman Air Force Base and Warren Air Force Base. This is the minimum that is needed for the protection of our land-based deterrent and to carry out the future development and deployment of the very vital Safeguard system in an orderly manner.

The proposition that we are faced with is that stable deterrence means that both the U.S.S.R. and the United States are able to absorb an initial attack by the other and still retaliate with overwhelming power. If we have this capacity the chances of an initial attack against us is greatly diminished—certainly as long

as the U.S.S.R. does not wish to commit suicide. While our retaliatory capability is fairly well assured at present, if the U.S.S.R. should develop the multiple independent reentry vehicle—MIRV—with reasonable accuracy our land-based missiles may some time in the future be in jeopardy. Therefore, defending the four Minuteman bases against the possibility of a Soviet attack is a very sensible step. It would mean that, when and after the Safeguard system is deployed and operational, we would probably have at least twice as many Minuteman missiles surviving a Soviet first-strike attack than would we have with only a two-base deployment.

We have said before that the additional base at Whiteman would increase the capacity for protection by 40 percent. That tells the story.

The very survival of the Nation may hinge on the vote which we take tomorrow and on whether or not we authorize all four bases for Safeguard installations as recommended by the full committee. When I say "national survival," I do mean, not only the survival of the United States of America as a national entity, but the survival of millions of Americans who would not survive if we become vulnerable and our strategic forces no longer deter. In addition, under those circumstances we would be prime candidates for nuclear blackmail.

We must not be led astray by the assertion that Safeguard does not protect the people but protects merely our bases. The Safeguard is designed to protect the people in that it protects our arsenal, our ability to hit, and our ability to protect ourselves. We protect the people most when we protect those things that are designed to be their protective weapon.

Let me remind you, Mr. President, that we voted in favor of the four-base deployment when we rejected the Cooper-Hart amendment last week. This was one of the direct issues presented to the Senate and, therefore, to adopt the Brooke amendment to reduce the Safeguard deployment around Minuteman bases to two rather than four would be a reversal of the action which we took last week and a step backward. I do not think that we want to take this leap to the rear at this time.

There is no middle ground. We either want four bases or we want two bases. Last week that was the prime issue with which we were concerned. The majority of this body, by a rather decisive vote, decided in favor of four bases. Now this amendment would come right along and state that we shall have only two bases. The only difference is that the Brooke amendment would leave in some of the money which the Cooper-Hart amendment would take out. That makes it eligible to be offered as an amendment, but the meaning is the same. With all deference to the Senator from Massachusetts, I think the orderly way to proceed with this matter would be to offer this amendment as a substitute for the Cooper-Hart amendment. Then we would have had a direct issue drawn; but now since we rejected the Cooper-Hart amendment, to come back now with an amendment providing for only two-site deployment is to march up the hill last Wednesday and back down the hill this coming Wednesday.

I just do not believe the Senate will do it. I do not believe the Senate wants to do that and I do not believe they will do that.

I want to point out at this point what Secretary of Defense Laird said about the cost in connection with money in the Brooke amendment. Secretary of Defense Laird was on the national televised program "Issues and Answers." The following is his anwer in response to a question by Mr. Peterson:

> Secretary LAIRD. Yes, I believe that the Brooke Amendment would give us less defense at more cost by using all of the funds that were provided in the authorization bill as requested by the administration at the two sites in North Dakota and Montana. We would be constructing additional radar time there and additional facilities. It would not give us the coverage of the Minuteman field that the third site would give us if constructed in Missouri, and would not give us the follow-on options for either area coverage or for accidental launch coverage that would be available should the third site go forward in Missouri.
>
> So what it would do, it would not limit the amount of funds. As a matter of fact, if we were to go forward and put all of these funds on these two sites, it would cost that additional $500 million. So we would have less defense, less coverage, at more cost.

I do not think that statement can be seriously contradicted. The Secretary of Defense is a knowledgeable man in this field and he is highly responsible for what he says.

Now let me turn to the SALT talks and the possible impact of the Brooke amendment on these talks. The second phase of these talks ended just a few days ago. The next phase is scheduled for Helsinki in November. The American officials have expressed guarded but clear optimism that progress has been made in these talks. One of the vital bargaining positions apparently revolves directly around Safeguard, and it would be a serious mistake at this delicate stage of the bargaining to pull the rug out from under the Government and limit this system as proposed by the Brooke amendment.

I mean that it would be a mistake of strategy, not a political mistake, in not backing up the President. The President is the head of this Government and he is the representative of the Government at these talks. He is the head man. Now, if we are going to march up the hill on this delicate matter that is directly involved in these negotiations and in favor of four sites, and then a week later we say, "No, we have changed our minds to two sites," we not only take the force out of his position but, with great respect, in the eyes of those at the negotiating table who are against us, it would make us look ridiculous.

It might be asked as to why four ABM deployments are more valuable and have more negotiability than two. The answer is as simple as two and two. As a matter of fact, it is precisely two and two, and two and two make four. Four sites certainly add to the force of our bargaining position and the strength of our negotiating power. This is one reason why the authorization for the Whiteman and Warren deployment is so important at this particular time.

There has been a momentum in the SALT talks which perhaps was not expected by most of us a few months ago. We need to maintain this momentum and a continuation with the Safeguard program will do this and enhance our bargaining position at Helsinki. On the other hand, the adoption of the Brooke amendment would not have this impact and would probably weaken our bargaining position which, it is reliably reported, revolves around an agreement involving the Safeguard and a limitation of some type of U.S.S.R. ICBM's, particularly the SS–9.

I think it would be very dangerous to adopt the Brooke amendment. Not only would we diminish the protection for our Minuteman sites, we might very well give a very adverse and perhaps fatal blow to the bargaining positions of our negotiators at Helsinki. I am sure that all of us who are interested in world peace do not want this result.

Let me make it clear that when the SALT talks are showing some encouraging signs of progress we are asked to unilaterally slow down the only program that we have which offsets the increasing offensive deployment of the U.S.S.R.

Refusal to proceed with the Whiteman and Warren deployments by adopting the Brooke amendment would be unilateral. We would receive nothing from the Soviets in return. Not a single SS–9 or any other Soviet ICBM would be shelved as a result.

I would not hazard any guess as to the amount which we would expend on Safeguard prior to a possible SALT agreement, but if our authorization of the four-site deployment of Safeguard creates enough pressure on the U.S.S.R. to bring about such an agreement then the cost is more than justified, regardless of how small or large it may be. In addition, let us remember that the Safeguard is a defensive weapon and is, therefore, in the nature of a hedge for the protection of our Minuteman sites in the event SALT should fail. The same cannot be said about the Soviet SS–9. That monster missile—which has a warhead which is equivalent of 25 million tons of TNT—can only be viewed as an offensive weapon and as having a potential first-strike capability.

Mr. President, while I appreciate the fine motives of the Senator from Massachusetts, I believe his amendment would impact adversely on the already tenuous balance of power, and I hope it will be defeated.

I think we will move into that debate tomorrow and then move into a very important vote and that there will be a very decisive reflection here in that rollcall that the Senate feels it has made up its mind, has taken its position, and the President can move forward and depend on that position, and then we will move forward to the rest of the bill.

As I said yesterday, I believe we will move forward rapidly after the vote tomorrow. We have many amendments. I shall start discussing many of them—not calling them up, but discussing them in advance in order to get the committee's view and my view into the RECORD.

THE HATFIELD AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks with respect to amendment No. 765 submitted by Senator HATFIELD and cosponsored by other Senators, the purpose of which was to implement the recommendations of the Gates Commission with respect to making our Armed Forces an all-volunteer operation.

I realize that this amendment has not yet been called up and I will have far more detailed remarks at that time. In view of the significance of this proposal, however, certain preliminary observations are in order.

Let me first say, Mr. President, I fully realize that on its face this is a highly appealing amendment. In substance, this amendment presumes that after next July 1, when the present induction authority lapses, all entering the Armed Forces will be only volunteers and there will be no more draftees. It presumes that we can end the draft and provide enough volunteers to maintain the Armed Forces by increasing certain enlisted pay rates.

There are a number of basic reasons why this proposal should be voted down at this time.

First of all, for the Senate to adopt an amendment of this magnitude without committee hearings in either the House or the Senate is to repudiate the fundamental legislative processes. The amendment itself, 15 pages in length, proposes a number of changes, some of them far reaching, in the compensation structure of our Armed Forces.

The amendment would cover increases in:

First, basic pay rates, both active and reserve, for certain enlisted and officer personnel;

Second, proficiency pay;

Third, hostile fire pay;

Fourth, travel and transportation allowances for certain lower and enlisted grades;

Fifth, ROTC scholarship programs;

Sixth, recruiting incentives; and

Seventh, special pay for physicians and dentists.

Mr. President, the estimated annual cost of this amendment is $4,316,000,000.

There is not one iota of a recommendation or approval of this matter from the Budget Bureau. I shall refer to a small amount, $250 million, recommended here, that is related, but there is no recommendation for the $4.316 billion required to cover this amendment.

Mr. President, we worked here for days, and even months, to reduce the cost of the pending bill.

The Armed Services Committee worked very hard to reduce the cost of this bill from $20,605,489,000 to $19,242,889,000. Moreover, there are a number of Senators, as we all know, pressing to see this bill cut still further on the Senate floor. It is ironic indeed that we are now confronted with an amendment which would increase the cost of the bill as reported by the committee by 22.4 percent—an amendment upon which not even hearings have been held and on which there is no recommendation from the President or the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, it is important for the Senate to know that the pending budget for fiscal year 1971 contains no funds for the adoption of the $4 billion amendment implementing the Gates report. The only pay legislation which has been submitted for this year is a proposal which has not passed either body which would increase the enlisted rates with under 2 years of service by 20 percent. This proposal would have an effective date of January 1, 1971, and involve a 6-month fiscal year 1971 cost of $250 million.

That is the only money recommendation we hear of here concerning this important matter.

What I have enumerated thus far, Mr. President, are just the cost elements of the amendment. Of equal significance is the fact that the amendment presumes that the authority for induction under the draft will be allowed to lapse next July 1. The President in his message to the Congress of April 23, 1970, made it clear that an extension of induction authority beyond July 1, 1971, would be required. At least, Mr. President, we should give the administration a chance to make its case rather than prejudge the issue some months before hearings are even conducted on the forthcoming extension legislation. I should add that if the induction authority is to be extended, the entire premise of this $4.3 billion amendment is wiped out.

I think everyone realizes that there must be a consideration of the all-volunteer Army proposal at the same time we consider the extension of the draft, the Selective Service. I think it is just as certain as night follows day that we must extend that Selective Service Act. The President of the United States thinks so. He said so in his message to Congress. So now for us to jump the gun and seriously considering this proposal as an amendment, even if it only passed this body, would be, I think, an abrogation of our legislative responsibility and would be legislating in the dark.

I am sure, Mr. President, that one of the arguments to be made in behalf of the $4.3 billion amendment is that it will save money. I would observe that for over 18 years this has been a customary argument presented in support of military pay legislation.

There is a hope that we may be able to save money after the shooting war is over and we will be able to settle down. I pray we will be able to settle down. The idea of considering the installation of an all-volunteer Army is a concept I do not totally reject, but, at the same time, many, many questions have to be settled. We do that first and settle the matter after extensive hearings, and after hearing witnesses from various sources.

I do not resent it, but I am disappointed that here, on a military procurement bill, we have an amendment that would propose such far-reaching matters, at such high cost, with so many unknown quantities, when that is not supported by the President of the United States, although he supports the idea somewhere in the future, and one that is not supported by the Secretary of Defense, although he doubtless hopes that something can be done at some time. All this is done while the war is still in the shooting stages. We hope the activity continues to go down, but it is by no means certain. There is always a possibility, and more than a possibility, for the attacks to be sustained.

Mr. President, let me say that I have the highest respect for the members of the Gates Commission. All of the men are either prominent in public life or have seen extensive military service in the past. They sincerely believe that the recommendations could result in an all-volunteer force.

I cannot understand how they could think that that could all be done, though, by June 30 of next year. I have the greatest respect for the ability and the high integrity of the authors of this amendment, who include some of our most valuable and experienced members. But I believe they have gone too far this time, rushing forward without hearings, rushing forward with all these facts staring us in the face, which they cannot overcome or ignore.

I would emphasize, however, that there has been at least one study in the past that throws considerable doubt on the practicality of an all-volunteer force. This study was completed in the Department of Defense in 1967. Moreover, in connection with the extension of the draft in 1967, it was then estimated that the cost of attracting an all-volunteer force of pre-Vietnam level of 2,700,000 persons would be from $4 billion to $17 billion annually with $8 billion additional annual cost being a reasonable guess. I do not say it would cost $17 billion; I think that is too high. But these men did vary in their estimates that much. This was at a time, Mr. President, when the price and wage levels were substantially lower than the existing scales. I point this out to show that there have been different views on even the cost of trying to attract an all-volunteer force.

I have grave doubts as to whether at this particular time we can maintain an armed force anywhere near our present size without a Selective Service System. And I want to say, too, Mr. President, that I do not buy all of this volunteer army concept, by any means. I am not satisfied, in my mind, what the army might become over a period of 20, 30, or 40 years, if there were not a stream of young fellows direct from civilian life, coming in and going out. I think the same is true as to young officers. I believe that that is one of the great safeguards in connection with our system of government.

Furthermore, I am very conversant with the fact that in many cases, the finest thing that can happen to these young men is for them to render military service to their country. It helps them find themselves, often as nothing else can do. It puts them on the road to training when they have rejected training of every other kind so far, or at least have not been adept in it, and have not realized the need for it.

It is an avenue of opportunity, it is an avenue of training, it is an avenue toward self-respect and self-sufficiency, and dedication to causes and purposes and to country, that many of these young men have not had until they received it from the military services. I think that training and dedication is a great plus that does not show up in the

cost accounts, but is one of the greatest assets this Nation has.

I would remind the Senate that the present Selective Service System was started in peacetime. Within a little over a year after World War II, this country could not maintain a total armed force of slightly over 1 million men without having in effect a Selective Service System.

We tried that after World War II. There was no Selective Service when I came to the Senate in 1947. But in 1948, before the cold war had gotten very far, and while we were at peace with everyone everywhere, we found that it was necessary to enact a Selective Service Act, and did in 1948—necessary to maintain even a minimum peacetime force. So how could we abolish it now, when we are still at war, and with many other uncertainties facing us as well?

I realize, Mr. President, that much of the impetus for the all-volunteer amendment arises from the disillusionment of the Vietnam war and the desire to greatly reduce our participation in this engagement. Aside from this factor, however, I would hate to see the day when we adopt the concept that the defense of this Nation is not a civic responsibility and that we should rely solely on volunteers. Moreover, that financial inducement would be the principal motivating force for maintaining the necessary manpower input for our Armed Forces.

It seems clear to me that the idea of an all-volunteer force at this time holds out only false hope to the mothers of the young men of America. We are saying to all mothers that "your son will not be drafted because there are sufficient sons of other mothers who will volunteer to meet our military requirements." I doubt if this will prove to be the case.

Mr. President, the forgoing remarks are not intended to be a detailed analysis of the amendment but merely to indicate some of the basic considerations why the Senate should vote down this amendment.

I hope that will be the course that this matter will follow. Of course, I do welcome debate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RESPONSE TO VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S SPEECH

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon, following his attack on the Vice President of the United States today, declined to yield to the Senator from Kansas. I had hoped to discuss with the Senator the so-called end-the-war amendment. That is the one item he failed to discuss in his onslaught on the Vice President—the so-called end-the-war amendment, which I have designated the lose-the-peace amendment, and which perhaps should now be called the extend-the-war amendment. It is very brief. With reference to South Vietnam, the pertinent section contains about 18 lines, fewer than 200 words, by which it is sought to lead the Senate and the people of America to believe that by adopting this amendment in Congress, the war in Southeast Asia would be brought to an end.

I have read very carefully the speech by the Vice President delivered yesterday in Miami, Fla., to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I share the view expressed by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Oregon that there should be limitations with reference to criticism of any Senator by another Senator, or by a member of the executive. But I might note that it was not too long ago that, in this Chamber, the Senator from Arkansas compared the Vice President of the United States, Mr. AGNEW, not to Joe McCarthy, but to Joseph Goebbels. I would comment, as many Senators have heretofore, that it is apparently fine for us to criticize, but the Vice President should not have that right—that he should not be as concerned about some happenings in Congress as other Americans are.

But I fail to find any aspersion concerning the character or the motives of any Member of the Senate in the speech delivered by the Vice President yesterday. In fact, he makes the point at least twice in the speech of emphasizing that he is not questioning the patriotism of any Member of the Senate, but that, as he has a right, he does question their judgment and their wisdom. I would hope that perhaps the propriety of his doing so would not be questioned at this point, after the sponsors of the amendment have raised a half million dollars or more, $600,000, by appealing to the emotions of the American people on an NBC program on May 12. Having now collected a sum in excess of a half million dollars based on their amendment, as they call it, to end the war, I understand it may now be changed, and the amendment to end the war may now become an amendment to extend the war, because, according to news stories this morning, the sponsors propose to extend the war for 6 months, or at least extend their endorsement of the war for another 6 months, until the end of 1971.

Simply by changing the amendment, those who have sent in $600,000 are told, "Well, we will have to go on 6 more months." I am not certain whether their money will be returned nor certain how the money is being used. But I, too, would question the advisability, the ethics and judgment of Senators who raise money from the public to lobby their own colleagues by use of paid TV commercials in many of our States, particularly the State of Missouri, the State of Kansas, the State of West Virginia, the State of Washington, the State of Virginia, and other States which, for some reason, were singled out for special treatment and special coverage.

What did the Vice President say? He discussed the amendment. I regret to say the Senator from Oregon failed to discuss the amendment. He said early in his remarks that the Vice President was making a false statement when he said that by December 31 the entire burden would fall on South Vietnam.

Let me read the amendment. That should be the best proof of what the sponsors intend. It reads:

> Unless the Congress shall have declared war, no part of any funds appropriated pursuant to this act or any other law shall be expended in Vietnam after December 31, 1970, for any purpose—

I repeat—

> for any purpose arising from military conflict:

That seems clear to me. It was clear to the Vice President. It is clear to many Americans who understand the amendment. It says, very simply, that after December 31, this year, not a dime of taxpayers' money shall be spent in Vietnam for any purpose arising from military conflict.

Then it goes on to say that by next June—June 30, 1971—every American must be withdrawn from South Vietnam.

The senior Senator from Oregon condemned the Vice President because he talked about the possible bloodbath in South Vietnam should there be a precipitate withdrawal. Let us go back to the amendment. Again, that is the best proof of what the sponsors intend. I read from page 2, line 3, of the amendment:

> That funds may be expended as required for the safe and systematic withdrawal of all United States military personnel, the termination of the United States military operations, the provision of assistance to South Vietnam in amounts and for purposes specifically authorized by the Congress, the exchange of prisoners, and the arrangement of asylum for Vietnamese who might be physically endangered by the withdrawal of United States forces:

The junior Senator from Kansas would assume that by the inclusion of that language, by making plans now to arrange for asylum for those South Vietnamese who might be physically endangered, at least the sponsors initially thought that there might be some danger of a bloodbath.

Really, the amendment to end the war advertising campaign has been successful. We have seen, for the first time in history, Members of the U.S. Senate go on nationwide television and raise more than a half million dollars, as lobbyists, to lobby their colleagues in Congress. We see full page ad after full page ad featuring a flag draped casket, with the inference being that the Senators listed are opposed to war and that the balance of us must be for war and against peace; that we enjoy the killing, we enjoy the death, and we enjoy the bloodshed, but that only those who cloak themselves in the so-called antiwar terminology are for peace; that those of us who support President Nixon want the war to go on, for some mysterious reason, even though the facts are to the contrary.

Where have some of these colleagues been for the past 5 years, when the war was escalating month after month? Where were they when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was passed in the Senate by a vote of 88 to 2?

Why should President Nixon feel the brunt of their attack now, at a time when there is a deescalation of the war, at a time when some hope for peace is in sight, at a time when a renowned ambassador, David Bruce, has been sent to Paris to negotiate?

The Vice President yesterday in Miami, discussed the McGovern-Hatfield amendment—and that is how it is re-

ferred to in all the ads and commercials, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment—but somehow, it is wrong for the Vice President to use the name "McGovern" or the name "Hatfield." It is all right to use them to raise a half million dollars, but the Vice President should not refer to the amendment by name because the names mentioning Members of this body is an affront to them.

The Vice President said that if the McGovern-Hatfield amendment should be adopted, it would strike a lethal blow at the Paris peace talks. Why should the enemy negotiate if by legislative fiat we determine that all troops will be out by next June 30, 1971? What is there to negotiate—whether they come by boat or by air or walk? Because then we would have announced to the world and to the enemy that we are quitting in Southeast Asia; we are surrendering, if you will, in Southeast Asia.

I find no direct attack upon any Senator by the Vice President. I recognize the old shell game of "talk about everything but your amendment if it has no merit." And it has no merit, as the debate in the next 2 or 3 weeks will indicate. It says, very clearly, that not one dime shall be spent after December 31, 1970, for any military purpose. That is not difficult to understand. It does acknowledge the possibility of a bloodbath, because it provides for asylum and the expenditure of funds for asylum in this country. Where? In Oregon? In South Dakota? In the Vice President's home State of Maryland? In the State of Kansas? That, apparently, is left to the President though the sponsors do not leave the conduct of the war to the President. Just where does he put the South Vietnamese who seek asylum?

The Senator from Arkansas, who is always free with his criticism of the Vice President, seems to feel some special pain when the Vice President mentions his name, as he does from time to time. But the amendment is clear. The amendment is notice to the enemy that we will quit in Southast Asia, that we will retreat and withdraw if necessary. That is what the Vice President was talking about to members of the VFW, many of whom have risked their lives for our country.

Again, I do not question anyone's patriotism. I agree with the senior Senator from Oregon—he has been consistent; he has been opposed to the war from the start. I do not disagree with that. But the facts are that the President of the United States, President Nixon, is disengaging in Southeast Asia; that we have deescalated the war; and that it has been done without the McGovern-Hatfield amendment; and President Nixon will continue on a path for peace. He might even beat the timetable some are now attempting to impose upon him.

It occurs to the junior Senator from Kansas that there must be one person in America, the President—whether it be Nixon or Johnson or Kennedy, or whoever in the future—who has the authority to negotiate for our country, who has the right and responsibility and obligation to speak for our country. This does not mean that the Senate has no role to play in foreign policy. This does not mean that the Senate has no role to play in Southeast Asia.

But why now, I ask the sponsors of this amendment? Why now, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment? The President has returned 120,000 Americans. By next May 1, it will be 265,000. Why now, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment? The war is being deescalated. We will have an honorable peace and it will be because of the efforts of President Nixon and not of those who would seek to impose their will upon him.

I yield the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a limitation of 3 minutes on statements therein.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S ADDRESS TO VFW IN MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday, Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW addressed the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Miami, Fla., on the threat embodied in the Hatfield-McGovern amendment.

He stated that he was not questioning the patriotism of the amendment's sponsors, but that he was deeply questioning their wisdom, logic, and judgment.

The Vice President called the end-the-war measure a perilous one and pointed out that its approval would have several deleterious effects. Among these are: Its approval could be a death blow to the Paris peace talks; and the South Vietnamese could collapse as a result of the hasty withdrawal of the American troops.

Mr. AGNEW documents his criticisms very effectively and raises several other important issues in this penetrating speech.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the Vice President's remarks and ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

I would like to speak to you today of a rising threat to everything our servicemen have fought to accomplish in Southeast Asia—a threat embodied in the Hatfield-McGovern Amendment.

Should this proposed Amendment become law, unless America declares war, President Nixon would be forced to end any military aid to Laos and to halt all military operations in South Vietnam—twenty weeks from today. Every American soldier, sailor, marine and airman would have to be out of Vietnam by June 30 of next year—ten and a half months from today.

Hatfield-McGovern is a blueprint for the first defeat in the history of the United States—and for chaos and Communism for the future of South Vietnam. The *Washington Post* was generous to call this amendment "reckless." It is worse than that; if adopted by the Senate and passed by the House, this publicized "Amendment to End the War" in Vietnam will go down in history as the amendment that lost the war in Vietnam and destroyed the chances for freedom and peace in Southeast Asia for the balance of the century.

Nothing less is at stake.

But, if this amendment, and any similarly irresponsible proposal which may be offered, can go down in humiliating defeat for its sponsors in the Senate—then this nation will *not* go down in humiliating defeat on the battlefields of Southeast Asia—I promise you that.

Today, I have a simple question. I am here to ask you, as fellow Americans, and fellow veterans—can the President of the United States count on your support?

The charges I have already made here are among the strongest since I took office as Vice President. But no more dangerous proposal has been presented to the American Congress in those 19 months—or in 19 years for that matter. While I do not question the patriotism of the sponsors of this amendment—I do deeply question their wisdom, their judgment and their logic. They are horribly wrong—and if their grave error is enacted into law, generations of Asians and Americans will suffer for their tragic blunder.

Let us look at the inevitable consequences should Hatfield-McGovern be enacted.

First, the amendment would be a final lethal blow to the Paris peace talks. Any vestige of hope that the enemy will negotiate with Ambassador Bruce at Paris would disappear overnight—for the last incentives for the enemy to talk seriously would be gone. He would have gotten what he came to Paris to get—a fixed final timetable for all Americans to get out of South Vietnam. Why should the enemy offer concessions to the United States for something Senators Hatfield and McGovern and their allies will give him free of charge in four months?

Should this amendment become law, and all American military operations in Southeast Asia cease by December 31, the immense burden of this war would fall immediately and totally upon South Vietnam. The government and people there would confront, alone and all at once, the completion of the enormous tasks of creating a stable democratic society, promoting economic and social reform, fighting an internal war against guerrillas and defending their nation from invasion from three frontiers.

Though South Vietnam has made enormous strides in development in recent years—today she could not carry those burdens alone. No developing nation could.

Hence, the result of a unilateral, precipitous American abandonment of South Vietnam would be the collapse of the government, chaos in the country—and ultimately the kind of Communism that literally decimated the civilian population of Hue in the Tet offensive.

The Rand Corporation estimates that if Communism prevails in South Vietnam, 100,000 Vietnamese who placed their faith in us will die for that error in judgment. Douglas Pike, the nation's foremost expert on the Viet Cong, estimates three million South Vietnamese could lose their lives in the bloodbath following a Communist victory.

Assuredly, this is not what Senators Hatfield, McGovern, and those supporting them want—but that is what they are inviting.

They say their amendment will provide for transport and a refuge for Vietnamese who would fear for their lives when the Americans go. But how—and where? Do Senators Hatfield and McGovern have in mind opening up Oregon and South Dakota to resettle the refugees? Hardly. And the place for these men and women who believe so deeply in freedom that they will become exiles rather than submit to the Communist yoke is not Oregon or South Dakota—it is South Vietnam.

It is clear from their mention of "provision" for refugees that Senators Hatfield and McGovern have considered that the collapse of South Vietnam will indeed be one consequence of their amendment. But have they considered the consequences of that collapse?

One wonders if they really give a damn.

If South Vietnam collapses then victory and success go to the hard-liners in Hanoi

and Peking who counseled belligerence and war instead of peace and negotiation.

If South Vietnam collapses then 285,000 Americans will have suffered and 43,000 will have died for nothing. An American Army, undefeated on the field of battle, will come home in humiliation because impatient pacifists in the Senate lost the war. What will be the reaction then when the American people wake up to learn that the thousands of lives and billions in taxes over a decade had been spent only to find national humiliation and disaster at the end of the road?

Will they then reward the blind impatient politicians who could not see the war through its final hours—and so snatched, for America, military defeat from the jaws of political victory?

If South Vietnam collapses, then Southeast Asia is gone. Those who do not believe in the Domino Theory, as the President has put it, have not talked to the dominoes. Already, Cambodia is half-occupied by North Vietnamese and Viet Cong. Laos is half-occupied by North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao. Thailand is fighting its own Communist insurgency, aided and encouraged from without. Does any rational man believe these countries—or Malaysia and Singapore at the end of the peninsula—can survive if South as well as North Vietnam should come under the rule of militant Communists?

Have the isolationists in the Senate pondered the full consequences of America's defeat in South Vietnam—and freedom's defeat in Southeast Asia?

Looking down the road to the year 2000, we see most Asian nations on the threshold of technological maturity; we see an Asia that contains 60 percent of all humanity; we see a world in which there are ten Asians for every American.

Are the isolationists content to let that Asia go by default to the Communists because they lacked the perseverance to see this through?

Well, we are not, my fellow Americans and my fellow veterans—and the President is not—and together we shall see this war through to an honorable end that will do justice to the sacrifices of all our sons.

Have the isolationists considered the impact of the abandonment of this one ally upon America's other allies around the world? Could any nation put trust in the word and capacity of the United States—if we slink home, defeated, from the battlefield of Southeast Asia?

The lessons for nations like Germany and Japan—even India—would be clear: The inescapable conclusion would be that the United States cannot be counted upon in the crunch and nations must depend upon themselves to survive. The nonproliferation treaty would be forgotten as every state rushed to develop its greatest possible deterrent. If collective security is a failure in Vietnam—who will place confidence in it in Europe or the Middle East

As I stated moments ago, while I do not question the patriotism of the Senators I criticize, I do question their wisdom, their logic and their judgment—and I question also their sense of justice.

Some of the same Senators who bewailed a Democratic President's lack of power in foreign policy ten years ago now contend that this newly installed Republican President has too much power.

Some of the same Senators who supported the "peace plank" at the Democratic National Convention in 1968 now condemn a President who has taken more risks for peace than that plank contained.

Some of the same Senators who were silent while a Democratic President sent 532,000 American soldiers to Vietnam are obstructing and undercutting a President who is bringing 265,000 Americans home.

What is there in the record of this President to justify the attitude and actions of these Senators?

When President Nixon took office there were 532,500 American troops in Vietnam. He did not send more troops in—he started bringing the boys home. He pledged in June of last year to bring home 25,000 troops; they have come home. He pledged in September to bring home 35,000 more; they have come home; he pledged in December to bring home 50,000 more; they have come home. Every promise he has made to the American people about the war in Asia, he has kept. American casualties are a third of what they were in 1968; time is now on the side of the allies, not the side of the enemy; and still they malign his policies and his performance.

The President has turned the war over to the South Vietnamese as rapidly as they have become prepared to shoulder the burden.

To proceed slower than that is to break faith with the American people. But to move faster than security dictates is to risk the lives of our men and invite a victory for Communism that tens of thousands of our lads died to prevent.

And no matter what the McGoverns and Hatfields propose—the President is not going to take those risks with the lives of American men.

The Senate sponsors of Hatfield-McGovern cannot win this war; they cannot conclude an honorable peace, but they can lose this war—as well as guarantee the ultimate failure of the uneasy peace to follow—if they convince enough of their colleagues to support their amendment.

They argue in the Senate that the Cambodian decision underscores the need to place limits and restrictions upon the President—to force upon him a timetable for withdrawal. I do not agree with that assessment. In my view, the President's decision to enter Cambodia and capture and destroy those tons of enemy arms and ammunition that would otherwise have been killing American men was an act of courage and the finest hour in the Nixon Presidency.

The Cambodian decision does not argue for putting shackles upon this President. It argues eloquently the case that the Senate should leave the President alone to exercise his Constitutional powers as Commander-in-Chief and determine what is necessary to protect the lives of American men.

Senator Fulbright now seeks a larger role for his committee in the conduct of foreign policy—but where the President decided and acted in a matter of hours to protect American lives—it took Mr. Fulbright and his colleagues seven weeks to decide on a simple amendment. His is a history of querulous "fuddy-duddying."

Many of the men in this great organization trace their military service to their country back to World War I. Yet, today, we see abroad in our land and in the halls of Congress the voices of that same short-sighted isolationism that lost the peace after World War I and helped to bring on World War II.

Let us not again forget the lesson that for the United States, there is no security in a retreat from the world. Let us not again force an American President to make in deepening despair the kind of statement that Woodrow Wilson made in St. Louis just 10 months after the armistice in France:

"If," he said, "(the Covenant of the League of Nations) should ever in any important aspect be impaired, I would feel like asking the Secretary of War to get the boys who went across the water to fight, together on some field where I could go and see them, and I would stand up before them and say,

"Boys, I told you before you went across the seas that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promises; but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise. You are betrayed. You fought for something that you did not get.

"And the Glory of the Armies and Navies of the United States is gone like a dream in the night, and there ensues upon it, in the suitable darkness of the night, the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nation before this war came; and there will come sometime, in the vengeful Providence of God, another struggle in which, not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world."

Let us never force an American President to say that again.

TRANSFER OF JUDICIAL FUNCTION OF NLRB TO FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the record is clear that the National Labor Relations Board has ignored the intent of Congress and time and time again fashioned law according to notion of Board members. Disregard for congressional purpose by the NLRB is at an all-time high. The Board shows both a zeal to aid union organizations and a preoccupation with punishing employees. Many times employees suffer economically because of unreasonable treatment by the NLRB.

Labor Board decisions have failed to follow the direction of Congress. For this reason they have unsettled the balance of power essential to sound collective bargaining and have contributed to the industrial strife and inflationary settlements which are now rampant.

An excellent editorial in the Wednesday, August 5, 1970, issue of the News & Courier in Charleston, S.C., deals effectively with this issue.

This is done by discussing pending legislation, S. 3671, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), that would transfer the Board's jurisdiction in unfair labor practice cases to the Federal district courts. The editorial says that Senator TOWER's pending legislation would be an improvement over the present unsatisfactory condition.

Mr. President, I will let this editorial speak for itself. The editors of the News & Courier, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, are to be commended for such forceful and sensible discussion of the matter.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

NLRB EXPERIMENT

Critics of the National Labor Relations Board, which Congress created in 1935 to oversee labor-management relations and disputes, long have contended that the agency has overstepped its authority by rewriting labor law and making biased decisions favoring organized labor.

The NLRB's record bears out much of this criticism. Nobody, however, seems to have been able to figure out a way to end the bias in this free-wheeling agency. Sen. John Tower, R–Texas, contends it can be done by transferring jurisdiction over unfair labor practice cases from the NLRB to federal district courts.

Sen. Tower says that the 35-year NLRB "experiment" of mixing prosecution, legislative, executive and quasi-judicial powers in the same agency has not been a success and

that Congress should undo its mistake. He is the author of a bill which would transfer the board's judicial functions to the courts.

The NLRB, Sen. Tower asserts, "has ignored the intent of Congress. It has become a policy-making body and has not hesitated to rewrite the law to suit its own purposes. It has subordinated the rights of individual employees, small unions and employers through biased decisions favoring big unions. In no small measure our present persistent labor relations problems derive from the structure which we have set up."

In 1968, a Congressional subcommittee on separation of powers was equally critical of the board and recommended transfer of its judicial powers to district courts. Nothing came of that recommendation.

Little doubt exists that Sen. Tower's bill is supported by a majority of business operators. A poll of members of the National Federation of Independent Business Inc. discloses that 82 per cent of those queried favor the Tower bill, 11 per cent are opposed and 7 per cent have no opinion. Eighty-seven per cent of South Carolina members of the federation endorse the bill.

There is no iron-clad assurance, of course, that Sen. Tower's proposal would automatically improve the government's handling of unfair labor practices. Just as there are some biased federal agencies there are some biased courts. The pro-union bias of the NLRB has endured so long and has been so pronounced that almost any means for improvement seems worth considering.

WELFARE RECIPIENTS IN POSH HOTELS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an article appeared in the Wednesday, August 5, 1970, issue of the New York Daily News which reported flagrant disbursements of taxpayer's money by the New York City Welfare Department.

These disbursements referred to in the article by Mr. Martin McLaughlin are extravagant expenditures by the New York Welfare Department to house welfare recipients in New York City's posh hotels. The only family whose picture appears in the article lives in posh hotel facilities that cost $85 a day. This will amount to $31,025 a year, tax free. It is also reported that the New York City Welfare Department is paying the same high prices for hotel facilities that are unfit to live in. A workingman with a family would have to earn a much larger sum than this in order to have a net spendable income of $31,025 because he would have to pay over 40 percent taxes on his income. The family referred to in the article does nothing to earn this large sum but the father could probably be trained to perform some kind of work. However, if he worked he would have to earn a much larger salary to end up with $31,025 net spendable income a year, so his financial incentive to work is killed.

The New York City Welfare Department reported that on Tuesday, August 4, 1970, there were 702 families living in New York City's better midtown hotels at a cost of more than $600,000 per month. The working people of the United States support the financing of the Federal Government through their tax dollars and the Congress is supporting this flagrant program by authorizing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to disburse funds to pay 50 percent of the cost of this program.

At the same time Congress is authorizing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make disbursements for this and other wasteful programs, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is cutting off badly needed funds to southern school districts because they are not complying with HEW's arbitrary and unreasonable guidelines. The education of the children of our Nation is far more important than the administration of extravagant give-away programs that kill all incentives for the recipients to go to school so that they can maintain regular employment and support themselves and their families.

It is true that there are many needy persons in our country that are unable to work because of physical or mental impediments. We have a responsibility to aid these people financially and to rehabilitate and train them so that they can lead healthy and useful lives. However, Congress has neither a duty nor a right to implement or support programs that increase the monetary incentive for Americans to quit working. People receiving assistance payments should find it more to their advantage to go to work than they do now. It should not be financially more lucrative to stay at home, at the expense of the taxpayers, than to go to work.

Many American workers feel that they are currently overtaxed to support wasteful spending by the Federal Government. Welfare programs that house persons in posh hotels and provide welfare recipients with other luxuries than most working Americans cannot afford support their feelings. Most taxpayers cannot afford to stay in $85-a-day hotel facilities. The taxpayers of the United States are rightfully upset by overspending by the Federal Government. Overspending by the Federal Government is a prime contributing factor to the spiraling inflation our country is currently experiencing. In this spiraling inflation, the taxpayer often finds himself in a financial squeeze because his net spendable income decreases as taxes and costs of goods increase.

The average annual income per family in the United States in 1969 was $9,433. Only 3.6 percent of the families in the United States made over $25,000 in 1969. The family referred to in the article in the New York Daily News is, without lifting a finger, receiving financial aid in an amount greater than income earned by over 97 percent of all American families last year. The taxpayer should not be required to support give-away programs that disburse money to support recipients that is in excess of that which over 97 percent of the taxpayers earn.

I have been informed by Mr. Robert Carroll, assistant welfare commissioner for New York City, that this wasteful and flagrant give-away program in New York City is financed 50 percent by Federal funds, 25 percent by State funds, and 25 percent by city funds. The taxpayers will not stand for this continued irresponsible spending by the Federal Government. It is morally wrong to require taxpayers to support such programs as this.

What is needed at this time is the immediate discontinuance of wasteful spending of funds presently allocated for welfare programs rather than allocating additional funds for more give-away projects. Those agencies whose responsibility it is to disburse welfare moneys should not pay prices for goods and services that far exceed their true value.

This kind of spending contradicts what the Federal Government's fiscal policy should be. The fiscal policy of all Government agencies should be one that fights the inflation that our Nation's economy is troubled with rather than one that contributes to this already severe problem.

Those agencies whose responsibility it is to disburse welfare moneys should strive to attain the most benefits available for each dollar spent. This would increase the real benefits to welfare recipients, increase the number of our Nation's deserving needy persons that could be helped, and help decrease Federal spending's responsibility for spiraling inflation.

Mr. President, I will let this article speak for itself. Mr. Martin McLaughlin of the New York Daily News is to be commended for bringing this wasteful practice of the New York City Welfare Department and the Federal welfare program into public light.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

RELIEFERS IN POSH CITY HOTELS

(By Martin McLaughlin)

Faced with a mounting crisis in housing for reliefers, the Welfare Department has turned to the city's better midtown hotels.

The department acknowledged that four families have been living at the Commodore for the past week at a cost of nearly $1,200 a week. It is paying $85 a day for one of the families and $27 and $30 a day for the other three.

Welfare reported that as of yesterday 702 families were living in hotels at an average of $900 a month for rent and food, for an overall cost of more than $600,000 per month.

$85 A DAY FOR 3 ROOMS

Presently and Beulah Harris and their seven children, who are in an $85-a-day suite of three rooms at the Commodore, which is at E. 42d St. at Lexington Ave., are typical of these families.

The Harrises said they were living in a comfortable house in Brooklyn until January, when the heater broke, the pipes burst and the Welfare Dept. moved them out because there was no heat. They went on relief three years ago when Harris became disabled.

"Since January," said Mrs. Harris, "we have been in four different hotels and slept on the floors of a friend's house on a couple of occasions. You couldn't believe how bad a couple of the hotels were. And how much the city was paying for these places!"

DAUGHTER IS RETARDED

The size of their family is not the only problem that the Harrises face in trying to find a place to live. Their daughter Bertie May, 14, was hurt in a car accident seven years ago. "The accident left her mentally retarded," said Mrs. Harris, "and injured her physically so that she needs a wheelchair most of the time."

She said that they need a place big enough to care for their daughter and that when most landlords learn they are on welfare and see the size of the family, with the daughter in a wheelchair, "they're just not interested."

Referring to the mounting housing crisis,

Assistant Welfare Commissioner Robert Carrol said that last November 390 welfare families were living in hotels and that the number has been steadily increasing to yesterday's total of 702.

"We have the responsibility of helping clients find housing—often on an emergency basis—and it's damned difficult because of the legal discrimination practiced against welfare clients," he said.

He said that although the costs at the Commodore may seem high, the department is paying the same amount for much poorer accommodations.

THE AGING CRISIS AND PENSION REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator KENNEDY, introduced in the RECORD on August 4, 1970, the extremely valuable and perceptive article, entitled "The Old in the Country of the Young," published in Time magazine of August 3.

I would like to join in commending the editors of Time magazine for publishing this authoritative and incisive examination of the truly bewildering array of problems confronting the elderly. Certainly the number and complexity of these difficulties has led to what can be termed "a crisis of the aged"—a crisis which is growing to such proportions that it contains all the ingredients for a vast social upheaval—unless we take the necessary steps to head it off.

In this connection, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to one critical passage in the Time article which, in my judgment, exposes the underlying core of the "crisis of the aged." As the Time report succinctly observes:

> Aside from health, money is the most pervasive worry of the aged: income maintenance is a major need. Private pension plans need attention too. According to one informed estimate, only 10% of the people who work under pension plans actually receive any benefits, usually because they do not stay long enough to qualify. As presently arranged, pensions also tend to lock older workers into their jobs and, if they become unemployed to lock them out. They are then denied jobs because it is too expensive to let them join a pension plan.

Without the means to take advantage of the opportunities for leading a positive and diversified existence, it is inevitable that many senior citizens will, of necessity, continue to lead frozen lives of deprivation, isolation, and despair. Thus, the key to any successful strategy for ending the forced and unnecessary obsolescence of the elderly, is to insure to the greatest feasible extent that the aged receive an adequate income.

It is important to appreciate that private pension plans can make a significant contribution to the economic security of large numbers of the elderly—giving to them together with social security a much higher level of living in retirement than would probably be the case from even a substantially liberalized social security system standing alone. While great emphasis deservedly falls on improving social security benefits, it is imperative that we also see to it that the private pension system operate in the public interest.

Since 1967 I have urged basic reforms to the private pension system, as proposed in my bill, S. 2167. In recent months, I have emphasized the basic lack of fairness in private pension plans which fail to provide retirement benefits to substantial numbers of employees because of harsh qualifying requirements. To determine the extent of this lack of justice in private pension plans, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey and I have recently commenced a survey—which will for the first time fully document the severity of this problem. This survey is being conducted among a representative sample of some 1,500 pension plans in the country and I believe that it will provide the necessary perspective the Congress needs to grasp the seriousness of this matter.

Lack of fairness, however, does not tell the complete story. To many thousands of retired workers, the additional income generated by private retirement plans could mean the difference between living in cheap, shoddy surroundings or living in modest but adequate housing; eating minimal unbalanced diets, or eating wholesome nutritious meals; foregoing or taking advantage of needed medical care and treatment; and existing in an isolated, friendless world or having the means to utilize existing transportation to visit friends and relatives and participate in community activities.

Unfortunately, for too many retired workers this anticipated retirement income will not be forthcoming simply because they will be victimized by the pension plans in which they had placed their confidence.

Incredible as it sounds, the Government not only permits this victimization to take place but encourages it by permitting employees to take tax deductions for contributions to pension plans which are so restrictively structured that they will only pay off to a handful of employees.

Not only this, but the Government permits its contractors to recover as an item of reimbursable expense, contributions made to a pension plan that will only rarely pay off in terms of benefits. And under the Fair Labor Standards Act, an employer is permitted to exclude from the rate of overtime compensation he must pay to his employees, contributions he makes to pension plans, even though that plan may hardly ever pay off and even though the employee has foregone wage increases in order to obtain promised retirement benefits that may never materialize.

And if this is not enough, consider that opponents of pension reform express concern that such reform will discourage employers from establishing new plans, as if by some parody of reasoning the failure to encourage the further extension of inequitable plans should cause distress.

I do not say that reform of the private pension system will automatically resolve the aging crisis. Of course, it will not. It will, however, provide that needed margin of security to many thousands that will enable them to confront old age with confidence and dignity.

I urge all those interested in securing a decent life for our senior citizens to give their attention to this matter of pension reform—and give it the highest priority. It is clear that pension reform is an essential ingredient if we are to successfully cope with the accelerating problems of the aging.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SECRET REPORT FROM ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report relative to the support of the Vietnamese and other Free World forces in Vietnam, and local forces in Laos and Thailand (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of development of the Joint Uniform Military Pay System, Department of Defense, dated August 18, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need to improve the effectiveness of contractor procurement system reviews, Department of Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated August 18, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED GRANT AGREEMENT WITH LELAND STANFORD, JR. UNIVERSITY, STANFORD, CALIF., FOR RESEARCH PROJECT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed grant agreement with the board of trustees of the Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford, Calif., for a research project entitled "Atmospheric Pollution Aspects of Magnetohydrodynamic Power Plants" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3225. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Western Division of the Southern District of Mississippi shall be held at Natchez (Rept. No. 91-1126).

By Mr. BELLMON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 15866. An act to repeal the act of August 25, 1959, with respect to the final disposition of the affairs of the Choctaw Tribe (Rept. No. 91-1127).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 4252. A bill to amend section 1372(e)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude certain interest from the definition of passive investment income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PACKWOOD:

S. 4253. A bill for the relief of Michael Amamchuko Ojukwu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 4254. A bill to provide for the free entry of a 61-note cast bell carillon and a 42-note subsidiary cast bell carillon for the use of Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 4255. A bill to provide that Route 70 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the State of Indiana shall also be designated as Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced S. 4255 appear below under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 4256. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the Squaw Valley, Calif., to the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 4257. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owner or owners of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 4258. A bill to provide for greater flexibility in Federal transportation funding; to permit the States to elect to use a portion of the funds received from certain Federal trust funds to meet local transportation priorities; and to create an Urban Mass Transportation Trust Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 4259. A bill to provide for the advancement in grade of a certain officer in the U.S. Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOLE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PERCY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SPONG, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 4260. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code and to provide for statewide public works planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 4255—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DESIGNATE HIGHWAY 70 WITHIN THE STATE OF INDIANA AS "MEMORIAL HIGHWAY"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to its veterans which can never be repaid. The bill I introduce is an infinitesimally small measure compared to their great effort; but nonetheless, one which I feel is entirely appropriate.

The bill would designate that part of Interstate Highway 70 within the State of Indiana, as "Memorial Highway" in memory of the brave Hoosiers who have served so gallantly in the armed services. I am proud to say that Indiana has done her part in the Nation's defense; Memorial Highway will pay tribute to the more than 890,000 Indianians who have served in uniform since 1914 and honor those who have made the final sacrifice for their country in Europe and the Pacific, in Korea, and in Vietnam. Indiana has thus far lost more than 1,200 of her sons.

Monuments come in many forms, but I can imagine few so fitting as a bustling artery of commerce, symbolizing the vigor and energy that has brought our Nation to greatness. Perhaps as Americans travel through Indiana on Memorial Highway past prosperous farms and thriving cities, they will reflect on those courageous Indianians whose sacrifice and devotion have guaranteed freedom for future generations of Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4255) to provide that Route 70 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the State of Indiana shall be designated as Memorial Highway, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 3596

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3596, to amend the Fur Seal Act of 1966 by prohibiting the clubbing of seals after July 1, 1972, the taking of seal pups, and the taking of female seals on the Pribilof Islands or on any other land and water under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3752

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) be added as cosponsors of S. 3752, a bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

The growing support for this bill, which would bring unit pricing of food commodities to our modern supermarkets, should be most encouraging to the buying public. Present economic statistics indicate that inflation continues to make its cruel impact felt on consumers of this Nation. Unit pricing of food commodities would bring a substantial saving in this Nation's $120 billion food budget. It is a necessary tool for the fight against inflation.

Mr. President, I think it worthy of note that those Senators who presently are sponsors of my bill come generally from Western or Midwestern States—in clear contradiction to the notion that unit pricing is a "radical eastern idea," as has been suggested by certain segments of the grocery industry. I note that four Democratic Senators are cosponsors, as well as four Republican Senators, including myself.

Mr. President, few measures would benefit our people as directly as unit pricing. It would provide the shoppers of this Nation with the facts. It would provide shoppers the knowledge that the giant economy size may indeed be "giant" but often not "economic" at all. It has the support of the President's Special Adviser on Consumer Affairs, Mrs. Knauer, as well as others interested in consumers of this Nation, including certain chains within the grocery industry.

The chairman of our Consumer Subcommittee, Senator Moss, who is a cosponsor of my bill, has indicated he will schedule hearings in the immediate future. I commend the chairman for his statement in this regard, Mr. President, and wish to add my encouragement to this intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4067

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 4067, a bill to amend title 5 of the Housing Act of 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4197

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) be added as a cosponsor of S. 4197, to encourage States to establish junked motor vehicle disposal programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4246

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) be added as a cosponsor of S. 4246, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a special emphasis transportation research and demonstration project program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 80

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLD-

WATER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) be added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 80, to establish a joint committee to investigate the treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 841

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 16311, the proposed family assistance plan.

The amendment authorizes a series of pretests and evaluations of the major reform provisions in the pending welfare bill. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to begin these tests immediately upon enactment of H.R. 16311, in the period of time remaining before full national implementation is scheduled. Three locations in various sections of the country would be selected as representative areas for the test programs.

The purpose of this amendment is to explore and evaluate family assistance as an operating program rather than an untried theory.

Mr. President, I have been increasingly concerned over the difficulties encountered by social legislation enacted in Congress. Laws that have been approved in legislative Chambers, and acclaimed as social milestones, have not passed muster in the field. The bureaucratic tangles and massive cost overruns of many of these measures have come as a profound shock to Congress and the country.

Too many social programs have been designed to perfection in social science laboratories only to fall short of expectation when put into effect.

The tendency has been to seek answers in position papers and other academic exercises. But, no social scientist, no administrator and no legislator can solve complex social problems on a piece of paper. People do not always react in accordance with predictions or pet theories.

In its past efforts to study and enact major pieces of social legislation, Congress has carefully reviewed the great questions of equity, Federal-State responsibility, cost estimates and the like. But, we have fallen short in giving enough attention to the equally great question of writing social programs that actually work in practice.

Traditionally, the failures of legislative concept and program administration are reviewed by Congress in the exercise of its legislative oversight function. But, such review is often sporadic and cursory. Administrative errors and legislative loopholes remain untouched for far too long.

Congress must take on a greater responsibility to insure that new programs are based on the best information attainable. This information can only be gained by experience. With the assistance of more practical information, these programs can be initiated on a sounder footing.

Five years ago, Congress enacted the historic medicare and medicaid laws. Today, these programs are beset by abuse and poor administration. After 3½ years of operation, Under Secretary Veneman has stated they are still in a shakedown phase. Only now, at the urging of the Senate Finance Committee, are steps being taken to correct the worst of these problems.

Similar administrative and conceptual difficulties have plagued the model cities program and the series of antipoverty and education bills passed several years ago.

These programs have not failed. But, their success has been short of what was predicted. Many social innovations have caused disillusionment because of these shortcomings.

Congress enacted these programs in a vacuum. No administrative experience or tryout preceded their full national implementation. As a result, problems unforeseen in the White House, Cabinet Room, or at legislative hearings have brought doubts about many programs.

Similar problems may plague the family assistance plan. H.R. 16311, now under review in the Senate Finance Committee, would drastically change our present system of public assistance. These changes include increased payments to families now on welfare as well as higher benefits to the aged, blind, and disabled. More importantly, some 12 million new Americans in families heretofore ineligible for Federal welfare would be entitled to assistance.

These additional millions of Americans coupled with new eligibility criteria, increased staffing requirements, and an expanded administrative role for the Federal Government, will all add their weight to the burdens of effective administration.

Yet, this program, if passed, will begin on a national scale, with little or no practical information available. How many of the newly eligible families will participate? How much assistance will they be entitled to? What new administrative plans must be activated to handle more welfare recipients? How will other social services be delivered?

Mr. President, H.R. 16311 is a major step in the direction of progressive welfare reform. But, the seeds of success or failure of new social programs are not found in the mere words of new statutory language. Innovation alone does not guarantee success, nor do good intentions insure good programs.

Very simply, my amendment would provide the means to answer the questions and meet the problems which arise only after a program is in operation. In this manner, it could foresee, and perhaps forestall, many of the innumerable difficulties which must, by nature, face any marked change in social policy.

Before welfare reform is undertaken nationwide, this amendment would provide the means to test its provisions. The amendment is not designed to delay welfare reform. It has become apparent that national implementation of any welfare legislation passed in the 91st Congress will not take place until 1972. Thus, the administration would have a full year to undertake the pretest programs and evaluations authorized by this amendment. The information so gained could be put to use as the full program goes into effect.

In essence, my amendment would authorize three pretests of the family assistance plan during calendar year 1971. The precise location of these tests would be left to the discretion of the Secretary. The design of the amendment, however, emphasizes that these tests should be in locations representative of as many variables in geography, living patterns, population, and income as possible. The test jurisdictions could be as large as a single State or as small as a single community.

The most radical change proposed in H.R. 16311 is the provision of Federal assistance to the working poor. Therefore, my amendment would stress that the tests and evaluations authorized would concentrate on the administration of this segment of the bill. Nevertheless, the Secretary will be authorized to test the full family assistance plan in at least one location.

These pretests would authorize the full implementation of welfare reform legislation including payment of benefits to all eligible persons within the test jurisdiction.

The amendment would also direct the Secretary to undertake an exhaustive and comprehensive evaluation of these test programs. Careful consideration must be given to all administrative details and a study made of how to improve the implementation of the legislation.

Equally important, the amendment directs the Secretary to review and evaluate the programs already operating in six States which provide financial assistance to the working poor. These States are New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island. It is essential that we learn from those who have tried aid to working poor programs before us. All wisdom does not reside in Washington—or in the theories of Washington's consultants. Those things which have worked successfully at the State level should be incorporated into the Federal program. New York State, for instance, has administered such a program for almost 20 years. What can we learn from these existing programs about participation and attrition rates, income and employment improvement, and administrative details? A careful evaluation of these experiences will provide much useful information to assist the proposed Federal program. Justice Brandeis once wrote that States could be useful social laboratories for the Nation as a whole. Let us take advantage of the knowledge and experience gained in these States.

The amendment authorizes $15 million for the establishment of three pretests and the review and evaluation of existing State programs assisting the working poor. An expenditure of this nature will be a sound investment for a better welfare program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received

and printed, and will be appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 841) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 842

Mr. PERCY. I am today submitting an amendment to the House-passed Social Security Amendments of 1970 (H.R. 17550). I ask unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD of the amendment which I submit, following my remarks, in order that my colleagues may study it.

Briefly, I propose to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide that a child dependent upon, but unadopted by, his grandparents with whom he is living, may receive the same benefits as if he were adopted.

Recently, I became aware of the fact that due to a provision in the social security law some children who are dependent on their grandparents cannot obtain benefits based on their grandparents' earnings. Under present law, a grandchild must be adopted by his grandparents before he qualifies for a child's social security benefits. This is most unfortunate, as there are cases in which the grandparents, for valid reasons, are either unable to or do not wish to adopt the child, yet still maintain a quasi-parental relationship.

The purpose of social security is to provide the family with a continuing source of income when the family income stops because of the death, retirement, or disability of a worker. Following this, social security benefits are paid to children whose parents have died, retired, or become disabled on the theory that children are generally dependent on their parents and suffer a loss of support when the parents' income stops. However, if that "parent" is a grandparent the child is made to suffer by denying him a social security benefit. Benefits are extended to grandchildren only when they are legally adopted.

This distinction which prohibits the unadopted child living with and supported by his grandparents from receiving the same benefits he would receive if he were adopted is grossly unfair. A child dependent on his grandparents is as deserving of social security benefits as is a child who is dependent on his parents. Perhaps even more deserving as grandparents very possibly would have less income. The payment of these benefits should be based on the realities of the situation.

Therefore, I am introducing today legislation to permit the payment of social security benefits to the dependent grandchildren of disabled, retired, or deceased workers when it can be shown that the child is actually dependent for support upon the grandparents.

My amendment would redefine the term "child" so that benefits would be provided for a grandchild if, at the time the grandparent died or became entitled to benefits, he had been living with the grandparents at least 1 full year—except in the case of death or disability of the grandparent within the same year as the loss of support from the parents. In addition, it would have to be shown that the grandparents actually furnished at least one-half of the child's support during that time.

Adoption of the measure which I propose would correct an anomaly in the social security program. It would make actual dependency the criterion for paying benefits to a grandchild.

Although this is not a major change when measured in terms of the number of people affected, it is nonetheless a major change when measured by the effect it will have on the incomes of those individuals who will qualify for benefits. Moreover, the social security actuaries inform me that because only a relatively few people could be expected to qualify for benefits, adoption of the proposal would have no significant effect on the total cost of the social security program.

OTHER SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSALS

On May 21 of this year, the House of Representatives incorporated into H.R. 17550 several proposals which I recommended over a year ago. Specifically, it adopted my proposals to provide full social security benefits for widows age 65 and over; and to protect social security recipients from the combined forces of inflation and politics by including a provision to grant automatic adjustment of social security benefits to correspond with changes in the cost of living. I am delighted with the House's acceptance of these proposals, and I hope the Senate will retain them.

The House also voted to raise the earnings limitation on benefits from $1,680 to $2,000, but I hope the Senate will go further by accepting my proposal to increase this limitation to $2,400 immediately, and to eliminate it entirely over a period of 7 years.

It is not difficult to understand the extensive opposition to the present level of social security earnings limitation. Americans who have invested in social security through all of their working years reach age 65 only to discover that the traditional value America places on industry and productive labor seems to be penalized as soon as a man reaches age 65. At the present time, a beneficiary who earns more than $1,680 a year receives a reduced social security benefit. I believe that there is no more basic a right than the right to work, and therefore it is wrong to penalize people who want to work and to keep from them social security benefits toward which they have contributed for years. It is a scandal to penalize persons who need to work to augment meager incomes. My proposal to increase this limitation immediately to $2,400, and to eliminate it entirely after 7 years, would not only alleviate the financial pressures on the retired; it would also reassure them that our Nation encourages and values the continued productive participation of its older citizens.

To my regret, two of the proposals I submitted a year ago were not included in the House-passed bill: S. 1596, to provide a $30 minimum benefit for each dependent; and S. 1597, to partially refund payroll taxes for low-income workers.

Social security protects not only the retired. It is also the principal source of income for many families suffering the tragic loss of a wage earner. The benefit formula for surviving dependents is designed to take into account both the earnings record of the worker and the size of his surviving family. In most cases the balance provides an equitable replacement of income for the stricken family. But because of the fixed upper limit imposed by the family maximum, this is not true for the very large family. The costs of raising a family of four and a family of eight just are not the same, and under the existing formula large families do not receive any additional benefits to compensate for their size. I propose a simple formula through which this severe problem for a large family might be resolved. My bill would establish a minimum dependent benefit of $30 a month to reflect the added expenses which large families must incur to achieve the same living standards as smaller families.

The steady rise of social security benefits has been accompained by a steady increase in both the taxable wage base and the payroll tax. While this process imposes an important fiscal discipline on the system, it has over the course of time accentuated the regressive aspects of the payroll tax. We have, as a Nation, committed ourselves to the elimination of poverty, yet the payroll tax annually consumes $1.5 billion of the incomes of those families whose incomes fall below the poverty line. For millions of low-income families, social security is an ever-present tax burden with benefits a far distant reality. A country committed to the principle of progressive taxation finds that the social security payroll tax is increasingly regressive because the poor pay proportionately higher percentages of their incomes. For, as income levels rise, relatively fewer and fewer Americans are being taxed on all of their wages.

It is an accepted principle of the income tax system that income alone does not determine a man's ability to pay. This principle is implemented through the mechanism of deductions in our income tax code. In the design of the social security system we seem to have all but reversed this principle. The question of the structure and incidence of the payroll tax is one of the most basic issues that must be considered in a comprehensive review of public policy with regard to retirement income. I do not propose here to sidestep such a review but one fact is clear: The collection of $1.5 billion a year from families whose incomes fall below the poverty line is at odds with national policies directed toward the effective elimination of poverty.

While it would not be in the best interests of the poor themselves to exempt them totally from contributory participation in their future retirement incomes, I do believe that we should seriously consider the possibility that in the lowest income groups the payroll tax might be partially refunded. My bill would establish a formula by which 90 percent of the payroll tax paid by workers in the lowest income groups would be refunded.

The formula takes into account the size of the family, as well as the family income. Single persons with incomes

under $2,225 per year would be eligible for a 90-percent refund. A couple with income less than $2,850 would be eligible for a refund, while a couple with two children could earn as much as $4,100 and still be eligible for a 90-percent social security tax refund.

Because the payroll tax is inequitable, the income tax law should be amended to provide a partial refund of social security taxes. These refunds would accrue almost entirely to households classified as living in poverty. While I do not claim that this formula is perfect, I do believe this is an important concept which should be incorporated into our social security laws, and, therefore, offered this bill as a means whereby the Congress can consider and discuss its merits.

Certainly, when the Nation is considering the feasibility of a negative income tax a more preferable step would be to first eliminate oppressive Federal taxation of the poor.

Mr. President, the legislation I have introduced cannot take care of all of the shortcomings of the social security program. They are, however, matters which have often been brought to my attention by my constituents, and I believe they deserve careful consideration by the Congress. Until some of these shortcomings in our social security law are corrected, social security will not adequately protect those citizens it was meant to protect.

Within the ranks of the elderly is to be found the experience and expertise which built our Nation and created the highest standard of living in the world. We would be an exceedingly ungrateful people if we did not allow those in our society who helped shape our Nation to also share in the fruits of that abundance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE). The amendment will be received and printed and will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 842) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 842

On page 57, line 13, insert "AND CERTAIN ADOPTIONS OF A CHILD BY HIS GRANDPARENT" immediately after "BENEFICIARIES".

On page 58, after line 22, insert the following:

"(c)(1) The first sentence of section 216(e) of the Social Security Act is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (1) thereof; and

"(B) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and (3) a person who is the son or daughter of the child of an individual or the son or daughter of the child of the spouse of an individual, but only if (A) such person was living in such individual's household and receiving at least one-half of his support from such individual, at the time application for child's insurance benefits was filed on behalf of such person as the child of such individual, or at the time such individual died, and (B) such person began living in such individual's household before such person attained age 18'.

"(2) Section 202(d)(8)(E)(i)(I) of such Act (as amended by subsection (a) of this section) is further amended by adding immediately after 'child-placement agency,' the following: 'or in an adoption which did not take place under the supervision of a public or private child-placement agency if the child is the son or daughter of such individual's child or the son or daughter of the child of such individual's spouse and the child was living in such individual's household at the time application for child's insurance benefits was filed on behalf of such child,'

"(3) Section 202(d)(9) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period ', or '; and

"(B) by adding after and below paragraph (B) thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(C) was legally adopted by such individual—

"'(i) in an adoption which took place under the supervision of a public or private child-placement agency, or in an adoption which did not take place under the supervision of a public or private child-placement agency if the child is the son or daughter of such individual's child or the son or daughter of the child of such individual's spouse and the child was living in such individual's household at the time application for child's insurance benefits was filed on behalf of such child,

"'(ii) in an adoption decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction within the United States,

"'(iii) on a date immediately preceding which such individual had continuously resided for not less than one year within the United States, and

"'(iv) prior to the date such child attained age 18.'

"(4) Section 202(d) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(10) A child who is a child of an individual under clause (3) of the first sentence of section 216(e) and is not a child of such individual under clause (1) or (2) of such first sentence shall be deemed to be dependent on such individual at the time specified in subparagraph (1)(C) of this subsection unless at the time specified in clause (3) of such first sentence such child was receiving regular contributions from—

"'(A) his natural or adopting parent, or his stepparent, or

"'(B) a public or private welfare organization which had placed such child in such individual's household under a foster-care program.'

"(5) The first sentence of section 203(c) of such Act is amended—

"(A) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period '; or'; and

"(B) by adding after and below clause (4) thereof the following new clause:

"'(5) in which such individual, if a child who is entitled to child's insurance benefits on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of a person (but would not be so entitled except for application of clause (3) of the first sentence of section 216(e)), is not in the case of such person or the spouse of such person, except that the provisions of this clause shall not apply if such person has died.'

"(6) The amendments made by the preceding provisions of this subsection shall apply with respect to monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the second month following the month in which this Act is enacted, but only on the basis of applications therefor filed in or after the month in which this Act is enacted."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 843

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) I submit an amendment to the pending bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and ask that it be printed. I intend to call up the amendment for consideration by the Senate tomorrow

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 844

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 17123 cosponsored by Senators GOLDWATER, CRANSTON, SCOTT, MCGOVERN, PACKWOOD, YOUNG of Ohio, DOLE, STEVENS, HARTKE, SCHWEIKER, GOODELL, MANSFIELD, CHURCH, BAKER, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, PERCY, and YARBOROUGH. The amendment would implement the recommendations of the President's Commisison on an All-Volunteer Armed Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey). The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

EXTENSION OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 845

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT TO MAKE FEED GRAIN AND WHEAT ADVANCE PAYMENTS MANDATORY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am today submitting, with the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), an amendment to the Agriculture Act of 1970 requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers under the feed grain and wheat programs.

For 7 years advance payments have been made to feed grain producers and for several years advance payments were made to wheat producers when payments were made for additional voluntary diversion. For budgetary consideration, however, they were eliminated this year.

Under the advance payment program, which was tailored to farmers' needs, producers received half of their diversion payments each year immediately after agreeing to divert a specified acreage. These funds were received at planting time and helped pay the spring seed, fuel, and fertilizer bills. Advance payments of a part of the wheat certification have not been made in past years but there is no good reason why they should not be made in the future.

I am convinced that the decision announced by the Secretary of Agriculture to eliminate advance payments to farmers participating in the 1970 program is wrong for a number of reasons:

First, halting such payments is not a cost savings to the Government, but simply a shift in funding to another fiscal year; and

Second, it will place a new financial burden on our farmers who must borrow money at today's high interest rates in

order to finance crop planting and operating costs.

In 1969, Minnesota producers received $31 million in advance feed grain payments which were immediately used in paying spring planting bills. This year in order to accommodate a budget shift, grain producers were required to wait until July and August for their feed grain payments. This was an entirely unnecessary hardship for them and for the small businessmen from whom they buy their supplies.

Minnesota producers are diverting an estimated 2.7 million acres from feed grain production this year, about 10 percent fewer than last year, and are receiving about $130 million in payments. Fewer feed grain acres were diverted in Minnesota and nationally this year, than last, in part because advance payments were not made.

The amendment which Senator BURDICK and I are offering requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make not less than 50 percent of the feed grain and wheat program payments within 30 days after producers sign up under the annual programs.

Our amendment would result in about 3 months earlier payments of some $400 to $450 million under the wheat program and $700 to $800 million under the feed grain program.

Under our amendment, Minnesota farmers would receive some $70 to $80 million from the two programs about 3 months earlier than otherwise each year, at no additional cost to the Government except of the interest cost on the money advanced.

The interest cost to the Government in making these advance payments is far less than the cost to farmers if the same amount of money were borrowed by 1.5 million individual producers and small businessmen.

Even more important, many of the smallest producers are unable to obtain credit. The advance payments make it possible for them to buy supplies in the spring months when otherwise they would be unable to buy all the supplies at planting time that are needed for efficient production.

Mr. President, I hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will take favorable action on this important amendment during their deliberations on the House-passed Agricultural Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey). The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 845) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 765 TO H.R. 17123

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as cosponsors of amendment No. 765 to H.R. 17123, the Military Procurement Authorization Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 774 TO S. 3619

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 774 to S. 3619, to create within the Office of the President an Office of Disaster Assistance, which would authorize the Small Business Administration to make loans to disaster victims to prevent the dispossession or eviction of any person from his residence as a result of the foreclosure of any mortgage or lien, cancellation of any contract of sale, or termination of any lease, oral or written, of the property which is such person's residence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT 838 TO H.R. 17123

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as cosponsors of amendment No. 838 to H.R. 17123, the military procurement authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 18, 1970, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3547) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 3201, TO AMEND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice of public hearings to be held on August 27 and 28, 1970, by the full committee on S. 3201, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide increased protection for consumers and for other purposes, which was re-referred to the Committee on the Judiciary from the Committee on Commerce with instructions to report back to the Senate not later than September 14, 1970.

Persons desiring to appear and give testimony with respect to this proposed legislation should notify the staff of the committee as soon as possible.

The hearings will commence at 10 a.m. on August 27 and 28 in the main Judiciary Committee room, 2228 New Senate Office Building.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER HONORED BY STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, earlier this year Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, pioneer in nuclear research and father of the nuclear submarine, was honored by the Steuben Society of America with its fifth Steuben Award memoralizing the highest type of public service.

The Steuben Society was founded to carry on the principles of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, a native of Prussia who came to our shores in 1777 to offer his heart and hand in assistance in our struggle for independence.

As a recipient of the Steuben Society Award, Admiral Rickover joins the illustrious company of the late President Herbert Hoover, the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the late, beloved Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.

In responding to this high honor by the Steuben Society, Admiral Rickover had some cogent thoughts for his audience. These remarks, having recently come to my attention, are worthy of consideration by the Senate.

Asked to offer his views on the Nation's involvement in Cambodia, Admiral Rickover responded with an answer which evoked considerable applause, as did much of his presentation. Pointing out that so much depends upon the credibility we place in our President, he said:

> We have had good Presidents and bad Presidents, but never a President who was disloyal to the United States.

Admiral Rickover went on to say that during World War II there were many who expressed bitter feelings toward President Franklin D. Roosevelt and called him a traitor to the United States. He added that no one was excoriated more than President Lincoln during the Civil War. Commenting that President Nixon inherited a difficult situation in Vietnam and noting that there has been no such commotion in the country since Civil War days, he declared:

> Mr. Nixon is President of all the people and he is trying to do his best.

Admiral Rickover concluded with a personal reminiscence. Noting that in 1958 he had accompanied the then Vice President Nixon to Russia as scientific adviser, he said he found Mr. Nixon to be a man of deep humanity, great intelligence, and one who carried the interest of the American people uppermost in his heart.

He said his conclusion was that the President has all the facts he needs when he makes decisions and that we should support him.

Mr. President, these are wise words from a wise and devoted public servant. They are the words of a lifelong military man dedicated to his country and his Commander in Chief. They are words which all of us would do well to ponder and heed in the days ahead.

TERMINATION OF NAVAL BOMBARDMENT OF CULEBRA ISLAND

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am glad to join the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) in cosponsoring the amendment to H.R. 17123 which would end the naval bombardment of Culebra Island. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Although this island is tiny and its inhabitants few in number, the Culebrans are American citizens and entitled to protection and rights which are not abridged by distance or size of population.

Since Culebra is a part of the Atlantic Fleet's principal gunnery range, it can only be a matter of time before an inaccurate shell adds to the four serious injuries which have been reported on Culebra. Just this year the authoritative Armed Forces Journal documented instances of bombs dropping as close as 400 yards to a dwelling, and in May three mortar shells were reported landing within 200 yards of children playing on the beach.

Alternatives to the use of an inhabited island for target practice certainly must exist, and should be thoroughly explored. As only one example, I understand that the Governor of Puerto Rico, Hon. Luis Ferre, has suggested the Navy's use of four uninhabited islands which are available in the same area.

I strongly urge that the Senate Committee on Armed Services, in its consideration of the Navy's proposal to double its land holdings on Culebra, uphold the rights of its residents and act to end the jeopardy in which they live.

FREIGHT RATES, PASSENGER SERVICE, UNION PACIFIC AND THE ICC

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am distressed by the recent action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in making permanent its interim across-the-board percentage freight rate increase granted on November 17 of last year.

Once again, the Commission has shown an insufficient regard for the interests of the consuming public, small businessmen and farmers of Idaho.

According to the ICC's own accounting procedures, the Union Pacific, in the first half of 1970, showed a $5.4 million increase in profits over the first half of 1969. Even in the face of this increased revenue picture, the ICC has granted this most recent freight rate increase. For years the railroads, without the ICC so much as raising an eyebrow, have imposed discriminatory freight rates on Idaho farmers. The rate schedules have always favored the Midwest over the intermountain States. Rather than correcting this inequity, the ICC compounds it by making premanent the interim 6-percent increase granted last year.

But freight rates are by no means the only problem. For years, I have been fighting a rearguard action to keep railroad passenger service alive in my State. Once again, the Union Pacific Railroad is pressing to discontinue passenger trains 35 and 36 between Salt Lake City, Utah, and Butte, Mont., via Idaho points. The UP maintains the losses sustained in the operation of these trains justify a discontinuance of the service to the public. Without regard for its public service responsibility, the UP has moved to halt this last remaining North-South passenger service. Twice before, I have presented testimony to the ICC in opposition to this move. But I am left to wonder whether the ICC response on this matter will be any more sensitive to the public need than the granting of this latest freight rate increase.

The ICC has allowed passenger service to deteriorate and disappear; it has allowed discriminatory rate schedules to go uncorrected; and it has shown no initiative in solving the chronic shortage of freight cars throughout the Western States.

In view of this dismal record, I hope the ICC will awaken at last to its public trust and permit no further passenger train discontinuances. However, if the past is any indication of what we may expect, the chances are small. The ICC has become so closely identified with railroad management, so vacillating in the performance of its duty to regulate on the peoples' behalf, that I must agree with the proposal recently made by the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD). He said the time has come to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission and turn its powers over to the Department of Transportation in the expectation that the Department would better protect the public. Certainly the Department of Transportation could do no worse. Hopefully, such a change would bring improvement.

Mr. President, after preparing these remarks for delivery today, I had an opportunity to read the August 14 issue of the National Association of Wheatgrowers' weekly newsletter. I was shocked to note that another freight rate increase request is in the works. This time the railroads will be back for a 15-percent increase.

If this report is accurate, this is the fifth rate hike requested by the railroads since 1967. If approved, it would amount to an increase of more than 30 percent in freight rates in the last 3 years. I oppose this latest request as I have such requests in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement contained in the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS FROM THE WHEATGROWERS' WEEKLY NEWSLETTER

Western and Eastern railroads are scheduling a general freight rate increase in the neighborhood of 15%. The railroads' request will more than likely be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission by September 1, and it could become effective within 30 days. The increase is reportedly aimed at generating revenue to cover more than the "basic necessities."

The proposed rate hike will be the fifth requested by railroads since mid-1967, and, if approved by the ICC, it will amount to an increase in freight rates of more than 30% in the last three years.

AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR: SAFETY OF TROOPS DURING WITHDRAWAL

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I offer today the third in a series of articles on various aspects of American involvement in Southeast Asia. The article, entitled "The Safety of American Troops While Withdrawing from South Vietnam," was written by Arthur L. Karp and Comdr. G. E. Everly, U.S. Navy retired, for the Congress of Young Professionals for Political Action. The credentials of these individuals for commenting on the subject of troop withdrawals are most impressive and they are found in appendix B at the end of the article. Mr. Karp's and Commander Everly's research delves into methods of troop withdrawals from South Vietnam and sets forth the possible tactics that could be carried out following adoption of Senate Amendment No. 609 to H.R. 17123 in specific. Their conclusion is clear:

In summary, if withdrawal is viewed in purely military terms, a systematic, planned military withdrawal is the safest way to disengage. Any other method, however attractive on the basis of political considerations, will impose greater military risks and a number of casualties that would depend on South Vietnamese performance. Once fully committed to other than a systematic military withdrawal, the U.S. will gradually lose control of the situation. A failure on the part of the South Vietnamese forces could confront the U.S. with the choice between very high casualties or re-entry into the country with a rescue force. A straightforward military withdrawal runs no such risks.

As the matter of the safety of American troops is of the utmost concern to all of us in the forthcoming debate on American involvement in Southeast Asia, I ask unanimous consent that "The Safety of American Troops While Withdrawing from South Vietnam" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SAFETY OF AMERICAN TROOPS WHILE WITHDRAWING FROM SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Arthur L. Karp and Comdr. G. E. Everly, U.S. Navy, Retired)

The proposed amendment to end the war, sponsored by Senators Hatfield, McGovern and others, has given rise to concern about the vulnerability of our forces during a disengagement from South Vietnam in accord with the amendment. While much of the concern is undoubtedly genuine, much, when expressed by those familiar with military operations, must be regarded as false argument raised for other than military reasons.

To understand this, one must examine the withdrawal rate apart from domestic factors in the U.S. or the residual political situation in South Vietnam. That is, assume the U.S. is solely interested in removing its troops as safely as possible. If viewed strictly in such terms, the systematic *military* withdrawal called for by the McGovern Amendment is by all odds the safest method. In fact, in the absence of a cease fire agreement, a conventional military withdrawal, in which combat and support echelons are withdrawn in the normal sequence as the forces conduct an orderly fall-back centered on a final port of embarkation, is the only sound military method. Such a maneuver is a standard military operation and would be facilitated

by favorable conditions present in South Vietnam, as will be discussed shortly.

Stated in a somewhat overly simplified form, we have three basic options as to the method of our disengagement (again assuming no negotiated cease fire):

1. A standard military withdrawal as called for by the McGovern Amendment.

2. Withdrawal of all combat troops, within a year or two, leaving only support troops (probably between 50,000 and 150,000 men) to supply the South Vietnamese with those services which have brought about the current relatively favorable military balance, and which the ARVN cannot supply itself. These services include such central functions as close air support (by helos and tactical air), artillery support, and airlift. Under this option, the remaining U.S. troops must depend on ARVN combat units for protection against NVA/VC harassment and assaults. Moreover, they would have to stay in South Vietnam, in a state of precarious dependence, for however many years the ARVN took to develop the required skills and experience.

3. Withdrawal of U.S. combat troops down to the minimum level required to protect the U.S. support forces which remain to service the South Vietnamese. Under this option, we would probably have between 150,000 and 250,000 troops in Vietnam for many years to come.

It is difficult to judge whether the current Administration policy is option 2 or 3. Public statements have been vague on the matter of U.S. protective forces remaining with an unspecified number of support forces. In either case, however, the possibilities for disaster are quite high. At best, if ARVN continues to improve and functions moderately efficiently in the years to come, enemy harassment-type attacks could easily keep the U.S. casualty rate above 100 per week for as long as we keep troops there. At worst, if ARVN fails, the U.S. forces will be in a very precarious situation. The vulnerability of the remaining U.S. support and protective troops should be clear when one realizes that in order to perform the previously stated services, they must be distributed among a number of locations, in relatively small units. It is not too difficult to envisage a situation in which the President would be faced with an unhappy choice between a crash evacuation (and a large number of casualties), reintroducing large numbers of U.S. combat units, or employing advanced (read nuclear) weapons.

Thus, if our disengagement is protracted over a number of years, as would be the case under options 2 and 3 (options generated by considerations of a nonmilitary nature such as the composition of the regime in Saigon), we can expect continued, substantial casualties, and conceivably even a military disaster. However, a purely military withdrawal, as demanded by the McGovern Amendment, could take place with very low risk. The principal reasons supporting this assertion follow.

1. The war in South Vietnam is not such that large numbers of opposing forces are locked in fixed positions. Therefore, the initial break-off of contact will not be difficult. Furthermore, U.S. forces can withdraw from their positions without fighting a rearguard action against overwhelming enemy forces, as they had to do in Korea when the Chinese crossed the Yalu. In Vietnam the U.S. force has a degree of mobility unsurpassed in military history. This mobility makes the initial break-off of contact a routine matter.

2. The fall-back and withdrawal could take place with full tactical air support and complete air superiority. The air support would not need to diminish as the force perimeters become small in the final stages. Our heavy bombers are based outside of South Vietnam, carrier based air is available in large quantity, and if needed during final stages, helicopter gun ships can be supported on some of the LPH's (helicopter assault carriers). For the past two years or more, the North Vietnamese forces have not been able to move as large units in South Vietnam, primarily due to U.S. air power and extremely effective, antipersonnel air-to-ground weapons. This factor would not change during the withdrawal. Air power would be overwhelming to the end. Hence, there is no realistic danger of large scale attacks during withdrawal.

3. The rate of disengagement would be under the full control of the U.S. and could be adjusted to allow for orderly re-embarking of whatever equipment and supplies we wanted to remove. Given the full year provided for in the proposed amendment, no major disruption of shipping would be necessary to obtain lift bottoms. The orderly removal of supplies and equipment might require a comparatively long time, but a year would be more than ample.

4. The amendment permits a coordinated fall-back on a final re-embarkation port while maintaining the proper ratio between combat and support forces at all stages of the withdrawal. The success of the operation would not be dependent upon the performance of the South Vietnamese forces. To whatever degree they can and do take over the defense of their country, the operation would, of course be that much simpler. However, their success or failure in taking over the defense would not be a major factor affecting our successful withdrawal.

5. The normal crucial stage of a withdrawal would be the removal of the final echelon of combat troops. In this case, with complete air superiority and floating helicopter platforms, the final stage should present no problem. A 3 brigade covering force of 16,000 men with its artillery could be lifted out by helicopter in only 9 hours.[1] Thus, in this specific situation, there is no crucial final stage.

In summary, if withdrawal is viewed in purely military terms, a systematic, planned military withdrawal is the safest way to disengage. Any other method, however attractive on the basis of political considerations, will impose greater military risks and a number of casualties that would depend on the South Vietnamese performance. Once fully committed to other than a systematic military withdrawal, the U.S. will gradually lose control of the situation. A failure on the part of the South Vietnamese forces could confront the U.S. with the choice between very high casualties or re-entry into the country with a rescue force. A straightforward military withdrawal runs no such risks.

APPENDIX A.—THE U.S. ABILITY TO QUICKLY AND SAFELY WITHDRAW THE COVERING FORCE

This appendix shows that the U.S. can easily and rapidly withdraw the force covering the final withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. Such an operation can be done in a number of different ways, and the circumstances are also subject to much variation. The mode of withdrawal examined here would be appropriate if hostile action were a problem—otherwise simple dockside embarkation would suffice.

A covering force of 3 Brigades, each with 5 Maneuver Battalions and 1 Artillery Battalion, will be assumed. This force, roughly equivalent to a division, consists of almost 16,000 men and includes 54 howitzers, all to be helolifted from the withdrawal area.

A Separate Infantry Brigade consists of 2196 men in headquarters and support units to which infantry or tank battalions are attached.[1] The majority of the supporting units would be withdrawn before the last day. In particular, the Armored Cavalry Troop, the Aviation Company, the Engineer Company, and the Support Battalion are assumed to be gone. This leaves the Brigade Headquarters and Headquarters Company (287 men) and a Battalion of 105 mm towed howitzers (540 men). In addition, a Separate Brigade Medical Company[2] (125 men) is attached. These remaining support units include 962 men and 18 howitzers. From 3 to 5 maneuver battalions are attached to the headquarters and support units to form a brigade. In this case, the maximum of 5 battalions will be assumed. Since each infantry battalion consists of 849 men,[3] the total strength of the Separate Infantry Brigade is 5197 men.

To lift the whole covering force of 3 brigades, then, requires that 15,591 men and 54 howitzers be helolifted.

The U.S. Navy operates 7 "Iwo Jima" Class LPH's (Amphibious Assault Ships), each of which carries 20–24 CH–46 and 4 CH–53 helicopters and can berth 2090 troops.[4]

It will be assumed that 5 of the 7 are made available for the operation. Further assumptions are a complement of 22 CH–46 and 4 CH–53 helicopters and an average helicopter availability of 75%. This results in 17 CH–46's and 3 CH–53's per LPH or a total of 85 CH–46's and 15 CH–53's for all 5 LPH's. The CH–46's and 5 of the CH–53's would carry troops and 10 CH–53's would carry howitzers and other equipment.

Each CH–46A can carry 17 to 25 troops to a combat radius of 115 miles at 150 miles per hour.[5] For this paper, 21 troops per lift will be assumed. The CH–53A carries 38 combat equipped troops; a later modification, the CH–53D carries 64 in a high density arrangement. In this appendix, 38 troops will be assumed per lift. The CH–53 can also carry a 105 mm howitzer in lieu of troops. The CH–54 radius is given as 125 miles; the cruising speed, 170 miles per hour.

Thus, the helicopters from the 5 LPH's can simultaneously lift 1975 troops and 10 howitzers. For a one-way flight distance of about 50 miles, the round-trip flying time—at the slower CH–46 speed—is about 40 minutes. If 20 minutes is allowed for loading and unloading troops, refueling, etc., the helicopters can lift 1975 troops and 10 howitzers per hour.

Thus, in 9 hours (about 3 hours per brigade) the troop-carrying helicopters could lift out 17,775 men, somewhat more than the 15,591 men in the 3-brigade covering force. Similarly the 19 CH–53 helicopters could, in the same 9 hour period, lift the 54 howitzers with 36 sorties to spare.[6]

Are there spaces aboard the ships for this number of troops? The 5 LPH's carry 10,450 troops. These berths would be filled by 498 of the 662 CH–46 trips made during the nine hours.[7] The remaining trips could be made to LPD's. There are 12 LPD's in the fleet, and each of these LPD's could receive at least 45 landings in 9 hours.[8]

Assuming 7 of the LPD's are available, this

---

[1] Data on the Separate Infantry Brigade from TOE 7–100G of 31 August 1966.

[2] TOE 8–147E, in Army Field Manual FM 101–10–2, dated January 1965.

[3] TOE 7–15G for "Infantry Battalion, Separate Infantry Brigade," dated 31 March 1966.

[4] In this appendix, ship data is from *Jane's Fighting Ships 1969–70*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York 1969.

[5] In this appendix, helicopter data is from *Jane's All the World's Aircraft 1969–70*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York 1969.

[6] Actual time to withdraw the covering force is from first lift-off to final lift-off of forces from Vietnamese soil. Thus, only 8 hours are required. On the other hand, some allowance should be made for sequencing waves; thus, the 9-hour estimate.

[7] Based on our assumptions 768 CH–46 trips can be made, but only 662 are needed to carry the troops not lifted by CH–53's.

[8] The LPD's have room for only about one operating helicopter at one time, so spacing helicopter arrivals 12 minutes apart, to give time for offloading, allows 5 arrivals per hour on each LPD, or 45 during 9 hours.

means a total of 315 landings could be made—but only 299 are required after the LPH's are filled. Of these 90 could be CH–53's carrying equipment, leaving 45 CH–53 and 164 CH–46 arrivals with troops. This would mean a total troop delivery of

$(45 \times 38) + (164 \times 21) = 1710 + 3444 = 5154$

The total of 5,154 troops on the LPD's plus 10,450 on the LPH's is 15,604; or just about the number to be lifted. And, the 7 LPD's can accommodate more than the 5154 troops—6180 in fact.

Another alternative would be to include the 2 "Paul Revere" class LPA's in the withdrawal fleet. Each of these ships can carry about 1500 troops. More important, each has a helicopter platform, and in 9 hours the two ships could receive 90 flights delivering over 1800 troops.

Other amphibious ships with helicopter platforms are 4 LST's, 4 LKA's, and 26 LSD's.

The above calculation applies to the removal of the final covering force. Other portions of the force would be taken off in the few preceding days. Table 1, which represents an arbitrary but reasonable assignment of ships, shows that a substantial force can be withdrawn in the last stage. The troops would be embarked over the course of a few days by helicopter, landing craft, and particularly in the case of the LST's, directly from the shore.

Note that all the ships are part of the active amphibious force, or the MSTS fleet. No use has been made of reserve fleet shipping (except for 8 MSTS troop ships, possibly), nor of this country's substantial airlift capability.

TABLE 1.—TROOP LIFT FOR AMPHIBIOUS AND MSTS SHIPS ASSIGNED TO THE WITHDRAWAL OPERATION

Type/class	Troop spaces per ship	Number in fleet	Number assigned to withdrawal	Total troop spaces available
LPH/Iwo Jima	2,090	7	5	10,450
LPD/Austin A	930	3	2	1,860
/Austin B	840	6	5	4,200
/Raleigh A	930	2	0	----------
/Raleigh B	860	1	0	----------
LSD/All	[1] 200	27	5	1,000
LKA/Charleston	300	4	2	600
/Tulare	135	1	0	----------
/Other	[1] 135	10	0	----------
LPA/Paul Revere	[2] 1,500	2	2	3,000
/Haskell	1,560	6	2	3,120
/Bayfield	1,500	2	0	----------
LST/Newport	430	4	2	860
/Suffolk City A	575	5	3	1,725
/Suffolk City B	430	2	1	430
/Terre Bonne Parish	395	14	10	3,950
/Other	147	31	20	2,940
MSTS Troop Ships	----------	([3])	11	25,585 to 36,094
Total	----------	----------	----------	59,720 to 70,229

[1] Estimates, not specified in Jane's.
[2] Jane's, 1968–69.
[3] Of the 11 ships, 3 are being used to shuttle ROK troops between South Korea and South Vietnam The other 8 were in an active but reduced operational status at the beginning of fiscal year 1970, but were scheduled to be in the National Defense Reserve Fleet by the end of fiscal year 1970. They could easily be brought back to a fully active status in 2 or 3 months. The lower estimates for troop spaces is the regular capacity; the higher estimate, emergency.

Source: (1) Department of Defense Appropriations for 1970, pt. 2, Operations and Maintenance, pp. 650 to 654. Hearings, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, Committee on Appropriations, H.R. 91st Cong., 1st sess. GPO, 1969. (2) Military Posture, pt. 1, p. 6904. Hearings, Committee on Armed Services, H.R. 91st, Cong, 2d sess. GPO, 1970.

APPENDIX B—THE AUTHORS

Arthur L. Karp is a graduate of M.I.T. (B.S. physics), New Mexico State College (M.S., mathematics), and has studied at the University of California, Berkeley. He has done research at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, the Hugh Aircraft Corporation, and the White Sands Proving Ground. Since 1956 he has been with the Center for Naval Analyses, where he has directed studies on a number of problems of naval interest. He has also served as systems analyst on the staffs of the Commander Seventh Fleet, Commander Task Force Seventy Seven, Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Commander G. E. Everly, USN (Ret.), served on active duty in the U.S. Navy from February 1941 until September 1965. During World War II, Cdr. Everly served on destroyer duty in the North Atlantic and submarine duty in the Pacific. In the post-war years his sea duties included command tours in both the destroyer and submarine forces. Cdr. Everly holds the Silver Star, Presidential Unit Citation, and Navy Letter of Commendation (with combat "V"), and Submarine Combat Insignia (six successful patrols). In 1965, Cdr. Everly joined the professional staff of the Center for Naval Analyses.

A NEWSPAPER DIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is a sad day when a newspaper dies. It happened last Saturday in Oshkosh, when The Paper for Central Wisconsin announced that it was suspending daily publication and would become a twice-a-week "shopper."

The Paper was a bright experiment, as bright as its generic name. It was begun in 1967—publishing for the first time on October 9 of that year—by the Miles Kimball Co. Mrs. Alberta Kimball, head of the firm that bears her late husband's name, wanted to do something for her community. She wanted to enliven it and make it live up to its potential as one of the fine places in a wonderful State and a wonderful country in which to live. Mrs. Kimball and her vice president, Ted Leyhe, were copublishers of The Paper.

It was a remarkable newspaper—alive, alert to the problems and assets of its community, and at the same time a tribute to the technology of printing. Twice, 2 years in a row, it was cited by the Inland Press Association for the best typography of any offset daily in the country. Twice, 2 years in a row, its women's editor won the Missouri-Penney award for content and makeup. Its photographers, individually, won many national awards.

But, most important, The Paper for Central Wisconsin was a force for good in its community. It pressed for open housing legislation by the Oshkosh Common Council, and that was adopted. It pressed for retention of the council-manager form of government, and the voters retained it. It pressed for bond issues for a needed second high school, and the voters responded in favor of education when the voters in many other jurisdictions were rejecting school bond referendum questions. It pressed for minimum housing legislation for Oshkosh to preserve it, and that, too, was accomplished.

The Paper was a public-spirited publication, dedicated to the betterment of its hometown. It was what every good newspaper should be—locally oriented.

But the times were not right economically for a new newspaper.

Competition is the life of the newspaper business. It can also be its death, as has been demonstrated in Oshkosh.

Nevertheless, newspapermen everywhere are dedicated to competition—for the advertising dollar, but also for the good of the readers. Competition to tell it first and accurately is the hallmark of a good newspaperman. It was remarkable that a city of 50,000 should have two independent newspapers dedicated to competing for the news.

Both kinds of competition are necessary to make a newspaper successful. The end of The Paper for Central Wisconsin as a 6-days-a-week publication is proof that it could not compete for the advertising dollar. In the other area, however, The Paper did compete, and it competed well. It was a noble experiment by a fine lady—Mrs. Kimball.

It is unfortunate that The Paper should die just as another of Mrs. Kimball's ventures, designed for the betterment of Oshkosh, is coming to fruition—Park Plaza.

Park Plaza is a $15 million shopping center. But it is different. Park Plaza is really an example of urban renewal in the private sector, for the Miles Kimball Co., without governmental help, cleared some 18 acres of blighted area in the heart of downtown Oshkosh and revitalized it. A modern, enclosed mall shopping center is nearing completion. It is bound to stimulate Oshkosh and bring more business to all merchants in the downtown area. If Mrs. Kimball wanted only a personal fortune, she would have built a shopping center on the outskirts of the city; she would not have started a morning newspaper.

One of her ventures designed to help Oshkosh has failed, for which the citizens of Oshkosh will become poorer. May she and Oshkosh be more fortunate with the other.

DEVELOPMENT OF AIR FORCE MANNED BOMBER, B–1

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, just recently before this distinguished body, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) provided a most thorough capsulation of how the Armed Services Subcommittee on Research and Development, under his able leadership, reached its conclusion to recommend to the Senate that we proceed with the development of the Air Force's manned bomber, the B–1. Following his astute

presentation, the Senator and I, plus the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), engaged in a rather comprehensive discussion of the B–1 program. I have had time to review this discussion and I would like to take this opportunity to further clarify several points which I feel are critical to the debate on the B–1 program.

First, you will recall my earlier remarks that the B–1 is designed to operate with the KC–135 tanker. At this point in time, I think this is a premise well known and accepted. What might not be as well appreciated is that as a normal course of action the Air Force continuously conducts studies as to the necessity and feasibility of replacement aircraft, be they tankers, fighters, bombers—whatever. Such studies necessarily involve the generation of cost and performance estimates for new systems in comparison with estimates for continuing or modifying existing systems. It was in this context that the Air Force prepared cost estimates for a replacement tanker. These were feasibility studies, not proposals.

I think it is important to realize that the Air Force employs aerial refueling in nearly every aspect of flying one might consider. Every day fuel is being transferred in the air from Air Force tankers to fighters, bombers, interceptors, transports, and even to helicopters. Not only do they serve as airborne service stations for the Air Force, but they refuel Navy combat aircraft as well. My point here is that the overall requirements for the tanker fleet are based upon much broader considerations than just those of the strategic bomber force. In the future, with due consideration of all pertinent factors, I certainly would imagine that the Air Force may well propose to procure new tanker aircraft as additions to or replacements for the current tanker force. But, I hasten to add that the Air Force has continuously and consistently planned the B–1 on the premise that it would be supported by the KC–135 tanker. The original performance specifications and all subsequent analyses have been worked on that assumption.

Next, I would like to discuss the B–1 strategic and tactical application. Before pursuing this further, let me clarify how the terms are normally used. Strategic air power is often considered synonymous with the use of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, tactical air power seems to imply the use of only conventional weapons. Neither implication is entirely correct. Strategic air operation deals with destroying enemy targets which primarily support their warmaking potential. Normally these are the heavy industries and command and control centers located deep in his homeland. The use of strategic air power was aptly demonstrated by our B–17 and B–24 raids against Germany in World War II. These raids were conducted entirely with conventional ordnance, however, in the future we could use nuclear weapons. Tactical air operations, as it applies to bombers, normally includes interdicting routes of supply and enemy massing areas. The ordnance carried may well be conventional as it is today by the B–52's in Southeast Asia. However, if the military political situation dictated and the President so directed, it could very well be nuclear.

How does all this affect the B–1?

As we all know, the primary purpose of our bomber and missile forces is to underwrite our strategy of nuclear deterrence with the unmistakable capability to inflict unacceptable levels of damage on any potential enemy. This is unequivocally the primary mission of the B–1. Granted that the B–1 will possess significant capabilities to deliver conventional weapons, however, these capabilities are inherent in the B–1 and provided on virtually a cost-free basis. The fact remains that the request for funds to develop the B–1 is based on the need for a manned strategic nuclear bomber for use during the 1980's. The capabilities of the aircraft to perform in either a strategic or tactical mission using conventional weapons are merely an added contribution to our ability to deter that level of warfare.

Now I wish to comment on what at first examination may to some persons look like an unwarranted luxury; that is, the supersonic capability of the B–1. Let me preface my comments on this subject by restating my belief, that trite as it may seem during these trying days of tight money and mounting domestic concerns, we must be certain that the taxpayer is receiving maximum defense for his dollar. However, I think that we, the Congress, may be going a bit far when we attempt to tailor weapon systems for the military to such an extent that we in effect dictate or limit the combat operational tactics. Those who believe that the B–1 should be only a subsonic capable aircraft may not be considering the total impact which speed can have on operational tactics.

I think that it is especially significant that the Air Force has proposed supersonic speed for the B–1 and limited it to high altitude only. This demonstrates to me that they have studied the B–1 speed requirements very thoroughly, as evidenced by their admission of their inability to justify in terms of incremental gain and added cost the requirement for supersonic speed at low altitude. In my opinion, the basic need for a supersonic capability at high altitude can be explained very easily. High speed is a very effective means for reducing the effectiveness of interceptor defenses. More simply, it means that you are within detection range a much lesser period of time and if detected are vulnerable to attack for a shorter period of time. Said another way, a supersonic B–1 permits enemy interceptors fewer attacks, whereas slower aircraft such as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota flew in World War II were subjected to repeated attacks by interceptors and ground to air defensive weapons.

Another consideration is that low altitude penetration, though it looks more favorable than high altitude penetration for the foreseeable future, might conceivably become less desirable. For example, since the Soviets are building surface to air missile and interceptor forces with improved low altitude capabilities, only time will tell the extent of their ultimate threat. It is conceivable that this growing low altitude defensive capability might require the penetrating bomber to utilize to a greater degree the presently higher risk high altitude penetration. It is important to realize, however, that supersonic speed will lessen that risk. Furthermore, coupled with the B–1's smaller radar image, reduced infrared emission and improved electronic counter measures, all of which degrade the effectiveness of ground launched and air to air defensive missiles, the high altitude penetration probability of success will be significantly enhanced.

In the final analysis, the capability of supersonic speed at high altitude provides our bomber force with the widest range of options. If the character of the Soviet defenses changes in the future, we will still have the flexibility to counter these changes with revised tactics. It is this flexibility that we should demand, not condemn, when we are considering the development of a bomber capable of providing a vital keystone in the strategic deterrence posture of our country through this perilous century.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE CALLS FOR SPEEDY TRIALS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the other morning in St. Louis, the Chief Justice of the United States addressed the American Bar Association. His address was noteworthy for a number of reasons. It was the first time the Chief Justice had ever given what he calls a state of the judiciary message to the country. Second, it was noteworthy because the Chief Justice's speech was carried live by the radio and television, and was an address to the Nation, and not only to the legal profession.

Noteworthy as are these two aspects of his address, the Chief Justice's message was far more important for its content than for its precedents. The Chief Justice warned the country that the court system was in danger of breaking down. Indeed, more than that. In some parts of the country—and one would have to include Washington, D.C.—we have to recognize that the court system has broken down. Surely, if the test is: Justice, fairly and speedily rendered, no one would contend that that is the case in this city, nor in most of the larger cities of the country.

The Chief Justice has no panaceas to offer to correct the deplorable state of our judicial system. No panaceas are possible when, as he said, the warning was given 64 years ago, in an address by Roscoe Pound, and not yet heeded. But if there are no quick and cheap cures for the progressive decrepitude that besets our courts, there are a number of slow, expensive treatments we can apply to start them back on the road to recovery.

One of the major points in the speech dealt with delays in criminal trials. The Chief Justice mentioned two legislative reforms in which I have been interested for many years. One is the Criminal Justice Act of 1964, which provided Government paid lawyers free to any criminal defendant who could not afford to

pay for his own. This reform did not confer the right to counsel on criminal defendants. It merely fulfilled the constitutional obligation that every man have the assistance of counsel during trial. The other reform is the much maligned, little understood Bail Reform Act. The Bail Reform Act did not revolutionize bail practices. It merely made effective a right of pretrial freedom which had been abridged and denied many citizens over the years on the simple ground of poverty.

I do not agree with an assessment which suggests that the delays in our criminal courts can be attributed to the passage of these two laws. But whatever the cause, the fact still remains that justice in our criminal system is an uncertain, cumbersome thing. The Chief Justice put it well when he said:

> There is a widespread public complaint reflected in the news media, in editorials and letters to the editor, that the present system of criminal justice does not deter criminal conduct. That is correct, so far as the crimes which trouble most Americans today. Whatever deterrent effect may have existed in the past has now virtually vanished as to such crimes.
>
> If ever the law is to have genuine deterrent effect on the criminal conduct giving us immediate concern, we must make some drastic changes. The most simple and the most obvious remedy is to give the courts the manpower and tools—including the prosecutors and defense lawyers—to try criminal cases within 60 days after indictment and let us see what happens. I predict it would sharply reduce the crime rate.

I agree fully with what he said. For many months I have tried to convince Congress that expedients such as preventive detention were no answer to the problem of ineffective criminal justice. I have tried to convince the Congress that speedy trial and speedy punishment, and then effective rehabilitation—these are the ways that criminal conduct can be deterred and then corrected. Congress has chosen to enact preventive detention. Thus far, it has shown little predilection to move to assure speedy trials.

I have introduced a bill, S. 3936, cosponsored by 22 Senators, which I believe has the potential for being an effective device toward achieving criminal trials within 60 days of indictment. Quite simply it requires each Federal district court to prepare a plan which will enable it to meet the 60-day deadline. After a certain period of time, 60-day trials will become mandatory. If the Federal court has insufficient resources to meet the 60-day goal, then it must ask for a dispensation from the Judicial Conference. But in doing so, it must present the Conference with a plan and a request for additional resources which will enable that court to meet the legislative goal. That plan and its accompanying requests will be forwarded to Congress. Then the burden will be on this body to provide the resources necessary to carry out the legislative objective of the act.

Many persons have always been skeptical of any legislative obligation of 60-day trials. I include myself in that category, as well. But I believe that this approach has certain benefits which may point the way to a solution. In the past, there have not been 60-day trials because the judges have been under no obligation to meet such a deadline. Thus, there has been no pressure for them to tighten their procedures, or to impose strict rules upon themselves and the lawyers who practice before them. When delays have occurred, the tendency has been to point the finger at Congress and blame its refusal to authorize more judges. Congress, for its part, has seen little interest on the part of the courts to use their resources efficiently to modernize their workings, or to show a real concern for speedy justice.

Thus far, in other words, both Congress and the courts have been able to avoid carrying out their responsibilities simply by pointing the finger of blame at each other. I believe that the speedy trial bill can break this vicious circle. It provides, first, the incentive to speedy trials which has been lacking. The incentive quite simply is a legislative imposed obligation of trials within 60 days. Second, it requires the courts themselves to develop on their own initiative the plans and procedures which will satisfy the legislative obligation. Finally, if the court has insufficient means to meet the legislative goal, it must then present Congress with a carefully thought-out plan which will enable the court to meet its obligation. Congress then will have before it a clear choice: Are we willing to provide the resources which are necessary, or are we going to accept second-class justice? I believe that S. 3936 will get us off the circle of finger-pointing between the two branches.

I am pleased that the Chief Justice has taken this opportunity to address the country on the needs of the courts. I hope that his remarks will produce a renewed willingness on the part of the bar and of Congress, and the courts, to address themselves to the needs of justice in the 20th century.

I believe one place to start would be to enact a speedy-trial bill. But there is much else that should be done, and I urge all concerned to heed the Chief Justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the speech by the Chief Justice, as it appeared in the New York Times on August 11, 1970, be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "The Chief Justice's Plea" published in the Winston-Salem Journal of August 12 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM BURGER'S TALK

ST. LOUIS, August 10.—Following are excerpts from an address by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger today before the opening assembly of the American Bar Association convention:

When President Segal and the board of governors of this association invited me to discuss the problems of the Federal courts with you, as leaders of the legal profession, my mind turned at once to one of the great statements on the problems of the administration of justice.

That was Dean Roscoe Pound's famous speech to this association at your meeting 64 years ago. He said then that the work of the courts in the 20th century could not be carried on with the methods and machinery of the 19th century.

If you will read Pound's speech, you will see at once that we did not heed his warning, and today, in the final third of this century, we are still trying to operate the courts with fundamentally the same basic methods, procedures and machine he said were not good enough in 1906.

In the supermarket age we are like a merchant trying to operate a cracker barrel corner grocery store with the methods and equipment of 1900.

The changes and improvements we need are long overdue. They will call for a very great effort and they may cost money; but if there are to be higher costs they will still be a small fraction, for example, of the $200-million cost of a C-57. The entire cost of the Federal judicial system is $128-million. Military aircraft are obviously essential in this uncertain world, but surely adequate support for the judicial branch is also important.

MODERN TECHNIQUES NEEDED

More money and more judges alone is not the real solution. Some of what is wrong is due to the failure to apply the techniques of modern business to the administration or management of the purely mechanical operation of the courts—of modern record-keeping, systems planning for handling the movement of cases. Some is also due to antiquated, rigid procedures which not only permit delay but often encourage it.

In the Federal courts today the problem areas are essentially in large cities. Here we find in the judicial system no more than a reflection of the complexities created by the population shift to large urban centers. The problems exist where the action is.

How did this situation come about in the face of numerous additional judgeships added by Congress in the past 30 years?

We can see three key factors that are important to our discussion:

First, the legal profession—lawyers and judges and Congress, with few exceptions—did not act on Dean Pound's warnings to bring methods, machinery and personnel up to date.

Second, all the problems he warned about have become far more serious by the increase in population from 76 million in 1900 to 200 million in 1970, and with it came the growth of great cities and the increase in the volume of cases.

Third, entirely new kinds of cases have been added because of new laws passed by Congress and decisions of the courts.

From time to time Congress adds more judges, but the total judicial organization never quite keeps up with the caseload. Two recent statutes alone added thousands of cases relating to commitment of narcotics addicts and the mentally ill. These additions came when civil rights cases, voting cases and prisoner petitions were expanding by the thousands.

Meanwhile, criminal cases, once a stable figure in the Federal courts, were increasing. The records shows that in all Federal district courts it now takes twice as long as it did 10 years ago to dispose of criminal cases from indictment to sentence.

But the increase in volume of cases is not by any means the whole story. Experienced trial judges note that the actual trial of a criminal case now takes twice as long as it did 10 years ago because of the closer scrutiny we now demand as to such things as confessions, identification witnesses, and evidence seized by the police, before depriving any person of his freedom. These changes represent a deliberate commitment—some by judicial decision and some by legislation—to values higher than pure efficiency when we are dealing with human liberty.

YARDSTICK GETTING AGED

It is an elementary fact, historically and statistically, that the system of courts—the number of judges, prosecutors, and of courtrooms—has been based on the premise that approximately 90 per cent of all defendants will plead guilty, leaving only 10 per cent, more or less, to be tried. But that premise may no longer be a reliable yardstick of our needs.

Changes in the laws that are part of what we lawyers call the "revolution in criminal justice," which began as far back as the 1930's, have brought this about. Anyone who questions these changes must recognize that until recently criminal law was the neglected stepchild of the law.

The consequence of what might seem on its fact a small percentage change in the rate of guilty pleas can be tremendous. A reduction from 90 per cent to 80 per cent in guilty pleas requires the assignment of twice the judicial manpower and facilities—judges, court reporters, bailiffs, clerks, jurors and courtrooms. A reduction to 70 per cent trebles this demand.

There is a widespread public complaint reflected in the news media, in editorials and letters to the editor, that the present system of criminal justice does not deter criminal conduct. That is correct, so far as the crimes which trouble most Americans today. Whatever deterrent effect may have existed in the past has now virtually vanished as to such crimes.

If ever the law is to have genuine deterrent effect on the criminal conduct giving us immediate concern, we must make some drastic changes. The most simple and the most obvious remedy is to give the courts the manpower and tools—including the prosecutors and defense lawyers—to try criminal cases within 60 days after indictment and let us see what happens. I predict it would sharply reduce the crime rate.

The price we are now paying and will pay is partly because judges have been too timid and the bar has been too apathetic to make clear to the public and the Congress the needs of the courts. Apathy, more than opposition, has been the enemy, but I believe the days of apathy are past.

As to the future I can do no more than emphasize that the Federal court system is for a limited purpose and lawyers, the Congress and the public must examine carefully each demand they make on that system. People speak glibly of putting all the problems of pollution, of crowded cities, of consumer class actions and others in the Federal courts. We should look more to state courts familiar with local conditions and local problems.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Let me list some major steps for the future—steps to begin at once:

(1) The friction in relations between state and Federal courts presents serious problems in both the review of state prisoner petitions and other cases. I strongly urge that in each state there be created a state-Federal judicial council to maintain continuing communication on all joint problems. Such a body could properly include a member of the highest state court, the chief judges of the larger state trial courts and the chief judges of the Federal district courts. In some states such bodies have already been created on an informal basis.

(2) State and Federal judges should continue their cooperation with the appropriate committees of the American Bar Association to establish standards of conduct of lawyers and judges that will uphold public confidence in the integrity of the system we serve.

(3) We should urgently consider a recommendation to Congress to create a judiciary council consisting of perhaps six members, one-third appointed by each of the three branches of government, to act as a coordinating body whose function it would be to report to the Congress, the President and the Judicial Conference on a wide range of matters affecting the judicial branch. This council could:

A. Report to Congress the impact of proposed legislation likely to enlarge Federal jurisdiction.

B. Analyze and report to Congress on studies made by the Judicial Conference and the Federal Judicial Center as to increase or decrease in caseloads of particular Federal districts.

C. Study existing jurisdiction of Federal courts with special attention to proper allocation of judicial functions as between state and Federal courts.

D. Develop and submit to Congress a proposal for creating temporary judgeships to meet urgent needs as they arise (some state legislatures authorize such appointments based on a formula of population and caseloads in order to adjust promptly to population changes in rapidly developing areas.

E. Study whether there is a present need for three-judge district (trial) courts and whether there is a present need for Federal courts to try automobile collision cases simply because of the coincidence that one driver, for example, lives in Kansas City, Kans. and the other in Kansas City, Mo.

(4) The entire structure of the administration of bankruptcy and receivership matters should be studied to evaluate whether they could be more efficiently administered in some other way. (Pending studies on this problem should be pressed to conclusion.)

(5) Over the years various statutes and decisions of courts have altered many aspects of criminal procedure. Meanwhile, some of the states have experimented with innovations and have developed new procedures to improve justice. Since Congress is now considering an entirely new Federal criminal code, we should soon undertake a comprehensive re-examination of the structure of criminal procedure to establish adequate guidelines reflecting adjustment both to the new code and judicial holdings.

(6) The system of criminal justice must be viewed as a process embracing every phase from crime prevention through the correctional system. We can no longer limit our responsibility to providing defense services for the judicial process, yet continue to be miserly with the needs of correctional institutions and probations and parole services.

(7) The whole process of appeals must be re-examined. It is cumbersome and costly and it encourages delay. Some courts, notably the overworked Fifth Circuit, have developed procedures to screen out frivolous appeals. Finality at some point is indispensable to any rational—and workable—judicial system.

(8) We made a wise choice in guaranteeing a lawyer in every serious criminal case but we must now make certain that lawyers are adequately trained so that the representation is on a high professional basis. It is professional representation we promise to give—nothing more—and within accepted standards of conduct. This association has now provided lawyers for the first time with comprehensive and authoritative standards and it is now up to the courts and the bar to make sure they are followed.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE'S PLEA

What we know of Chief Justice Warren Burger's judicial philosophy seems modest when compared with what we know of his opinions on how to run a courtroom.

True to his word on taking office, the chief justice has spent much of his off-bench time seeking support for his ideas on reforming the courts. In his most significant effort to date, he appeared this week before the American Bar Association to plead for reforms that would transform the federal judiciary from top to bottom and at the same time allow the state courts to play a more active role in the judicial process.

Not least among his recommendations was a proposal to bring every criminal suspect to trial within 60 days of his indictment. Sen. Sam Ervin is seeking the same thing in a bill now before Congress. To those familiar with the delays and frustrations of American courtroom procedure this may seem a wholly unrealistic idea.

But is it?

Though no provision of the Constitution is more widely ignored than the right to "a speedy and public trial," this guarantee is at the heart of Anglo-Saxon law.

And in Chief Justice Burger's eyes it has a practical as well as moral justification. What better way to reduce the rising crime rate than to make certain that defendants are brought to trial on time? By bringing a halt to unnecessary trial delays, we would eliminate the need for the unwelcome and probably unconstitutional "preventive detention" measure recently enacted by Congress as part of the District of Columbia crime bill.

It is true, as the chief justice says, that "the public may well be called upon to pay something more for the federal judicial system to increase its productivity."

The courts are undermanned, and courtroom space itself is lacking; but money alone is not the answer. We will not solve the problem of delay and confusion simply by hiring more lawyers, prosecutors and judges—not as long as the courts are in the habit of putting off cases at the slightest urging.

What Chief Justice Burger says must be taken as a piece with what he has said previously on the subject. His concerns do not stop with courtroom procedures, however. He seems thoroughly committed to the idea of reforming our penal institutions so that a convicted man will not come out of confinement more embittered against society than when he went in. This, in fact, was a central preoccupation of his before he became chief justice.

The sooner we put our faith in remedies of the sort he has recommended, rather than in the kind of repressive measures proposed by the administration, the safer our streets and playgrounds will become.

AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as the debate on an all-volunteer armed force draws nearer, I think it only prudent to study this question from a number of perspectives. Because hearings which were to have been held in the Senate Committee on Armed Services on this subject have been postponed, many individuals who had hoped to testify have not had the opportunity to be heard on this vital issue. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the statements by the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., bishop coadjutor of the Episcopal Diocese of New York—Bishop John Wesley Lord, Bishop of the United Methodist Church, Washington area—Arlo Tatum, national secretary of the CCCO—Gerard B. Noonan, chairman, Dubuque, Iowa, county selective service board 13–31—George Wald, Higgins professor of biology, Harvard—Robert E. Jones, executive director, joint Washington office for social concern, representing the American Ethical Union, American Humanist Association and Unitarian Universalist Association—and the Reverend Rodney Shaw, representing the board of Christian social concerns of the United

Methodist Church—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT REPEAL NOW

TESTIMONY IN BEHALF OF THE HATFIELD AMENDMENT TO THE MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACT OF 1970

I am the Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., Bishop Coadjutor of the Episcopal Diocese of New York, 1047 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, New York.

I served in the United States Marine Corps for four and one half years during World War II as a rifle platoon leader in combat in the Tulagi-Guadalcanal operation, where I was wounded, and later served on the Division Staff of the Third Marine Division, and also as Battalion Operations Officer and Company Commander. I attended the Marine Command and Staff School at Quantico. For the last three years I have been increasingly disturbed by the impact the Vietnam War is having upon our country and increasingly dubious about its validity. I have counselled many young men who are facing the draft.

I feel it is appropriate for a Churchman to present testimony at this hearing, because the Church has traditionally served as an institution responsible for preserving the ethical and human values of our society.

Christian (and Jewish) teaching, from the earliest times, has questioned the right to kill another human being. Because of the openness of the Church to all men, soldiers have never been excluded from the Church, and war has been tolerated as part of the sinful fabric of our society. Nonetheless, even when the Church has encouraged particular wars, there has never been a question as to the right of a person to refuse to fight for conscience's sake. The draft, in coercing persons to join the army, trespasses against this right. Nor does the presence of the Conscientious Objector section of present legislation protect this right, for the following reasons: The judgment as to the sincerity of the petitioner is made by a less than qualified board in most instances; the system is irregular, so that young men in different communities are subject to different standards; the sincerity of a citizen in a democracy should not be subject to the judgment of the state, no matter how impartial the judicial process; becoming a C.O. prejudices the future employment of the individual in our present society; and finally, the poor and uneducated do not have equal access to draft counselling, which works a hardship upon them.

For those who are drafted and who are sent into a battle situation, and indeed for anyone who participates in the military life, I have an even deeper concern. Having experienced the horrors of war myself, I am convinced that the exposure to this life does deep damage to the human spirit. It is bad enough to force a man to give his life involuntarily. It is even more evil that a man should be forced to take the life of another.

Military training has as one of its goals the brutalization of the human spirit so that the taking of human life becomes natural or even seems good. I have known that process within myself. I have calmly shot at another human being without the slightest twinge of conscience. Thus the so-called Mylai massacre did not surprise me. In my pastoral work I have frequently seen the scars of war distorting a life as much as twenty-five years later, and affecting the lives of other human beings, such as family members, who live in close association with the veteran. It took me many years to regain my own sensitivity after the war was over. I have seen sensitive young men go mad at the sight of human bodies bloated by the tropic sun; and well they might.

This process of brutalization not only affects the lives of individuals and their families, but also takes a deep toll on the life of our nation. It dulls compassion, encourages brutal behavior, and elevates violence to a virtue.

I also have a pastoral concern for the young people of our land, because of the effect the draft is having upon their spirit. Many of them have progressed in their thinking to the point where war is seen as an unmitigated evil, often perpetrated for unworthy cause, whatever the rhetoric used to rationalize. Because the draft forces upon them a way of life they totally reject, they are losing faith not only in our country's use of military power, but also in all those institutions of government which our culture has carefully built up over the years and without which, I believe, we cannot live as a free people. As one who loves our country and reveres our flag, I shudder at the lack of respect shown by many young people, but at the same time understand their feelings that much of our national life is hypocritical and works against the very values which we pretend to be protecting. The major symbol of this, the part of our system which touches the young most immediately is, of course, the draft and the seemingly useless and evil war which it forces them to support.

I feel that if a war does not have enough popular support to elicit a voluntary army, that it is undoubtedly unjustified. To draft a man to fight in a war which his own representatives have not declared is a further indignity. I also feel that if it is decided by Congress that our nation needs an army of a particular size, we should be willing to offer sufficient pay and benefits to compete for men's services on the open market.

I also reject the concept of universal service with the option to chose non-military service as a sop to the military draft. I feel it is dangerous to submit every young man to the control of the government for two years of his youth.

Enclosed is a statement against the draft passed by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church in the Fall of 1969.

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

SEPTEMBER 4, 1969.

Whereas, the Selective Service System, however necessary it might be in times of unlimited national emergency, deprives persons of their personal freedom, tends to lead us as a people to an increasing dependence on war and violence as a means for solving international problems and seriously undermines the morale of many of our youth; and

Whereas, the President of the United States on May 13, 1969, called for draft reforms "that will eliminate conscription as soon as feasible"; therefore be it

Resolved, the House of Deputies concurring, that this Special General Convention II calls upon the Congress to enact legislation to end the draft at the earliest possible moment.

POSITION FAVORING A VOLUNTEER MILITARY AND IN SUPPORT OF THE GATES COMMISSION REPORT

(By Bishop John Wesley Lord)

AUGUST 10, 1970.

In 1940 the Congress of the United States and the American people reluctantly accepted military conscription as a temporary measure to meet a drastic international emergency. At that time it was recognized that the draft constituted a serious curtailment of personal freedom and human rights and now in permanent form has been linked with the course of militarism in many nations.

It seems incredible that during the intervening years this great democracy has accepted this un-American and harmful influence to exist within the nation. We have lived with the draft so long, President Nixon has pointed out, that too many of us accept it as normal and necessary. The evils and inequities of the draft do not have to be recounted but its repeal would be the first step to regain control of our runaway military establishment. The two most serious consequences of the Selective Service System reside in its ruthless disregard for the rights and moral principles of our young men of draft age and its blank check authorization to the White House and to the Pentagon to prosecute the war they may choose. It is an evidence of spiritual erosion within the nation.

Our first President, George Washington, recognized in his Farewell Address to the people of the United States that "reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles;" and that the permanent felicity of any nation is not only related to its virtues but is "rendered impossible by its vices."

Many religious leaders and church bodies have noted from time to time that military conscription in the United States is linked to the vast growth of the military establishment and have urged that a voluntary system be substituted. They have also noted that the present draft permits the President to expand armed forces and to intervene overseas without effective congressional control or restraint. It is not in the American tradition to place this grave responsibility upon our President.

Most Americans think that the draft is simply a device by which men are forced into the army. This would be bad enough but there is more to it. Actually the draft has been used as a device to force young men into jobs or studies they would not otherwise have chosen. In the words of General Hershey, one time Director of Selective Service, the major purpose of the draft is not alone the "delivery of manpower for induction. . . . It is in dealing with the other millions of registrants that the System is heavily occupied developing more effective human beings in the national interest." Who is to determine what is in the national interest? "The problem," he says, "is how to control more effectively the service of individuals who are not in the armed forces. . . . There isn't anything that can't be solved now by having an individual pursue the things you want him to pursue and then use him. . . ." He illustrated his point by showing how he had forced upward the number of persons with engineering degrees from 27,000 annually in the 1950's to 48,000 annually by 1963–64. Might not this very fact threaten the free enterprise system of our land and lay the groundwork for an authoritarian society in still other ways? Has the "climate" in which men now live and move and have their being, been determined in part by such maneuvering and manipulation by draft boards under the Selective Service System? It is not pleasant for the writer to admit that there are men in our seminaries today who are there to secure military deferment from military service but who are not qualified for the Christian ministry. The church will suffer through such ministry and because of those whose motivations are suspect.

General Hershey writes, "The deferment is that carrot that we have used to try to get individuals into occupations and professions that are said by those in charge of government to be the necessary ones." Here is one carrot the nation can do without.

For these and other considerations, I support the report of the President's Commission On An All Volunteer Armed Force, now known *as* the Gates Commission Report. It comes with force and clarity and "with healing in its wings." It is the greatest national "antipollutant" measure yet received and, if

accepted, will remove much of the moral turpitude of our nation.

It calls for the abolition of the whole Selective Service System no later than July 1, 1971. In summary, the following recommendations should commend themselves to every thoughtful and patriotic American:

1. That voluntarism is preferable in our society to compulsion.

2. That a volunteer army will cause only a small budget increase, and will actually be cheaper in real economic terms than the draft.

3. That the all-volunteer force can be achieved by July 1, 1971 and that the draft can and should be ended then.

4. That a volunteer force is adequate to defend the nation, and that a peace time draft is not required to protect the nation in case of sudden attack.

5. That a stand-by draft should be minimal, and should be reactivated only by a joint resolution of Congress upon recommendation of the President. This is a vital provision and will prove to be the most controversial.

6. That an end of the draft will terminate the practice of "channeling" which provides the military and government with powers bordering on those of a dictatorship.

7. That a volunteer military would not vary in makeup from the present mixed system, particularly with regard to the number of Negroes serving and the economic profile.

STATEMENT ON THE DRAFT

(By Arlo Tatum)

AUGUST 11, 1970.

For eight years now I have headed up CCCO, An Agency for Military and Draft Counseling, founded in 1948 as the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors. CCCO is a political, non-sectarian, and non-profit. Its three offices tie in with a few thousand draft and military counselors and draft information centers across the country, most of which use CCCO's technical memos, *Handbook for Conscientious Objectors* and *Advice to Conscientious Objectors in the Armed Forces*. About 400 attorneys cooperate with CCCO and its General Counsel, Marvin Karpatkin.

I have been and am highly critical of the draft system, which simply cannot function the way Congress intended. The explanation is simple enough; part-time volunteer board members cannot go through each man's file before making a decision. In metropolitan areas this would be a physical impossibility. One local board member told me he doubted it could be done even if they worked full-time.

As we know from court cases and Senate hearings, the same situation prevails at many state appeal boards and the Presidential appeal level. We therefore find ourselves in the extraordinary situation where a registrant can go through the entire appeal process without his file having been even opened by anyone with the legal and moral responsibility of classifying him. These part-time volunteers rely on the résumés or advice of professionals, which at best is a procedure of questionable legality.

But this should not be taken as a criticism of either the volunteers or their over-burdened secretaries and clerks. I think on the whole State Selective Service Directors and National Selective Service Headquarters honestly try to see that each registrant ends up with the proper classification, by whatever means. But surely this World War II relic is not something which should be preserved, even on a stand-by basis.

Reforms are good and fine persons in positions of responsibility are good, but neither can make the draft "good." There is no way to make provision for all genuine conscientious objectors, excluding those whose objection to military service does not spring from conscience. There is no way to establish objective criteria for "extreme hardship to dependents" deferments. To me these are not theoretical statements but are based on day-to-day experience.

I like President Nixon's phasing out of certain deferments and his desire to eliminate deferments for study. All deferments and exemptions should be eliminated if the draft continues, including the IV–B exemption for young Congressmen who vote to continue drafting others. Deferments and exemptions, like any lottery system, are designed to conceal the massive excess of manpower available—for this available manpower is the clearest indication that a draft is unnecessary.

Why preserve an institution which is so devisive in its social and political impact? Intrinsically, the draft favors those in our society already at an advantage and takes advantage of those already in difficulty. If all deferments and exemptions were ended, the military would still need to have standards for rejecting draftees. Who do you think would come to a pre-induction physical armed with letters from medical specialists and psychiatrists? The same young men whose parents are now paying their way through college. This is not a criticism of the middle class of which I am a part, but of a system which by its nature adds to the burdens of those young men who are already disadvantaged in this most competitive of societies.

In fact, the draft worsens every serious problem we have as a society seeking to be democratic. Have you considered the possibility that conscription is an institutionalization of the hostility we middle aged people feel toward the young? Whether a young man goes into the army or into prison, he will at least get the haircut which means so much to us. There is no solution to the generation gap so long as we compel young men to bend to our collective will. There is no solution to our racial problems, no solution to our urban/rural problems, no solution to our economic problems, no solution to the problem of violent, destructive dissent, until we end the draft.

To me the most discouraging proposed substitute for military conscription is the National Service concept. While it must be acknowledged that Hitler eliminated slums in Nazi Germany by this method, it would move us in a direction very few of us want to go. Let us recognize that "compulsory service" is self-contradictory. Voluntary service is true service. Compulsory service has another, more appropriate name in the 13th Amendment of our Constitution—"involuntary servitude".

There are pressing reasons to restore the traditional concept of what was once the American ideal of a citizen's relationship to his government: that the sole legitimate function of government is to serve its citizens; the role of citizens is to oblige the government to fulfill that function.

Involuntary servitude, even for purposes we might all endorse, has no place in the United States of America. The draft must be ended before the society wounds it is aggravating are beyond cure.

POSITION FAVORING A VOLUNTEER MILITARY

(By Gerard B. Noonan)

My interest in the Draft and Selective Service Procedures goes back over the past ten years. I am Registrar of a College of 1300 male students located in Dubuque, Iowa and became a member of the County Board with a special concern with problems of student deferments. I have been a member of this Board for six years, and am now the senior member in time of service and have been elected Chairman for the past three years. I have also participated in two panel sessions (National Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) with various State Directors and Washington officials over matters concerned with Selective Service. Although my first concerns were mainly problems regarding student deferments, I have gained a great deal of insight into the problems regarding all types of deferments and various selective procedures. I have missed one meeting of the Dubuque County Selective Board since my appointment six years ago, and believe that unless one has sat in this situation and attempted to make the decisions called for, you cannot understand the personal frustrations caused by such an event. You might ask: Why remain a part of a system you feel cannot work? I answer that according to my philosophy of life, one works for change as a part of the system rather than attempting reform through other more devious methods. I believe in change through legislative action and as such, present this testimony on behalf of a Volunteer Military.

REASONS

1. We should not attempt to run a system, that even if deemed necessary, cannot possibly function efficiently under its present procedures and standards. The document "Who Serves When Not All Serve?" National Advisory Commission On Selective Service points up some of the serious problems within the present system. Problems that I consider so great that it is not possible to have any type of a draft when needs for personnel are low, and a large number of deferments are issued by all Boards. We should just for a minute consider the following points taken from the publication: "Who Serves When Not All Serve."

a. The state of Alabama with 275 Draft Board members and thirty percent of the state's population Black and not one Black Draft Board member.

b. The state of Mississippi with forty-two percent of its state population Black with not one Black Draft Board member.

c. My own state of Iowa with large Black communities in Des Moines, Sioux City and Waterloo and not one Black Draft Board member.

d. The average age of Draft Board members at this time was 58. One-fifth of all board members were over 70, and of these, 400 were over 80 with 12 between 90–99. People at this age level are being asked to communicate with, have discussions with, and make decisions for 19–20–21 year old Americans.

e. The many different procedures as conducted from Board to Board and State to State as pointed out within this document.

The message from The President of The United States: 90th Congress First Session: House of Representatives: Document No. 75 which promoted the above study contained the following statements:

"We cannot lightly discard an institution with so valuable a record of effectiveness and integrity."

"Neither can we afford to preserve it, if we find that in practice it cannot adapt to the new controlling concept of equal and uniform treatment."

2. The Gates Commission states: Reform the inequity in the pay of first-term servicemen. Promote the efficiency and dignity of the armed forces by better training and recruiting. Allow every American man to determine his own life in accord with his own values.

If I did not feel that a volunteer force was adequate to defend the nation, I would not be in favor of such a program but as pointed out in the Gates Commission report, the improved incentives and training for the Ready Reserves are far more important in case of emergency than application of conscription. This Commission also points out that a voluntary military can be created, without great additional cost, without creating new internal threats or political or social problems, or without endangering external defense.

3. The Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement: Report to the Committee on Armed Services House of Representatives Ninetieth Congress First Session, February 28, 1967 makes the following statement regarding a Completely Voluntary Military Establishment:

"That the concern of attempting to satisfy all future military manpower requirements with volunteers attracted by massive increases in compensation be rejected as an alternative to the draft."

This Commission puts forth its only objection on financial grounds but page 29 of the Gates Commission report states "When the hidden costs of conscription are fully recognized, the cost of an all-volunteer armed force is unquestionably less than the cost of a force of equal size and quality manned wholly or partly through conscription."

We should also call to mind that the Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower also recommended the following regarding the Lottery System: "The Panel is firmly of the opinion that re-adoption of a lottery would be unwise and retrogressive." Almost everyone connected with Selective Service would agree that while the Lottery has failed to eliminate most of the problems of Selective Service it is an improvement in order to selection.

4. I believe that during the past six years, I have been as close to Selective Service as any single person except for those employed in this area. I believe most strongly that the Congress and the President of the United States owe to the young people of this nation the test as stated in the Hatfield Amendment:

POINT NO. 4

"A voluntary system should be instituted and given a fair test as soon as practicable while providing necessary safeguard in the event that unforeseen circumstances create a need for additional military manpower;"

I think that this bill is most important at this time in our history. It seems that many people are always searching for the perfect answers to difficult social problems, before making any attempts at solution. It seems that in this issue like many others we should be willing to try new and sometimes dramatic solutions.

Each of you should have the experience of being on a local board and attempting to decide the classification of various registrants. After a few such meetings, I'm sure many would be asking the question.

WHO SERVES WHEN NOT ALL SERVE?

The only answer to this question is an all Voluntary Military.

ACADEMIC PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE DRAFT

(By George Wald)

Nothing now so poisons academic life in America as the draft. It distorts and disrupts our colleges and universities, distracting and harassing students and faculties alike. Many persons who would not otherwise wish to attend college come and stay to avoid the draft. Students who should go off for a time to work, or to study elsewhere, cannot do so because of the draft. One sees this at once by comparing the behavior of men and women students. At Radcliffe College, for example, about one student in six takes a year off during her stay; and the College regards this as highly advantageous for educational, economic and other reasons. At Harvard, largely because of the draft, such leaves of absence are rare.

There has been a great deal of public and Congressional interest lately in student unrest, and the ways in which the colleges and universities have dealt with it. It should be understood that the draft has much to do with both these problems. It accounts directly for much student unrest, and greatly hampers faculties in attempting to deal with it. Faculties that would like to discipline students by making them withdraw for a time or by expelling them must face the embarrassment of thereby exposing them to the draft. It does not help that draft boards and the services may be particularly severe with such cases. A faculty wanting only to send a student away for a time, or for good, must face the prospect of learning a few months later that it may have condemned him to fight and perhaps die in a war that most students and faculty members reject. Just as worthy young men, frequently worthier, who are not students are exposed to those hazards too; but college faculties didn't put them there.

Important aspects of undergraduate education that depend upon graduate students are now badly undercut by the graduate student draft. Many types of instruction, including almost all laboratory teaching in the sciences, are ordinarily done by graduate students. It is very much in the national interest that this go on, and be done well. Yet we now face disastrous cuts in graduate student enrollment. Many graduate students have been drafted, many others have abandoned graduate study for occupations that offer deferment. The country is losing many potential scientists, mathematicians and other highly trained persons that it is going to need; and is suffering now a serious lack of graduate students to teach our undergraduates in the sciences and other fields.

Some of these disabilities might be relieved by a wider exercise of student deferment; others again are the direct result of student deferment. In any case, student deferments provide no solutions, only delays. They only prolong the agony. It should be said also that neither faculties nor students are inclined to plead for special treatment for students, even though it be in the national interest.

There has been much talk lately of "equity" in this connection. Equity however is an ideal only when coupled with justice. To distribute an injustice equally only makes it worse. It means doing to all what should not be done to anyone. That is the essential effect of spreading the draft more widely.

If Congress wishes to improve the condition of our colleges and universities and their relations with the public and with government, probably the most effective thing it can do is to repeal the draft.

POSITION FAVORING A VOLUNTEER MILITARY

(By Robert E. Jones)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert E. Jones. I am Executive Director of the Joint Washington Office for Social Concern, representing three religious liberal groups—the American Ethical Union whose national headquarters is in New York, the American Humanist Association whose national headquarters is in San Francisco, and the Unitarian Universalist Association which has its continental headquarters in Boston.

We are presenting joint testimony today because we have nearly identical positions on the draft and conscription, and because our religious positions are similar. Just a word about the religious positions. All three groups take as their central belief a faith in freedom. We grant to our members individual freedom of belief, feeling that in matters of religion the individual conscience must be sovereign. We are, therefore, churches or religious associations without a fixed religious creed or dogma, though our members may have a consensus of belief in ethical and social matters. We are not in the category of "peace" churches but our members hold a range of positions on the questions of participation in war, including the pacifist position but not excluding members who support the use of force when deemed necessary in international relations.

We have reached the position, today, that the best interests of the United States and of its citizens will be served by termination of the authority to induct—an end to the draft—and a return to the all-volunteer armed forces which have characterized our nation's military preparedness for most of its history.

Until the Korean and Vietnam wars, this country had resorted to the draft only in time of major conflict—in the Civil War with its imperfect draft law, and in the First and Second World Wars. The tradition since the Revolution had relied heavily on volunteers to fight the smaller wars. Conscription, for most of our history, had been viewed as an undesirable use of governmental power, usually associated with European despotism, and resorted to by a democratic republic only in the gravest emergency.

Though Korea and Vietnam represented serious international crises, it cannot be said they represented a peril to the survival of the nation, as did the three major wars in our history—one domestic and the other two foreign—cited above.

In those three major wars the United States Government had little difficulty securing volunteers for its armed services and one is led to conjecture whether the draft was necessary at all in World War II, for instance, after Pearl Harbor united the nation and impelled thousands to enlist. It has been said by some that the popularity of a war with the citizenry can be gauged by the rate of enlistments in the fighting branches. If heavy enlistments are not forthcoming the war is obviously unpopular and may be unjust as well. Perhaps only wars of self-defense, as World War II, will rouse enthusiastic approval.

A good case could be made that if a war does not bring out volunteers to fight it, then that war is not worth fighting, for the people, in their wisdom, have decided not to support it.

We are concerned with the inequities of the draft and have supported reforms in the law such as the random selection method and liberalization of the conscientious objector provision.

We were pleased with the Seeger and Welsh decisions of the Supreme Court which made it possible for ethical and moral beliefs to qualify for conscientious objection recognition on equal footing with conventional religious belief. We are therefore, encouraged by the response of the Director of Selective Service, Dr. Curtis W. Tarr, to the recent Supreme Court decision on the non-religious objector, and feel that Local Board Memorandum 107, issued by the Selective Service System on July 6, 1970, gives local boards much-needed guidance in evaluating the sincerity of conscientious objector applicants and follows faithfully the Supreme Court dicta in the Welsh case.

However, pleased as we are with the trend toward liberalizing the conscientious objector section of the law, and with other steps which have been taken to make the law fairer in its administration and in its impact on youth, all three of our organizations have come to the realization that draft reform, though desirable, will never totally erase the inequities of Selective Service. We will still have to contend with local draft boards, with all their frailties, some of which exhibit the meanest kind of prejudice against conscientious objectors.

Unfortunately, in the case of the military draft, the rain does not fall on the just and the unjust alike. Indeed, the draft singles out certain segments of the young male population and subjects them to a disproportionate share of the burdens of citizenship. We are not in a frontier society where every able-bodied man and youth was expected to turn out for muster when the Indians or Redcoats appeared. Not everyone of draft age is needed.

Some 1.5 million young men turn 19 each year and become draft-eligible, but cur-

rently Selective Service is drafting about 180,000 a year. Selective Service was designed to meet the limited manpower requirements, over and above enlistments, where not every eligible young man is needed. Over the years, the Selective Service System has resorted to various deferments and exemptions as a way of narrowing the pool. Occupational and student deferments enabled many to avoid military service. Inevitably, this system of deferments and exemptions militated against the uneducated and the unskilled, and the channeling processes of Selective Service, for those not inducted or assigned to civilian service, robbed the individual of his freedom of choice.

In spite of the institution of a random selection, or lottery, method, the problems of inequality of sacrifice and general inequities remain. For, however the draft law is tinkered with, we come back to the reality that conscription is a denial of individual freedom; that it is a form of involuntary servitude.

Conscription has another aspect to it which is frightening in its implications. It stimulates foreign adventurism, and weakens democratic control over the Nation's foreign policy. The Chief Executive, armed with the draft, possesses the manpower to undertake quick, massive responses to crisis situations the world over. There is a temptation on the part of the President to commit troops quickly, without having to face adequate public discussion and debate, when the troops are available. Large standing armies, historically, have tempted their rulers to use them—either for foreign adventures or domestic repression—and often, for both purposes.

Another compelling reason for our opposition to the draft is what it is doing to the social climate of America. Large segments of our student and youth population are in resistance to the draft. Like Prohibition in the twenties, a significant portion of the citizenry are not obeying the law. The draft and the war, which many deem unnecessary and unjust, have caused a widespread disaffection with American society and institutions. Ending of the draft should do much to eliminate the anxieties and insecurities which plague our youth, and diminish the ferocity displayed in the revolutionary sectors of the student population.

It will be a healthy thing for this country to do away with conscription.

For these reasons, we endorse the voluntary system of military manpower procurement embodied in the legislation introduced by Senator Hatfield of Oregon, Senator Goldwater of Arizona, and others. It is our understanding that, in the absence of hearings in the Armed Services Committee, this will be presented as an amendment to the Military Procurement Act of 1970.

We urge its adoption.

POSITION FAVORING VOLUNTEER MILITARY

(By Rev. Rodney Shaw)

My name is Rodney Shaw. I am a minister of The United Methodist Church and served as a chaplain in the U.S. Army during World War II. I work in the Division of World Peace of the United Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns and would like to present the general position of The United Methodist Church and also the more detailed position of the Board of Christian Social Concerns, an official agency of The United Methodist Church.

The 1968 Uniting Conference of The United Methodist Church, the only body that speaks for the whole church, has said: "We affirm the opposition of The Methodist Church to compulsory military training and service in peacetime."[1] This clearly means that the United States should return to the traditional voluntary system of raising manpower based on adequate pay and other inducements.

It is not only the violation of personal freedom, but the flexibility provided by conscription in determining the size of the armed forces that leads us to oppose strongly the renewal of the draft. This flexibility is simply another name for a blank check on the nation's young men that permits the Executive branch of government quickly to expand the army, to send troops into other countries, to engage in hostilities and to escalate into full scale war without a Congressional declaration of war or a debate on manpower.

A voluntary system of raising manpower in peacetime would make it necessary for the Executive Department to consult Congress and hence the people, before embarking on a major war overseas. Congress would thus regain the constitutional control over use of the armed forces that it lost when it allowed military conscription to become part of the American way of life.

For Congress to continue the draft is to abdicate its responsibility to the Constitution and to the people by facilitating the ability of the Chief Executive to launch and conduct an undeclared war. For the continuance of the draft is the continuance of an advance pledge of almost unlimited manpower for any military venture the Executive wants to launch.

If the White House and the Pentagon had to ask Congress to conscript men whenever they wanted to engage in an undeclared war, a national debate would be precipitated that might result in a substantially different course than the Administration had intended.

In fact, no Executive would dare try to authorize the escalation of troops from a few thousand military advisers to some hundreds of thousands of combat troops if he had neither a peacetime draft nor a Congressional declaration of war in his pocket.

When official spokesmen talk about the inequity of the draft they are operating on the principle that the issue before us is how to draft people equitably and not human freedom from such servitude. There is a real inequity in that the draftee's substandard pay means he is subsidizing society when there is no need to do so except to keep down the taxes.

However, the real issue is "the impact of conscription on the freedom, education, and vocations of young citizens."[1] The draft unnecessarily denies these young men freedom for a period of years, forcing them into a role they would not otherwise have chosen and delaying or jeopardizing plans for education, vocation, and marriage.

It is estimated that 40,000 young men have fled the United States so that they would not be subject to the draft. We need to recall that it was for essentially the same reason that many of our ancestors fled compulsory military service in a highly militarized 19th century Europe. The flight of these young Americans should be regarded as a danger signal, warning of the heavy burden of militarism and consequent loss of freedom in the United States even as the action of our ancestors was an indictment of Prussian militarism.

There are many responsible people in our society who believe that the United States is too deeply influenced by what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex, that the United States, in its power contest with Russia, has chosen to establish order in the world through its own might rather than through the strengthening of international institutions, that such a course inevitably involves more and more interference in the internal affairs of other nations, and that the draft is in a real sense the symbol of this whole trend and a key to its continuance.

In conclusion, as the United Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns stated at its annual meeting in October, 1969, "The Board of Christian Social Concerns of The United Methodist Church . . . calls for an immediate end to military conscription in the U.S., through repeal of the Selective service law."[2]

---

[1] "The United Methodist Church and Peace," resolution of the 1968 Uniting Conference of The United Methodist Church, paragraph 7.a.

[2] "Repeal of the Draft," resolution of the October, 1969 meeting of the United Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns.

THE VICE PRESIDENT AND THE AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the Vice President yesterday made some unfortunate and, I believe, unjustified conclusions about the amendment to end the war. Regrettably he chose to cloak his conclusions with some of his now familiar florid rhetoric and predictably he impugned the motives of those who have drawn conclusions different from his own on how best to disengage from Indochina.

Mr. President, Vietnam is a national disaster. We should be discussing it in a rational and temperate manner rather than using it as an excuse for partisan political bomb throwing. Those of us who support the amendment to end the war have attempted in speeches and in publications to outline in great detail the reasons why we believe a commitment to a fixed timetable for safe and orderly American disengagement offers the best way out of our disastrous involvement in Indochina. I should hope the Vice President would give us the benefit of the reasons which led him to draw different conclusions about the effect of our amendment.

Our President has promised to try to bring us together again. I am sure the Vice President shares this desire as do all the Members of this body. Our country is deeply divided today over many issues.

What we need to bring us together again is more reason and less emotional rhetoric. When we must disagree over the difficult problems we face we should discuss our disagreements with temperance and hopefully with some measure of charity and respect for the other fellow's point of view. We are after all discussing the problems of the greatest democracy the world has ever known, not wrangling at some lodge meeting. If we cannot conduct ourselves like gentlemen, how can we expect the people of this country to respect and uphold the rules of reason and of law which are the foundations upon which our social compact rests.

Mr. President, the Vice President, despite his verbal excesses, is a man of courage and conviction. I know that he has acted quietly and with great dignity to bring the moral weight of his office to bear against the military junta in Greece. While I disagree with him on many issues, I respect his convictions. I know he cares as deeply about this country as I do. But I hope he tones down his rhetoric before it causes deeper tears in our social fabric.

We desperately need reasoning men and reasoned debate today.

Our Vice President should be one of the first to recognize this.

OIL POLICY COMMITTEE MAKES RIGHT DECISION ON OIL IMPORT QUOTA SYSTEM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, yesterday Brig. Gen. George A. Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, announced that the Oil Policy Committee, of which he is chairman, had decided to recommend retention of the present oil import quota system. In announcing this recommendation, General Lincoln also indicated that President Nixon concurred in the decision of the Oil Policy Committee.

This is a most significant decision, and I believe it is the right decision.

It would have been a great mistake to have adopted a new policy which might have served to weaken the domestic petroleum industry, particularly at a time when we face the prospect of a fossil fuel shortage of major, possibly crisis, proportions.

In announcing this recommendation, the Oil Policy Committee cited the following factors: Increased demands for the petroleum products in the last 6 months, decreased domestic supplies, growing shortages in other fuels such as natural gas and coal, sharp increases in Mideast oil and tanker costs, and the uncertainty as to when the great oil resources of the North Slope of Alaska will be available for consumption.

Some of these factors are fairly recent in origin. Most have been there all the time but have not been given their proper weight in the making of previous recommendations on oil import policy. The Oil Policy Committee, under the chairmanship of General Lincoln, is to be commended for its thorough and realistic appraisal of all the significant factors. The oil quota system has served this country well. Internal modifications of the program during the past few months have improved its operation.

Mr. President, I salute this action by the Oil Policy Committee and the President. It is appropriate and sound. It will serve to protect and advance the interests of the Nation as a whole.

RESOLUTION ON POW'S PASSED BY THE GRAND LODGE OF A., F. AND A.M. OF OREGON

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, whatever policy is pursued by the United States with respect to our involvement in Southeast Asia does not alter the fact that the North Vietnamese have life and death control over the unknown number of Americans held captive over the years of conflict. As the Senate's attention becomes focused on a series of amendments which will have a direct bearing on American involvement and policy in Southeast Asia, I believe we must give important consideration to the effect these amendments will have on the status of American prisoners of war.

Secretary of Defense Laird's efforts in asking the North Vietnamese for a release of all Americans being held captive, or at least compliance with the 1949 Geneva Convention provisions relating to POW's, should be highly commended. But as our Nation continues to be a major combatant in the Southeast Asian war, our Nation's sharp protestations and invocations of international law have met with little success. I and the other cosponsors of the amendment to end the war—Senate amendment No. 609 to H.R. 17123—believe that our amendment, however, holds out a hope for these men not available under the alternative of continued conflict. We believe that Hanoi will hold Americans as prisoners of war only as long as they are fighting against American forces. When it is certain that we are determined to withdraw completely and end our own military involvement in this Asian conflict, then they will have no further incentive for maintaining these Americans as prisoners.

The Grand Lodge of the Ancient, Free and Accepted Masons of Oregon has passed a resolution regarding American prisoners of war urging, among other things, that our Nation not forget American POW's in their consideration of treaties, accords or agreements relating to our involvement in Southeast Asia. I commend the Grand Lodge for their concern in this area and can assure them that careful thought was given to this area in the formulation of Senate amendment No. 609. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, there is an undetermined number of United States citizens interned as prisoners of war by the Government of North Viet Nam, and

Whereas, some of these members of the military service of the United States have been imprisoned as long as five years, and

Whereas, the intelligence reports and information from those who have been released or escaped leaves no doubt that these men, while imprisoned, are subjected to unusual, cruel and inhuman treatment, to-wit: physical torture, psychological terror, public display, insufficient medical care and treatment, neglect of health, dietary and sanitary necessities, and are denied correspondence with relatives, and

Whereas, by inflicting such treatment upon the members of the military service of the United States of America, the Government of North Viet Nam has violated the fundamental standards of human decency and has grossly deviated from civilized concepts of international accords and agreements on prisoners of war, and

Whereas, the Geneva Convention of 1949 requires the fair, humane treatment of prisoners and the Government of North Viet Nam in 1957 became a signatory to said agreement and the said Government of North Viet Nam has refused to identify the prisoners whom it holds, to release the seriously sick and wounded prisoners, to permit inspection of the prisoner of war facilities and has refused to permit exchange of mail between the prisoners and their families, and has refused to permit the International Red Cross to inspect the prisoners, and

Whereas, the acts of the Government of North Viet Nam in this conduct have violated all standards of decency toward members of the military service, many of whom are members of Free Masonry.

It is, therefore, resolved that the Grand Lodge of the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Oregon at its annual Communication assembled June 11, 1970, does condemn in the strongest terms the conduct of the Government of North Viet Nam in its treatment and confinement of these members of the military service of the United States and does hereby petition to the United Nations and all of the free governments associated therewith for the Government of North Viet Nam to be censured and required to act as follows:

(1) To observe the terms and conditions of the Geneva Convention of 1949 as signed by the Government of North Viet Nam in 1957;

(2) To allow the International Red Cross and United Nations to immediately visit said prisoners to determine the number confined therein and advise their families and loved ones;

(3) To immediately release the seriously sick and wounded prisoners;

(4) To provide continued impartial inspection of the facilities of the prisoners by the International Red Cross and other appropriate organizations;

(5) To provide proper medical treatment of the sick and wounded;

(6) To provide a regular supply of sufficient food, medicines and other items to maintain a decent standard of living;

(7) To cease using prisoners for purposes of propaganda, public degradation and mental torture.

We do further resolve that the United States of America enter into no treaties, accords or agreements that will in any way prevent or delay repatriation of these members of the military service of the United States and their prompt return to the Government of the United States and to their wives, children and families.

It is further resolved that a copy of this resolution in appropriate form be sent to the President of the United States; the Vice-President of the United States; the Secretary of State of the United States; the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to the Secretary of the United Nations.

In witness whereof, the Grand Lodge of Ancient, Free and Accepted Masons of Oregon, has caused this Resolution to be executed by its Most Worshipful Grand Master and Right Worshipful Grand Secretary and the seal of the Lodge affixed thereto.

B. D. DOTSON,
Most Worshipful Grand Master.
W. L. ELLIOTT,
Right Worshipful Grand Secretary.

TO EVERYTHING THERE IS A SEASON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe it was Victor Hugo who once said:

Greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose time has come.

We are drawing nearer to the time when we must make a momentous decision on a significant advance in international human dignity. I speak of the Genocide Convention.

To paraphrase a famous and poignant folksong, I firmly believe that "to everything there is a season." The season has come for courageous decisions on matters of human rights.

To everything there indeed is a season; a season for soul searching and a season for courage, a season for doubt and a season for decision, a season for council and a season for commitment. I ask that the Senate act on its con-

science when the United Nations Convention on Genocide comes to the floor of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION TESTIMONY ON RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on August 12, 1970, the Subcommitee on Constitutional Rights resumed its hearings on the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. The purposes of this hearing were to ascertain the policies, programs, and plans of the Federal Government affecting the rights of the mentally ill and to evaluate the implementation of the 1964 District of Columbia Hospitalization Act.

Witnesses who testified at the hearing included Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Dr. Sherman N. Kieffer, Director of the National Center for Mental Health Services, Training, and Research of the National Institute of Mental Health. The witnesses were requested to comment upon the steps that have been taken over this decade by the Federal Government, and to describe the plans for the future, to: First, promote mental health research: second, encourage enlightened policies for effective and early treatment of mental illness; and third, assure better laws for protection of the constitutional rights of mental patients.

Dr. Egeberg outlined national trends in the medical and legal fields affecting the rights of the mentally ill. He pointed to a decrease in the mental institution population and emphasized the advantages of treating mentally ill persons in the community. He acknowledged the growing concern with the patient's right to treatment and the adequacy of treatment for those involuntarily committed to mental institutions. Dr. Egeberg said:

> The rights issue is extremely important and objective judicial and administrative review of the quality of services are crucial in a democratic society. It is the responsibility of health care professionals, however, to stay in the vanguard of changes in the service we are offering. The question of quality is not restricted to whatever are the levels of adequacy that can be legally enforced. Our responsibility and challenge is to assure the value of what we offer to those who come to us for help.

Dr. Sherman Kieffer, in discussing the implementation of the 1964 District of Columbia Act, said:

> A review of the past five years of operating experience indicates that the Act's legislative framework has generally proved to be both durable and flexible, and that the principles it embodies have ably withstood the test of time.

Dr. Kieffer strongly endorsed the concept of voluntary commitment, one of the fundamental purposes of the 1964 act. He summarized the position of the National Institute of Mental Health:

> We are opposed professionally to any practice which would tend to discourage patients from entering treatment on a voluntary basis.

Mr. President, in my opinion, Dr. Egeberg and Dr. Kieffer presented testimony which will be of great value to the subcommittee in its continuing study of the rights of the mentally ill. I believe that their statements will be of interest to every American concerned with the problem of mental illness. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that these two statements and the brief remarks which I made in opening the hearing be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR., RESUMPTION OF HEARINGS ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL, AUGUST 12, 1970

With today's hearing the Subcommittee resumes the series of hearings we began in November of 1969 to consider the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. The lapse of time between the earlier hearings and this one was caused by the demanding responsibilities of the Subcommittee in other areas and the problem in scheduling additional witnesses.

Our hearings have been undertaken to provide a comprehensive "decade review" of the state of the law governing those who are subject to loss of liberty and to involuntary hospitalization because of mental illness. We have focused upon recent legal and medical developments in the field, commitment procedures and practices in various states, the availability of legal assistance to persons subject to commitment and to persons actually hospitalized, the significance of a patient's moral and legal "right to treatment" under the law, the implementation of the 1964 District of Columbia Hospitalization Act, and various suggestions for improvements in policies and practices affecting those persons in our society determined to be "mentally ill."

Thus far, we have heard from a distinguishing group of witnesses with experience and expertise in all areas of this subject. Our witnesses have included representatives from the American Psychiatric Association, the American Medical Association, the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, the National Association for Mental Health, the Medical Committee on Human Rights and the American Civil Liberties Union. We have also had the benefit of testimony from representatives of the District of Columbia Medical Society, the District of Columbia Health Department, the District of Columbia Judicial Conference, the District of Columbia Mental Health Association, the Neighborhood Legal Services, the District of Columbia Legal Aid Agency, and professors of law with knowledge in this area.

Today we are focusing upon the Administration's programs and plans concerning the mentally ill in our nation. We shall also hear first-hand from those charged with administering the new law for the District, how well it is working, and how it has been implemented. The 1964 Act was largely the product of this Subcommittee's study and hearings in the early 1960's. There is general agreement that this legislation constituted a significant improvement in protecting the rights of the mentally ill and in encouraging voluntary commitment. We have evidence to suggest that some of the purposes of this legislation have been realized. However, there is also evidence—including the testimony of previous witnesses—to underscore my belief that certain provisions of the 1964 Act have not been effectively implemented.

I am confident that the witnesses scheduled to testify today will be of great value in pointing out our shortcomings and in helping us to understand what should be done to remedy the areas of neglect. I also look forward to the testimony to be presented on behalf of the Administration as to its plans for coming to grips with the complex problems involved in responding to the needs of those who are mentally ill.

Finally, I hope that this entire series of hearings will encourage the Congress and the public to re-examine old assumptions and outmoded approaches concerning the problem of mental illness in this country. In a free society, a determination that any man shall be denied his liberty—even upon a good-faith belief that it is in his own best interests—should be made with the greatest caution and with the full protections of due process afforded the individual by our Constitution.

I would like for the record to show that in the appendix of the hearings, there is to be inserted a letter which we have received from Mr. Robert J. Golten, of the District of Columbia Legal Aid Agency. Also, I understand that the Center for Study of Responsive Law has undertaken a study of the rights of the mentally ill. The Center has given permission to include its report in our hearing record when it is available. In addition, in response to a Subcommittee questionnaire sent to the National Institute of Mental Health, we have received a very helpful collection of reports and statistical information which will also be included in the record with the questionnaire.

STATEMENT BY SHERMAN N. KIEFFER, M.D., ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this distinguished Subcommittee to convey the professional opinions of the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Center for Mental Health Services, Training, and Research regarding the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act.

A review of the past five years of operating experience indicates that the Act's legislative framework has generally proved to be both durable and flexible, and that the principles it embodies have ably withstood the test of time. I shall, however, comment on certain amendments to the Act which were proposed in S. 2869 as originally introduced, about which you ask our opinion.

When Saint Elizabeths Hospital was first established in 1855, its mission was stated as the provision of "the most humane care and enlightened curative treatment" for persons suffering from mental illness. This, Mr. Chairman, you translated into legislative language establishing the corresponding right of every patient to receive such treatment. What has changed over the years is not the goal itself, but the definition of "humane care" and of "enlightened curative treatment."

Through our accumulated research findings and clinical experience, we know that most mental illness can be treated more effectively when detected and diagnosed early and properly, and when the positive relationships between the individual and his family, his job, his friends, and his community are not severed. We also know that custodial care alone, no matter how compassionate, how enlightened, or how restitutive it may be, will not provide the kind of active support required to effectively rehabilitate an individual suffering an emotional crisis and to return him to a productive life in the community.

Dr. Egeberg has described the national efforts to bring about desired changes in the pattern of delivery of mental health services. He has traced the development of the Community Mental Health Centers program and, equally important, the growth of clinical research and training programs, without which programs of services would fail to grow in excellence.

The National Center for Mental Health

Services, Training and Research embodies all three elements of the national program in microcosm. It consists of three closely interrelated and interdependent Divisions—the Saint Elizabeths Hospital-Division of Clinical and Community Services, the Seymour D. Vestermark Division of Intramural Training, and the Winfred Overholser Division of Clinical Research. The Hospital Division forms the essential base for the delivery of clinical and community services. The Vestermark Division is a laboratory for the development of new and more effective techniques for the training of professional and paraprofessional personnel to provide such services. The Overholser Division carries out clinical and social science research programs which can be utilized by the other Divisions and by the Institute as a whole in exploring and evaluating innovative treatment approaches.

It is anticipated that the accomplishments of the National Center as a whole will be replicated by communities throughout the United States. The model provided by the Hospital Division should be particularly significant to them because it did not spring full-blown from a mental health planner's drawing board. Existing resources—in this case, the old Saint Elizabeths Hospital—are being utilized in new and creative ways. The hoped-for result will be a pattern of services which goes far beyond the old functions of providing intermediate or long-term inpatient care only. The services we are presently providing for the 155,000 residents of the District's Health Service Area D in our model community mental health center include, in addition to inpatient care when needed, a full range of alternatives to such care, for children as well as for adults. In addition, consultation to community agencies and concerned personnel, improved screening and diagnostic techniques, and intensified follow-up care for patients moving back to the community are available. These programs have all been developed in collaboration with the District Health Department officials.

The statements made before your Subcommittee by Dr. John Schultz, Associate Director for Mental Health and Retardation, D.C. Department of Public Health, last November 12, 1969, need clarification. He stated that ". . . the right to treatment of a patient presented to Saint Elizabeths Hospital for care includes the right to precare and the right to aftercare in his community and the full range of alternative services which Saint Elizabeths cannot provide. Saint Elizabeths can only admit or not admit." No one mental institution alone can effectively serve the entire population of an area the size of the District of Columbia. This is, in effect, the role Saint Elizabeths has been forced to assume ever since the District closed down its only security inpatient psychiatric facility at D.C. General Hospital in late 1966. For patients requiring security confinement, Saint Elizabeths is often the only available resource.

Mr. Chairman, we are willing and eager to, and do admit any and all residents of Health Service Area D and provide them with the most comprehensive range of services possible. For fiscal 1970, for example, we admitted a total of 1,650 patients from the other three health service areas of the District. We feel, however, that it is time that the parallel responsibilities of the District of Columbia to provide the same full range of services for residents of the other health service areas of the city were implemented in those areas. Until such time, however, we will certainly continue our cohort services to residents of Areas A, B, and C, and our overwhelming burden of services to patients committed for pre-trial examinations through the criminal process. We must frankly admit, however, that our resources are becoming strained to the breaking point. For many patients it is quite true that we cannot always offer the kind of comprehensive treatment services which in our professional judgment constitute an "adequate" program.

I have detailed the strengths and weaknesses of our treatment program not only because it is the only honest response to your question about the implementation of the "right to treatment" which your statute guarantees, but because the woeful lack of alternatives to inpatient care for three of the city's four health service areas renders inoperative another innovative feature of your statute—the right of the court to commit to such alternative resources in lieu of natory of the convention.

A number of studies conducted or supported by the NIMH or others have demonstrated that an extremely small percentage of civilly committed patients meet the statutory standard of danger to themselves or others to an extent that in our judgment necessitates inpatient care. Despite the legislative language, they are committed and retained because they are in need of care and treatment, they do not have the insight to seek such care voluntarily, and—there is nowhere else to send them. We hope the day is not too distant when, in the District of Columbia at least, commitment to partial hospitalization or outpatient care will be the rule rather than the exception.

Most of your questions regarding implementation of other specific sections of the Act are answered in the Addendum which I have submitted for the record. There, too, will be found a number of tables and charts which provide background statistical information about admissions and releases of patients in the years since the Act was passed. I would like to call attention to two charts which are particularly significant.

Table I presents a 3-year comparison of patient status at the end of each of the last three fiscal years. You will notice that in fiscal year 1969 particularly (the first year of the National Center's operation), the resident patient population was decreased from 5,476 to 4,865. This decrease of 611 resident patients represents an 11.16 percent annual rate of decline, or a 179 percent improvement compared to the average for 1962–1967. What is particularly significant is that this was accomplished in spite of a 70 percent increase in the admission rate for the five year period prior to 1969. This we attribute to our redoubled efforts to place patients in the community when hospitalization is no longer necessary. Since the establishment of the National Center in November 1968, we have reduced the average daily resident population by 1600. This marked reduction has enabled us to evacuate and close the 12 antiquated patient buildings constructed during the Nineteenth Century. It should be noted here that of the 6,000 patients discharged since November 1968, only 188, or about 3%, are currently rehospitalized. The national average for readmissions under similar circumstances has been about 50%.

Table IV is also of interest because it confirms what several witnesses have told the Subcommittee—that the number of D.C. resident patients alone seeking care on a voluntary basis has increased since the Act has been in operation. In fiscal year 1965, the first year of operation, of 1,011 civil D.C. resident admissions, only one-third (357) were voluntary. In fiscal year 1969, of 2,418 civil D.C. resident admissions, nearly one-half (1,180) were voluntary.

The increased utilization of the voluntary admission procedures is a trend we encourage in every way possible in the national mental health program. There is no question but that the prognosis for a motivated patient who takes the first hard step of acknowledging his need for help and seeking such help on his own initiative is very much better than for patients forced to enter treatment against their will. In addition, voluntary patients for the most part seek assistance at an earlier stage of their illness, at a time when therapeutic intervention can be maximally effective. For these reasons, we are opposed professionally to any practice which would tend to discourage patients from entering treatment on a voluntary basis.

We share the conviction of the great majority of mental health professionals throughout the country—whose representatives, I believe, have already testified to this effect before your Subcommittee, Mr. Chairman—that any procedure which would undermine the therapist's credibility and break faith with the patient should not be approved. The very meaning of the term "voluntary" implies a lack of coercion. In accepting a patient on this basis, we have obligated ourselves, ethically and professionally, to respect his right to seek or to reject our help as he may choose. If we fail to live up to this obligation by placing roadblocks in the way of his release, we have destroyed the very foundation of a meaningful therapeutic relationship.

In this connection, we would invite your attention to the amendment to section 21–512(a) of the D.C. Code proposed in section 5 of S. 2869 as originally introduced. The amendment would provide that if the chief of service has reason to believe that a voluntary patient is mentally ill and, because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others if not detained, and if the chief of service applies for emergency hospitalization within 48 hours, then the hosptial would be permitted to detain the patient even though 48 hours had expired since he has asked to leave.

We believe this amendment requires some refinement so as to assure that it would not have the effect of discouraging patients from entering treatment voluntarily, while nevertheless assuring that the D.C. Public Health Department was notified in the case of a voluntary patient who seeks release while a danger to himself or others. We hope to complete our consideration of proposed changes in this amendment in the very near future and will at that time make our recommendations to the Subcommittee.

Turning to the emergency commitment procedures, we would recommend a modification of the D.C. Code as recently amended by the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970. The Code now provides that *any* physician of the person in question, and not merely a *family* physician, should be authorized to file for admission of a patient under emergency procedures provided for in section 21–521 of the Code. While we agree that the term "family physician" is perhaps a bit anachronistic for much of the population we serve today, and approve the change made by the new Reform Act in deleting the qualifying word "family", we do not think it is wise, from a therapeutic standpoint, to permit physicians employed by the treating institution to initiate a petition for involuntary hospitalization. It is no solution to limit the right to file emergency applications to physicians licensed to practice in the District of Columbia, as some witnesses have suggested. Many staff physicians at Saint Elizabeths Hospital are so licensed. We would prefer to see the language changed so that any physician, except one employed by the institution to which admission is sought would be qualified. I am advised by our Counsel that this may require an amendment not only to section 21–521 but also to section 21–582(a) which expressly deals with the question of the qualifications of hospital staff physicians to initiate such petitions.

In connection with the detention of persons upon application to the court by the Commission on Mental Health, we note that sections 6(d) and 7 of S. 2869 would author-

ize the court to issue an "attachment for the immediate apprehension and detention at a hospital" of a person "not otherwise in custody" for whom a petition for judicial hospitalization has been filed. In such cases, the Commission could detain the person for examination and a hearing for a period of up to seven days, unless the person or his counsel requests a recess. Proponents of the proposal, in testimony given to the House District of Columbia Committee, stated that its purpose is to handle the situation of the clearly mentally ill and highly dangerous person who refuses to submit himself to the Mental Health Commission for examination. We believe, however, that there should be a provision for notice and opportunity for a hearing on this matter, both with respect to the question of whether there is sufficient probable cause to *order* an examination and to consider the possibility of an examination conducted at home or otherwise on an outpatient basis. If the situation warrants, the emergency procedures under Subchapter III of Chapter 5 of Title 21 of the D.C. Code would be available.

I would like to make just one comment regarding the amendment to the D.C. Code, section 10(b) of S. 2869, which would add a new procedure by which hospitalized patients could submit a motion for release to the court which entered the order for hospitalization. The amendment would allow the court to restrict the patient to only one release motion, unless he claims that his mental condition has changed, there has been no court hearing to determine his present mental condition for a period of six months, and he has exhausted the remedy pursuant to section 21–547 of the Code and all other administrative remedies. He may thereby be precluded from offering to the court, in a proceeding under the proposed section 21–548 of the Code, evidence that what has changed is not his own condition but an outside factor, such as the existence of a suitable alternative to hospitalization. If he were to be so precluded, it would not appear to be consistent with the spirit and aims of the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act. We would suggest that the amendment be studied further with this consideration in mind.

As mentioned before, the procedures, directives, forms, etc., developed to implement the various rights guaranteed to patients under the D.C. Code have been included in the Addendum to this statement, but the subject of competency to exercise a number of civil rights requires some further discussion in the light of our experience over the past 5 years. I hasten to assure the Subcommittee that the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Center for Mental Health Services, Training, and Research have always supported—and continue to support—the validity of the provisions which separate determinations of the need for hospitalization from determinations of incompetency. We have taken our responsibilities under Section 21–564 of the Code very seriously. Between September 15, 1964 (when the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act was passed), and September 15, 1965, the hospital examined over 5,000 patients who had previously been considered incompetent solely upon the basis of an order of involuntary hospitalization. Since that time, every patient is examined at the time of or soon after his admission to the hospital to determine his competency to exercise each of the separate rights enumerated in the statute. (The form used to record this information and the results over the years are part of the Addendum). Although we are required to notify certain persons of the patient's mental inability to exercise particular rights, the statute does not require any of the persons so notified to take any legal steps to have the patient's alleged incompetency judicially determined. The subject of followup steps to protect such patients more adequately should also receive further study and consideration.

Before closing I would like to mention one provision in the present D.C. Code which may cause considerable administrative difficulties if or when the District of Columbia develops adequate services for the residents of Health Areas A, B, and C. As presently written, Sections 21–511 and 21–513 of the Code provide that voluntary applicants and non-protesting persons whose conditions justify hospitalization are entitled *as a matter of right*, to be admitted to the public hospital of *their choice*. As a result, the Administrator of Saint Elizabeths Hospital may not transfer a patient who resides in Health Areas A, B, or C but asks to be admitted to Saint Elizabeths Hospital to the appropriate facility in his own catchment area nor may the Administrator of an Area A, B, or C facility transfer a patient who lives in Health Area D to Saint Elizabeths Hospital. This means that any plan for more effective utilization of public facilities in the District would be nullified if the patient chose to request admission to a facility not located in his own residence community. This problem was first pointed out to your Committee in 1964 by both the District of Columbia and the Department of HEW at the time the legislation was under consideration but no action was taken at that time since the District had not yet developed its own facilities. We are now bringing the problem to the attention of this Committee once more so that it may consider the advisability of amending the present Sections 21–511 and 21–513 of the Code to make it more flexible.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say again how much I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act, and to discuss our successes and our failures in carrying out the directives it embodies. I assure you that we share your determination as professionals and as concerned citizens that every possible protection will be given the human rights of persons afflicted with mental illness. We will now be happy to answer any further questions you may have about the statement or about the materials submitted in the Addendum.

STATEMENT OF ROGER O. EGEBERG, M.D.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am happy to appear at these hearings on the legal rights of the mentally ill to talk about the development of our national mental health program. The rights issue and, in particular, the legal-psychiatric concerns and discussions about the right to treatment have focused attention on changing emphases in American public and professional responses to the mentally ill.

These emphases have resulted in a shift from custodial care to community based treatment of the mentally ill. Essential to this shift have been growing public and professional expectations that almost all the mentally ill will be returned to meaningful and productive lives, and, increasingly, the prospect that with early community-based help, they should never have to seriously disrupt work and family relationships.

I know you are familiar with the custodial "snake pits" reported by Deutsch in the thirties, where the mentally ill were often treated inhumanly as outcasts, often by other outcasts from society who were charged with their care (Deutsch: *The Mentally Ill in America*, 1937). The shift from the "institutional solution," which again flourished after World War II with larger and larger public expenditures for new structures and equipment, has been relatively recent and significant. For one thing, since 1955, there has been a striking reduction in the number of hospitalized mentally ill at State hospitals.

In the ten year period prior to 1955, the number of resident patients in mental hospitals increased each year. This number rose to 559 thousand in 1955, when—with the introduction of psychoactive drugs and a new community centered approach to the care of the mentally ill—the trend was reversed. Since then we have seen a decrease of more than thirty percent so that at the end of 1968 there were only 367 thousand resident patients. If the decrease in the number of resident patients continues, we can predict that by 1973 we will have only 186 thousand resident patients in mental hospitals—a reduction of two-thirds in the period 1963–1973.

This will be quite a remarkable achievement, in view of the fact that if the upward trend prior to 1955 had continued there would have been 809 thousand resident patients by 1973. This decline in resident patients is even more remarkable in that total admissions to mental hospitals during the same period have been rising.

Several factors have contributed to the reduction of resident patients in mental hospitals. Progress in research into the care and treatment of mental illness, in large measure Federally supported and stimulated, recently has made it possible for the Nation and its States and communities to begin to establish a program of comprehensive community mental health services providing effective and early treatment of the mentally ill.

Increased knowledge about mental illness and its treatment has also increasingly resulted in new public acceptance and understanding of the mentally ill and of community-oriented treatment.

I would like, very briefly, to elaborate on these national trends.

Since 1948, the purpose of the Federal assistance program in the mental health field, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the National Institute of Mental Health, has been to provide grant-in-aid support for research, training and manpower development, and the development of mental health services.

In addition to financial support, the NIMH also provides stimulation in each of these program areas through staff consultation with State and community personnel, demonstrations of new programs, and the evaluation of their merit.

The dual role of Federal leadership and support was demonstrated with the advent of psychoactive drugs in the 1950's, when research in psychopharmacology became one of the major areas of successful effort in the Federal research support program, in terms of both basic and clinical research studies.

Fifteen years ago, psychiatry possessed no clearly useful drug treatment for any form of mental illness. Today, in large measure through Institute efforts, psychiatrists, using chemotherapy, have been able, in many cases, to shorten the length of inpatient treatment and to treat persons who remain in the community without serious disruption of family and work relationships.

I mention the progress of psychopharmacology as one example of the importance of research which we believe is the foundation of the entire mental health program. There are many other examples.

Suffice it to say that Federal support of mental health research has grown from 38 projects in 1948 to some 2,000 in Fiscal Year 1970. In FY 1970, 28.6 percent of funds available to NIMH—about $116 million—were allocated to the support and conduct of research. This amount represented approximately 65 percent of all support for mental health research in the United States.

Some of the most pioneering and outstanding work on schizophrenia and depression has been carried out in the Institute's intramural laboratories.

While there has been no breakthrough in treatment of schizophrenia, the most serious

and most prevalent of the mental illnesses, our understanding of the disease grows daily. Research in the treatment of depressions shows definite progress and the results are now being tested in treatment. Mania—long resistant to treatment—now responds promptly to lithium carbonate.

Throughout the Institute's extramural research program, basic scientific research is being augmented with new investigations into the multiple causes of psychopathology.

Research by physical and biological scientists is being examined and further interpreted by social scientists and practitioners, including psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, economists, lawyers, and political scientists. These specialists contribute a broad perspective within which to explore properly the nature of such special mental health problems and phenomena as suicide; the difficulties of adolescence; the mental health problems of the aged; abuse of and dependence on drugs and alcohol; and the alienation of groups within our society.

This Department has long recognized the need to reform the laws affecting the rights of the mentally ill, and the restriction of liberties that often accompanied earlier approaches has come under increasing scrutiny during the transition from custodial to community-based treatment. Many State laws were enacted at a time when alternatives to confinement in large isolated State hospitals were nonexistent, when long-term hospitalization was the rule rather than the exception, and when in many States all judicially committed persons were automatically considered incompetent. On the premise that good treatment can only be based on enlightened laws, the NIMH has continued to support studies related to commitment and court procedures and to forensic psychiatry, and has provided consultation at the request of a few States in the updating of their commitment laws.

For example, since 1961 it has supported an American Bar Foundation study of civil and criminal commitment procedures. This study has documented the tendency of States to apply involuntary commitment procedures to any one considered mentally ill and in need of immediate inpatient treatment. Voluntary procedures were generally ignored in addition to the statutory requirement and safeguard, in those States in which it existed, that a person must be dangerous to himself or others as well as mentally ill in cases of involuntary commitment. An early Public Health Service Draft Act for Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill, while stressing voluntary hospitalization, permitted commitment even in the absence of danger if the individual was in need of custody, care, or treatment in a mental hospital and because of his illness lacked sufficient insight or capacity to make a responsible decision. Psychiatrists apparently acted on the theory that commitment was for the patient's own benefit, and legal safeguards were often reduced to routine and automatic administrative actions.

Differences between statute and practice are not an unfamiliar issue to this Committee. This is one reason for our keen interest in the D.C. experience with the Ervin Act and our grant support for the recently reported Judicial Conference study of the Mental Health Commission, which functions under the Act. It is also the reason we believe it important to carefully study the effects of changes in commitment laws and practices. The New York law which provides continuous review of the status of committed patients through a number of Regional Mental Health Information Service offices is an example of an effort that we have watched with great interest. The Pennsylvania Assembly has held hearings on a "right to treatment" bill to establish treatment criteria and standards. This effort also should be carefully observed and analyzed.

Recent California legislation has drawn particular attention to the growing emphasis on early voluntary and community-based treatment. The NIMH is supporting a study of California's handling of the mentally ill before and after the enactment of their new law.

The Lanterman-Petris-Short Act, as the California law is known, became operative in July of 1969 (Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 5000 et seq.), and has been described as the "Magna Carta of the Mentally Ill." While this may be an overstatement certainly its emphasis on voluntary treatment and alternatives to hospitalization is worthy of careful observation.

There are significant provisions in the California law for maintaining the mentally ill person's civil rights. Prompt administrative and judicial reviews are provided in the case of involuntary certification, and particularly interesting is the requirement that involuntary certification is allowed only after a bona fide effort has been made to have the person accept voluntary treatment. Furthermore, involuntary certification is for a period not to exceed 14 days and may be used only when a person's condition renders him dangerous to himself and others or gravely disabled. This is a far cry from routine involuntary commitment for treatment or custodial purposes.

Not all professionals agree that patients should be treated on a voluntary basis, but the trend toward early, voluntary, and community oriented care is unmistakable. Some in the mental health professions claim that mental illness requires not merely the restraint of the individual for the protection of society but also for his treatment for his own benefit. A recent decision by the California Supreme Court sustaining the State's right to provide a 14-day period of involuntary intensive treatment on medical certification under the new law [see Thorn v. Superior Court of San Diego County, 83 Cal. Rptr. 600 (1970), and County of San Diego v. Superior Court, 83 Cal. Rptr. 607 (1970)].

In any case, there is generally agreement that some individuals need to be restricted and treated, although the number is far fewer than were previously committed and thought to be a "danger to themselves and others."

The legal-psychiatric discussions on the right to treatment have focused primarily on insuring adequate treatment for persons involuntarily committed. That this issue is of growing concern is especially understandable in a period when society's response to the mentally ill has been shifting from custodial care to treatment.

The rights issue is extremely important and objective judicial and administrative review of the quality of services are crucial in a democratic society. It is the responsibility of health care professionals, however, to stay in the vanguard of changes in the service we are offering. The question of quality is not restricted to whatever are the levels of adequacy that can be legally enforced. Our reponsibility and challenge is to assure the value of what we offer to those who come to us for help.

There is a certain amount of submission by the patient to the professional in every professional-patient exchange. Our responsibility for quality services is only made more explicit by the specific legal limitations of liberties in the case of involuntary commitment. The net result is a check on whether the individual receives some help in the facility to which he has been committed. Our professional concern extends much further; in this broader context, we need to make much more explicit the quality of care that should be provided in all health care situations. We need to identify standards of care and the extent to which new knowledge modifies previous treatment approaches.

In the light of these developments, it is important to understand that treatment no longer takes place only on an inpatient basis in public mental hospitals. Increasingly, patients are being treated as outpatients in their own communities, or with day or night care involving partial hospitalization. Facilities providing such services may be those of a non-profit, private organization. In addition, there are outreach efforts, where community mental health workers go into neighborhood areas to intercept crisis events such as suicide attempts. The mentally ill are less often locked up in wards, without treatment. It is now less necessary for the mentally ill to be hospitalized before mental health workers respond to their needs. Although the availability of these types of services is not yet universal, there has been much progress through the community mental health centers program.

To keep treatment procedures abreast of research findings, it has been necessary to accelerate our training programs. Federal support for training mental health manpower has produced a nucleus of professional and supporting personnel capable of treating mentally ill and emotionally disturbed individuals within their home communities. This is an extremely important advance, since the majority of mental health manpower in the United States are still trained in and oriented toward hospitals or large institutions. From its beginnings, the Federal program has attempted to emphasize the training of community mental health manpower, but sufficient public demand and Congressional support to make more than a token effort in this regard has been forthcoming only since 1963, with the passage of the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

With the adoption of this statute, the Congress recognized the need for increased Federal responsibility in upgrading and expanding mental health manpower training efforts. Through this support program, training facilities have significantly increased the numbers of mental health professionals now in practice. Many of these trained people serve in Community Mental Health Centers.

By the end of fiscal year 1970, approximately 420 community mental health centers will have been funded. These are located in every State in the Union and will make services available to approximately 57 million people.

There are still not enough of these facilities, but the effect of those centers now in operation has already been demonstrated. The National mental health program has reached the point where neither the professions nor the public would countenance a regression to the custodial character of the 19th and early 20th century mental hospitals.

I can only give you a brief summary today of the elements of community involvement in the fate of the mentally ill which were catalyzed by the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

In 1962 and 1963, Congress authorized funds to make grants-in-aid available to each State to help them develop plans for comprehensive mental health services programs as a first step in qualifying for center support.

Literally thousands of men and women—most of them volunteers—served on the first mental health planning committees and task forces. This was the Nation's first real commitment to a program in which each community's objective would be to provide total mental health care to a defined group of people.

From its outset the community mental health program brought individuals together from all of the helping disciplines. Their primary purpose was to assure not only adequate treatment of individuals who were already mentally ill but, simultaneously, through the establishment of consultation and education services in each community mental health center, to provide services for the prevention of mental illness. In addition, the development of emergency mental

health services available on a 24-hours-a-day basis made early intervention possible.

This is one of the clearest examples of a public policy of prevention in the health care field. From that experience has emerged a public policy of stimulating comprehensive health planning, with responsibility shared by Federal, state, and local governments, and the private sector.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this Administration is committed to the extension and expansion of Federal Support for the community mental health centers program. We think it is a responsive, consumer-oriented effort. Congress recently enacted Public Law 91-211 which extended and broadened the scope of the Community Mental Health Centers Act, provided special support for community-based treatment and rehabilitation of mentally ill children, alcoholics and drug abusers; and provided preferential Federal support for the establishment and provision of mental health services in urban and rural poverty areas.

My purpose here has been to give you an overview of progress in the National mental health program. The experience of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the NIMH, has demonstrated that the public now considers adequate treatment of mental illness an important right and community responsibility. Mere custodial institutionalization of the mentally ill for indeterminate periods is no longer defensible therapeutically, legally, socially, or politically.

This concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I would ask that Dr. Kieffer now be permitted to deliver his statement, after which we shall both be pleased to answer any questions the Committee may have.

MILTON FRIEDMAN ON THE VOLUNTEER MILITARY

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Milton Friedman, professor of economics and member of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, is one of the most articulate spokesmen on the subject of voluntarism versus conscription with regard to military recruitment.

Due to the imminent debate on the issue of an all-voluntary Armed Force, I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles which Professor Friedman has written for Newsweek magazine on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DRAFT

(By Milton Friedman)

The arbitrariness and deficiencies of our present method of manning the armed forces are highlighted by the recent directive ending automatic exemption for hitherto protected occupations and automatic deferments for most graduate students (the exceptions are students already in their second year or beyond, and students going into medicine, dentistry and related fields or into the ministry).

Academic administrators are expressing great concern that graduate-student enrollments will decline sharply and that teaching assistants will be scarce. This concern would be fully justified if all the young men who would have been deferred or exempted under earlier rules will in fact now be drafted—except of course for those who do not meet physical or mental standards or are granted status as conscientious objectors.

ONLY COLLEGE GRADUATES?

But arithmetic plus the needs of the military assure that this will not occur. The number of young men added to the eligible rolls is at least double the number who will be drafted. Supposedly, the oldest are to be drafted first. If that were done, all of the new draftees would be in their middle 20s, and most would be college graduates. Not one of the roughly 2 million young men turning 18 would be taken. Would the military be satisfied with this outcome? If there be conscription, it is certainly inequitable to give special treatment to young men who go to college. But, on the other hand, is soldiering one of the occupations for which college graduation should be a prerequisite? Is that a reasonable use of our manpower?

What is likely to happen is that, by one expedient or another, most college graduates and persons now exempt on occupational grounds will continue to be deferred. Public pronouncements will be one thing, practice another. But that does not mean that the pronouncements do no harm. On the contrary, hundreds of thousands of young men will be subjected to needless uncertainty and distress. They will find it more difficult to get employment because of the risk that they will be drafted. Employers will be induced to get along with less satisfactory employees. Thousands of colleges will take measures that will prove unnecessary or harmful. We shall have another striking example of the defect of compulsion as a method of deciding which young man shall serve in the armed forces and which two or three or four shall not.

Over a year ago, I wrote in this column that "a military draft is undesirable and unnecessary. We can and should man our armed forces with volunteers—as the United States has traditionally done except in major wars" (Newsweek, Dec. 19, 1966).

WHY NOT VOLUNTEERS?

In the interim, Congress has passed a bill extending conscription for another four years, yet there has also been increasing recognition of the defects of conscription. The case for a voluntary system has been presented in testimony before Congressional committees. Several bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House providing for the early transition to a fully voluntary system of manning the armed forces.

Three books on the subject have recently appeared: "The Draft," which summarizes a conference held at the University of Chicago in December 1966 and presents evidence on all the alternatives (edited by Sol Tax, University of Chicago Press); "How to End the Draft," by five congressmen (edited by Douglas Bailey and Steve Herbits, National Press, Inc.); and "Why the Draft?" by seven young men connected with the University of Virginia (edited by James C. Miller III, with an introduction by Senator Brooke, Penguin Books). These books demonstrate that conscription is neither necessary nor desirable, that it is entirely feasible to man our armed forces by voluntary means provided the military stop underpaying new recruits and take effective steps to make a career in the services more attractive. These books consider and meet every objection that has been raised to a voluntary army.

Draft or no draft, this country would be now engaged in a searching debate over Vietnam. But the virulence and the divisiveness of the debate have been greatly increased by the draft, with its threat to civil liberties and with its closing of all alternatives except open revolt to young men who disagree strongly with our policy. Must we continue to add to the strain on our society by using a method of manning our armed forces that is inequitable, wasteful and basically inconsistent with a free society?

THE END OF THE DRAFT?

(By Milton Friedman)

At long last, the end of the draft is in sight.

Two months after his Inauguration, President Nixon appointed a commission "to develop a comprehensive plan for eliminating conscription and moving toward an all-volunteer armed force." That commission has now unanimously recommended a plan that it believes would permit conscription to end on June 30, 1971, when the present legal authority expires. It would retain only a standby draft to be put into effect in case of emergency by action of Congress on the recommendation of the President.

As a member of the President's commission, I was much impressed by the emergence of unanimity out of initial disagreement. As our deliberations proceeded, and especially as our knowledgeable staff developed a growing body of factual evidence, it became ever clearer to all of us how superficial are most arguments in favor of conscription and how inefficient conscription is both as a method of taxation and as a method of recruiting manpower.

MOSTLY VOLUNTEERS NOW

The often hysterical claims that an all-volunteer force is undesirable because it would be all black or all this or all that or because it would strengthen militarism or because . . . all these claims are contradicted by one simple yet overwhelmingly important fact: *our armed forces today consist predominantly of true volunteers.*

Many men "reluctantly" volunteer for a first term of service because of the threat of the draft. But we know that all men beyond the first term of service are true volunteers, and they alone number nearly 40 per cent of the total forces. In addition, our best estimates are that at least one-third of the first-termers are also true volunteers. In all, therefore, at least 60 percent of the armed forces are true volunteers. A change in the method of recruiting the remaining 40 per cent—mostly enlisted men in the very lowest ranks—cannot produce drastic changes in either the composition or character of the armed forces.

Enforced service by a conscript is a tax imposed on him no less than the check you send to Internal Revenue is a tax imposed on you. The size of his tax is the difference between the sum of money for which he would have served voluntarily and the pay he actually receives. Currently, this tax amounts to about 50 per cent of the potential civilian income of draftees. So unfair a tax imposed on so small a minority would never be passed explicitly by Congress. It persists only because it is hidden.

The tax is not only unfair, it is also inefficient. Every tax involves costs in addition to the amount of the tax itself. For conscription, these indirect costs are the heavy burdens imposed on actual and potential draftees, their families, universities, employers—and most important, on all of us through the weakening of the political fabric of society.

Most of these costs cannot be assigned a money value. But for those that can, the commission estimates that "for each $1 in tax-in-kind collected, an average of $2.50 is forgone by the public"—i.e., that it costs $1.50 to collect $1. That is one reason why, when the books are kept properly to show all costs and all returns, a volunteer force is far less costly than a mixed force of conscripts and volunteers. But it is not the only reason.

A young man is conscripted for two years. He spends the first six months or so being trained, the last few months being processed for his discharge. We are lucky if he spends one year in active service. In addition, the time of other men must be used to train him and move him in and out of service.

To man a mixed conscript-volunteer force of 2.5 million men (the middle of the range of force levels considered by the commission) requires recruiting each year about 440,000 enlisted men (excluding officers). Even with today's low first-term pay and

conditions of service, at least 250,000 would be true volunteers, leaving 190,000 who would have to be conscripted or induced to volunteer by threat of the draft.

An all-volunteer force of equal effectiveness has less turnover and uses manpower more efficiently. As a result, it requires recruiting each year about 325,000 enlisted men, or only 75,000 in addition to the present number of true volunteers.

THE REAL ALTERNATIVES

Compel 190,000 men per year to serve. Or improve pay and conditions of service to attract an additional 75,000 volunteers out of the 1.5 million who each year turn 19. These are the real alternatives.

(By Milton Friedman)

President Nixon's proposal of a draft lottery as an interim step to an all-volunteer military force has received generally favorable notices in the public press. These notices have stressed the reduction in uncertainty for men aged 18 to 26. Under the proposed plan, a young man would know by age 19 how large a chance he ran of being drafted, and this chance would not be affected significantly by his future behavior. He could then plan for the future in light of this knowledge. He would not, as now, have to keep a weather eye out year after year for how his current behavior will affect the likelihood that he will be drafted.

This is certainly a significant advantage. But there are also disadvantages of the lottery, less obvious to the naked eye, that have been overlooked. When account is taken of these disadvantages, it is by no means clear that the lottery would be a major improvement. What is abundantly clear is that either the present system or the lottery is distinctly inferior to an all-voluntary military force. Yet, by reducing the decibel level of protest to the draft, enactment of the lottery might delay or even prevent the introduction of this fundamental reform.

HIGHER CALLS

The lottery shares the key defect of the present system: compulsory service by a minority of the young men of the relevant age. It requires one out of three or four young men to serve, regardless of their willingness to do so and often at great sacrifice, while their fellows pursue their careers.

By comparison with the present system, an obvious disadvantage of the lottery is that it makes service in the military subject to Lady Luck. It reduces the solemn obligation to serve one's country to the level of the Las Vegas gaming tables. The present system at least purports to select on the basis of rational criteria.

A less obvious yet far more basic disadvantage of the lottery is that it would increase sharply the number of young men who would have to be conscripted—possibly to more than double the roughly 200,000 a year who are now conscripted. The lottery would raise draft calls because it would reduce the number of volunteers. Many men now volunteer partly in order to avoid the uncertainty involved in present draft procedures. The new plan would largely remove this uncertainty. Hence many men who now volunteer would not do so. Their places would have to be filled by conscripts even more reluctant to serve—as demonstrated by their unwillingness to volunteer even reluctantly under present arrangements.

If the lottery were the only alternative to the present system, the choice would be very difficult indeed. The number of young men who would gain from the lottery is much greater than the number who would lose—but the gain to most of the gainers would be small, while the loss to many of the losers would be large. There is no problem in the human calculus that is more difficult than to balance quality against quantity. Nonetheless, if this were the only alternative, I would probably prefer the lottery.

A BETTER ALTERNATIVE

Fortunately, there is a third alternative. We can start immediately to move toward an all-volunteer armed force by improving *substantially* the conditions offered to new recruits. The entering pay is disgracefully low—about $50 a week including cost of food, clothing and housing. Other conditions of service—quality of food and housing, the matching of skills to tasks and so on—are deplorable. Every other consideration aside, simple humanity demands a major improvement in the compensation and other conditions of military service. Such an improvement would convert many reluctant volunteers into true volunteers and many who are now drafted or who do not now serve into volunteers of either category.

These measures would not only reduce the residual number of young men who would still have to be conscripted but they would also provide invaluable information on how responsive the supply of volunteers is to the conditions offered. President Nixon has committed himself to moving to an all-volunteer force once the demands of Vietnam have eased. Perhaps experience would show that his object can be achieved even sooner.

Whether that be so or not, a major step toward a system of military recruitment fully consistent with our traditions and values is greatly to be preferred to a minor improvement in a system of compulsory service that denies the very basis of our existence as a society of free men.

A VOLUNTEER ARMY

(By Milton Friedman)

A military draft is undesirable and unnecessary. We can and should man our armed forces with volunteers—as the United States has traditionally done except in major wars.

Only a minority of young men now enter the armed forces. Hence, some method of "selective service"—of deciding which young man should serve and which two or three should not—is inevitable. But our present method is inequitable, wasteful and inconsistent with a free society.

On this point there is wide agreement. John K. Galbraith and Barry Goldwater, the New Left and the Republican Ripon Society have all urged that conscription be abolished. Even most supporters of the draft regard it as at best a necessary evil.

The draft is inequitable because irrelevant considerations play so large a role in determining who serves. It is wasteful because deferment of students, fathers and married men jams colleges, raises the birth rate and fuels divorce courts. It is inconsistent with a free society because it exacts compulsory service from some and limits the freedom of others to travel abroad, emigrate or even to talk and act freely. *So long as compulsion is retained, these defects are inevitable.* A lottery would only make the arbitrary element overt. Universal national service would compound the evil—regimenting all youth to camouflage the regimentation of some.

THE PAY IS LOW

Two principal objections are made to a volunteer force:

(1) That a "professional" army endangers political freedom. There *is* a real danger, but it arises from a strong armed force not from the method of recruiting enlisted men. Napoleon and Franco both rose to power at the head of a conscript army. However we recruit, the essential need is to maintain close links between the officers corps and the body politic.

(2) That a volunteer army is not feasible because, at present terms, too few men volunteer. Little wonder: the starting pay, including cost of keep, is about $45 a week! We could readily attract more volunteers simply by paying market wages. Estimates of how much total military pay would have to go up vary from $4 billion to $20 billion a year.

Whatever the extra amount, we are now paying a larger sum in concealed form. Conscription is a tax in kind—forced labor exacted from the men who serve involuntarily. The amount of the tax is the difference between the sum for which they would voluntarily serve and the sum we now pay them—if Joe Namath were drafted, his tax might well run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. The real cost of manning the armed forces now, *including this concealed tax,* is greater than the cost of manning a volunteer force of the same size because the volunteers would be the men who find military service the most attractive alternative.

THE COST IS HIGH

Moreover, a volunteer force would need fewer recruits. We now waste manpower by high turnover, unnecessary training and retraining and the use of underpaid servicemen for menial tasks.

Adding to cost, low pay for men in service encourages extravagant veterans' bonuses—currently more than $6 billion a year (over 40 per cent as much as total military pay). Young men seeking shelter from the draft impose unnecessary costs on colleges and universities. Other young men fritter away their time in stopgap jobs awaiting conscription, while industry seeks men to train.

The monetary savings that would come from abolishing conscription are dwarfed by even greater nonmonetary advantages: young men could arrange their schooling, careers, marriages and families in accordance with their own long-run interests; draft boards could be freed from the appalling task of choosing which men should serve, deciding claims for conscientious objection, ruling whether young men may leave the country; colleges and universities could be free to pursue their proper educational function; industry and government could hire young men on their merits not their deferments.

One of the greatest advances in human freedom was the commutation of taxes in kind to taxes in money. We have reverted to a barbarous custom. It is past time that we regain our heritage.

NO DRAFTEES TO VIETNAM

(By Milton Friedman)

President-elect Nixon is committed to ending military conscription and establishing an all-volunteer armed force as soon as manpower needs in Vietnam decline substantially. That is a consummation devoutly to be desired. But, in the interim, the new Administration could reduce enormously the bitterness, dissension and division arising from the Vietnam conflict by taking a major first step toward an all-volunteer army: sending no more draftees to Vietnam.

This proposal raises two basic questions: Is it desirable? Is it feasible?

The first question hardly needs discussion. Men who agree on little else about Vietnam would agree on the desirability of not using conscripts to fight the war.

The key question is, therefore, whether it is feasible to man the Vietnam war with volunteers. I believe the answer is, Yes. Will it be easy to do so? The answer is clearly, No. But that is hardly decisive. The aim of national policy should not be to make life easy for government officials, whether civilian or military.

THE FACTS

Here are the basic facts. Currently, about 540,000 men are in Vietnam: 360,000 in the Army, the remaining 180,000 in the Marine Corps, Air Force and Navy. The Air Force and the Navy use no conscripts; the Marines, a negligible number. Hence, only the Army raises a problem.

The strength of the Army worldwide is about 1.5 million. Only about 600,000 are conscripts; the other 900,000 are volunteers.

On a purely arithmetic basis, it seems clearly feasible to provide 360,000 men in Vietnam out of the 900,000 volunteers plus any conscripts who might waive their exemption. But this is misleading. The problem is harder than these numbers suggest.

1. The adoption of the new policy, *if nothing else were done,* might well reduce the number of "reluctant volunteers"—those who volunteer mostly under the threat of conscription. To offset this reduction, it would be highly desirable to raise substantiallly the pay of men who serve in Vietnam—a step that is called for in any event on grounds of equity.

Even substantial increases in combat pay are clearly feasible on budgetary grounds. A rise of $1,000 a year for all men in Vietnam would cost around a half billion dollars. Yet this rise, even if flat and across the board, would raise the pay of enlisted men by something like 40 per cent. And the rise should not be across the board. It should be concentrated on the positions for which volunteers are fewest.

2. Currently, the term of service of enlisted men in Vietnam is limited to twelve months. Disregard officers, and suppose that all of the nearly 900,000 volunteers in the Army enlisted for a single term of three years. Then each could spend only one-third of his service in Vietnam, so that a maximum of 300,000 men could on the average be in service in Vietnam.

The policy of limiting the term of service in Vietnam to twelve months has been strongly criticized on strictly military grounds as highly unsatisfactory and inefficient. It takes several months for men to learn their jobs; their last several months are homeward-looking; at most, six of the twelve months are useful service. In addition, the perpetual rotation makes it impossible to establish those informal lines of communication that are at least as important in every large administrative structure as the formal channels. Lengthening the normal term of service would cut sharply the number of men needed in Vietnam and thus doubly facilitate a policy of no draftees to Vietnam.

3. A third possible difficulty is that the Army needs units rather than individual men in Vietnam and it is undesirable to segregate all Army recruits from the outset into conscript and non-conscript units. However, this difficulty is not relevant. Initially, units as a whole were sent to Vietnam but currently men rather than units as a whole are sent as replacements.

THE CHALLENGE

The difficulties are real. But they are far from insuperable. They offer a challenge to the men who run the armed forces, not a reason for rejecting a policy that offers so many advantages. President Nixon and Secretary of Defense Laird should set a definite and near date after which no more draftees will be assigned to Vietnam—unless they volunteer for that duty. There is no other measure that they can take that will do more to unify the country and at the same time increase the effectiveness of our military forces in Vietnam.

REORGANIZATION OF OUR ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS—SENATOR MUSKIE'S VIEW

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I am concerned that the agencies responsible for our programs in environmental control and improvement be provided enough manpower and funds to accomplish the tasks assigned to them by the Congress and the President.

Consequently, I am disturbed by an implication that the reorganization of these programs and agencies in the proposed Environmental Protection Administration will bring about reductions in Federal expenditures for environmental control and improvement.

As the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) pointed out in his statement before the Committee on Government Operations, these programs already are underfunded and undermanned. The shortages are particularly critical, for example, at the National Air Pollution Control Administration.

Mr. President, I wish to join Senator MUSKIE in warning that "we should not expect expenditures for these already unerfunded, undermanned programs to decrease." I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3, CREATING THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, JULY 28, 1970

Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in favor of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3, creating the Environmental Protection Agency.

The President has proposed to do by reorganization what I had proposed to do by legislation. Last December I proposed the creation of an independent watchdog agency to protect the environment, and on April 6 of this year I introduced a bill (S. 3677) to create the environmental quality administration.

Removing environmental regulatory authority from promotional agencies was the goal of my proposal, and it is the primary importance of the President's reorganization plan. At the same time, concentrating environmental protection programs in one independent agency should give our environmental quality efforts a measure of stability and coordination they have never known.

Few Federal programs and executive agencies have undergone the constant change in a relatively short period of the time that has marked our environmental efforts. Few Federal "Wars" are being fought with as much room for administrative improvement. Without a thorough reorganization—of the kind that the President and I have proposed—the pursuit of environmental quality will never achieve preeminence in the Federal government.

Even more important than the question of preeminence and organizational stability is the narrow focus of environmental protection without which no program will ever be successful. If the control of pollution is assigned to those responsible for the promotion of polluting activities at the same time, we compromise our goal of environmental protection. This is what happens now in the Department of Interior, in the Department of Transportation, in the Atomic Energy Commission and in several other agencies.

To meet these two criteria, organizational stability and autonomous environmental regulation, some have suggested the creation of a Department of Natural Resources or a Department of Conservation.

Whatever the merits of such a department to serve other purposes, such a move for these purposes would be a mistake for several important reasons.

First, it would ignore the fact that our environmental protection problem involves competition in the use of resources—a competition which exists in any department which must develop resources for public uses.

The agency which sets environmental quality standards must have only one goal: protection of this and future generations against changes in the natural environment which adversely affect the quality of life.

Second, we must recognize that environmental protection is not the same as conservation, although sound conservation practices should enhance the environment.

Finally, the traditional concerns of conservation activities have been too closely identified with the protection of natural resources separated from the population centers. Our primary concern must be man where he lives and the interrelationship between the natural environment and his man-made environments.

An independent agency, charged with the responsibility for developing and implementing Federal environmental quality standards, supporting basic research on problems of environmental quality, and providing technical and construction assistance to state, interstate and local agencies would reflect the national commitment we need if we are to avoid ecological disaster.

The President's reorganization plan meets these criteria. It transfers to the new agency the research, standards-setting, and grant-making authorities of the Federal Water Quality Administration and The National Air Pollution Control Administration. It includes in the new agency many of the other important environmental regulatory functions now scattered among The Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal agencies. At the same time, it excludes from the EPA any responsibilities for resource development or promotion. The single mission of the EPA will be the protection of the environment.

At the same time, there are several aspects of the President's plan which concern me. I hope that Administration witnesses will discuss these questions in detail.

First, there are important environmental protection programs that are not included in this reorganization.

Noise pollution control does not belong in the Department of Transportation. It should have been transferred to EPA in the plan.

The fragmentation of sewer construction grant programs confuses many communities and impedes effective coordination of water pollution control programs. Although the grant program administered by the Federal Water Quality Administration has been placed in this new agency, the programs of the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Agriculture have not. Further transfers might be appropriate in this area.

NAPCA and FWQA have been criticized for their failure to monitor air and water quality adequately. These capabilities presently exist in the geological survey and the Environmental Science Service Administration, and we should consider transferring them to the new agency.

The *second* focus of my concern with the reorganization plan is the ability of the new agency to evaluate health matters quickly and to act on those evaluations. The National Institute for Environmental Health Services was *not* transferred to the new agency.

There needs to be assurance that the new agency will have the capacity to identify potential environmental health problems. Had the FWQA used the capacity of the Bureau of Water Hygiene, earlier identification of the present mercury crisis might have resulted. The committee should be assured that the EPA will have the environmental health personnel to set the adequate standards for radiation and pesticides which are needed immediately.

My *final* concern with the President's plan is reflected in the message that accompanied transmission of the plan to Congress. The message states that the EPA should result in more efficient operation of the government

It goes on to say: "It is not practical, however, to itemize or aggregate the exact expenditure reductions which will result from this action."

We should not expect expenditures for these already under-funded, under-manned programs to decrease.

The manpower shortage is especially serious at the National Air Pollution Control Administration. At the time of enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967, the projected need for NAPCA manpower was for 1,900 in fiscal 1970. Instead, they are staffed about half that strength. The current employment is 961. The budget request for only 117 additional positions for NAPCA in the next fiscal year is clearly not adequate.

To demonstrate the effects of this shortage, one need only look at the progress on the first vital procedural step under the Air Quality Act. Of the 57 air quality regions which should have been designated in 1969, only 28 were designated. The Agency has only eight workers doing this essential work. A report prepared by NAPCA, but not released, shows that an additional 2,000 workers will be required by 1974 to implement the provisions of the Act.

A look at the funding history of NAPCA gives a good idea why there are manpower problems. In fiscal 1968, $109 million was authorized, but only $64 million was appropriated. In 1969, the authorization was $185 million, but the appropriation was only $89 million. And in fiscal 1970, $179 million was authorized but only $109 million appropriated.

The picture in water pollution control is not a great deal brighter. In fiscal years 1966 through 1969, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (now known as the Federal Water Quality Administration) remained from 1,000 to 600 positions below its authorized manpower, partly as a result of ceiling levels set by the Bureau of the Budget. The Agency is now within about 125 of its authorized level, but that is because the authorization has been cut back from 2,800 to 2,400. A 1969 study by the General Accounting Office showed that as a result of manpower shortages, there was insufficient technical assistance to the states and in some cases a hindering of the research effort and insufficient supervision of construction grants. Some additional positions have been added to the construction grant program as a result of additional appropriations for that program for fiscal 1970, but much improvement still is needed. We should not be cutting back authorized manpower when we should be greatly strengthening our water pollution control efforts.

The committee should request from the Administration accurate estimates of projected funding and manpower for the new agency over the next three years. The Congress should make clear its commitment to fund and staff the EPA. Without that commitment, EPA will be merely another example of unfilled promises.

I hope that the Administration witnesses who appear in the next two days will respond to the questions that I have raised.

On balance, the President's plan is a good one. If it is augmented by the additional transfers I have suggested and if it is administered and funded properly, the EPA would mark an important commitment to environmental quality.

These are big "ifs," but they represent the opportunity EPA would create. We could translate our concern into effective action, our financial commitments into results and our determination into strong enforcement. EPA will give us this chance, and I urge the Congress to approve the reorganization plan.

NO CONCRETE SUCCESS

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, Astronaut Frank Borman reported yesterday, August 17, that his efforts to obtain information about American prisoners of war in North Vietnam "had met with no concrete success" in Moscow and Stockholm.

This is indeed sad and disheartening news.

It may be recalled that President Nixon had requested Mr. Borman to make such inquiries during his tour of Europe. This was a part of the continuing effort of the administration to use every channel, official and unofficial, to persuade the North Vietnamese to comply with the Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War. The North Vietnamese Government is a signatory of the convention.

Mr. Borman also announced he would not seek an interview with North Vietnamese representatives in Paris, inasmuch as Hanoi has already announced that any such request would be refused.

We wish to thank Mr. Borman for seeking information which would mean so much to the wives and families of the Americans held prisoner by North Vietnam.

We pledge ourselves to continue to use every channel in the hope that Hanoi will change its strange and inhumane policy with respect to prisoners of war.

I ask unanimous consent that a news dispatch on the subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

POW MISSION CALLED FRUITLESS

PARIS, Aug. 17.—Frank Borman, the retired American astronaut on a presidential mission to obtain information about American prisoners of war in North Vietnam, said today he has met "with no concrete success" in Moscow and Stockholm.

He arrived here from Stockholm after stopping earlier in Moscow.

"I have had a very sympathetic reception" Mr. Borman said and then added: "It's a very difficult undertaking but with no concrete success that I can point to."

He said he would not seek an interview with North Vietnamese representatives in Paris. A Hanoi spokesman said last week that any such request would be refused.

DEVASTATING CRITICISM OF WELFARE REFORM BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the administration sent back to the Finance Committee what was supposed to be a rewritten bill aimed at reforming the welfare mess. The revisions were intended to stifle serious objections that arose when the committee began its careful study of the legislation as passed by the originating body.

The bill as it now stands is not improved. It is unacceptable for many varied and valid reasons.

Severe and devastating criticism of the reworked bill is being loudly voiced by individual citizens, some of whom—it might be anticipated—would be its most fervid champions.

A distinguished nationally syndicated newspaper columnist, Mr. Richard Wilson, correspondent of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, seriously questions the wisdom of passing the legislation. He says in his analysis that it would more than triple the welfare rolls in 13 States, and add millions in other States.

But three well-known advocates of welfare reform have made the most surprising arguments against the legislation, questioning it in clearly understood language before a national television network audience.

In my opinion, it will be worth while for every Senator to read and ponder the words of the three principals who appeared on the "Today," NBC television program on the morning of August 5, 1970.

They were Mrs. Betty Whaley, of the National Urban League; Chauncey Alexander, of the National Association of Social Workers; and Dr. George Wiley, of the National Welfare Rights Organization.

In the event that Senators are unfamiliar with the activities of the last named, Dr. Wiley, I also draw attention to an editorial published in the Washington Post of August 5, 1970.

In the transcript of the remarks by the participants on the "Today" show, they make the following points, should the administration's rewritten welfare bill be enacted:

First. That it will not bring about a reduction in the number of the Nation's large corps of social workers.

Second. That the proposal to furnish the so-called working poor families a guaranteed family income should be separated and dealt with apart from the provisions in the bill concerning welfare reform so the public can examine the Government income plan, especially its high cost and inequities.

Third. That the bill will create an even larger bureaucracy of Government social workers whose initial assignment will be to register on the welfare rolls 2 million persons who now have jobs.

Fourth. That the bill is also branded a very cruel deception as far as getting jobs for the poor.

Fifth. That the administration's chief developer of the welfare bill is labeled a clever "propagandist" who has oversold the bill as a reform vehicle.

Sixth. And that the true objective of advocates is a guaranteed income of $5,500 or $6,000 a year.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the NBC telecast, Mr. Wilson's column which appeared in the Washington Star, July 31, and the Washir gton Post editorial concerning Dr. Wiley be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S WELFARE BILL

RON NESSEN. We have in the Washington studios this morning Mrs. Betty Whaley, Chauncey Alexander and Dr. George Wiley. They all represent organizations which are opposed to President Nixon's welfare reform proposal. In a few minutes we'll talk to them about why they are against it and some ideas they have of how they think it should be improved.

The three guests are Mrs. Betty Whaley who represents the Urban League, Chauncey Alexander who represents the National Association of Social Workers, and Dr. George Wiley who represents the National Welfare Rights Organization.

Mrs. Whaley, let me read you something.

About ten days ago on this same program Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the President's counselor who played a big part in writing the President's welfare bill, said this: "The Urban League has a long and respected tradition of social work, but you know I'm afraid social workers are against this program because they feel it might put social workers out of work." Now, is that the reason the Urban League opposes the welfare reform bill?

Mrs. WHALEY. Well let me say at the outset that that is a glaring example of a half-truth. The National Urban League has been on record for the past ten years as being in support of a basic minimum income for all people. And in fact, Mr. Moynihan will recall that the National Urban League testified on request before the House Ways and Means Committee and at that time endorsed the concept of a basic minimum floored income. And even though we have some reservations about that legislation as presented to the House Ways and Means Committee—particularly around the inadequacy of the level of income—we were prepared to support it.

Since that time we've had serious questions about the revisions which are being presented now before the Senate Finance Committee. In direct response to the question about social workers being out of jobs—if you really look at, very carefully at the legislation—the kind of investigative methods, the kind of tracing fathers, the kind of trials that social workers would have to undertake under that legislation—we would not be out of work. Social workers would not be out of work—in fact we would be busy at work doing jobs that would completely negate the principles that we have been fighting for for so long.

RON NESSEN. Mr. Alexander, you are the representative of the Association of Social Workers. Are you or your members afraid they'll be put out of business if this bill is passed?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Indeed not! We feel, however, that the American public should know what this bill contains and we have fought for the principle of an adequate income base for many years.

We feel that there should be a direct separation of the income payments from the social services so that the American public, taxpayers, and the consumers can see what goes into money payments and what goes into social services. Then you can measure it and see what is being produced.

We're asking for a program that will clean up this bill. We're working for amendments to the bill in order to separate the money payments from the social services aspect.

We feel that there should be an adequate income floor. This bill mixes the two together.

It is administratively inefficient. It will provide—instead of additional money to the poor—only about $2 billion of the program will go to the poor. The rest will go in supplements to the states for administration and a number of other programs of that sort.

RON NESSEN. In principle, you accept the idea of a Federal floor on welfare?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have fought for that for many years, and we have asked for it, and we have tried to inform the American public of the fact that this is important in order to establish a base line in the country for adequate living for poor people.

RON NESSEN. But if this works the way the President says it's going to work, eventually the people on welfare would all go to work and there wouldn't be any more people on welfare—not very many. Wouldn't that indeed put your members out of business?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No indeed! We have plenty of business in a whole series of problems. Because just having a job does not eliminate some of the social problems that people have.

RON NESSEN. Do you agree with the President that his bill would indeed either force people to get jobs, train people to get jobs, encourage them to get jobs?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No we do not. We think that it, in effect, will create a large bureaucracy.

RON NESSEN. Larger than we have now?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes indeed. It proposes to register two million people—half of whom have jobs, and then in turn will only take care of about 250,000 people for job training, etc.

RON NESSEN. It holds out false hope then of getting a lot of jobs for people?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It's a very cruel deception and I think that it's important that the American public look into it.

RON NESSEN. Dr. Wiley, your button pretty well tells the story of your views. You think that $1600 is much too low.

Dr. WILEY. It's totally inadequate. The bill, as originally proposed, was a token change—it would make a small step toward changing the welfare system, and with the amendments that the Nixon Administration proposed to the Senate, it actually is an attack and denies income to more than seven and a half million people presently on Aid to Families with Dependent Children. These are the female-headed families who are the most vulnerable people in the population.

They are women and children who will be denied up to a $1,000 a year of present benefits that they are receiving under the old fashioned welfare programs who will be denied under Nixon's Family Assistance Plan.

That's a direct attack on poor people which is typical of the kinds of things that the Nixon Administration has been doing—to attack black people and poor people in a lot of subtle ways throughout their Administration.

And I think it is fraudulent on Daniel Moynihan's part. I've known him for a long time. He's one of the cleverest propagandists in this country—to sell this.

He's oversold it as a great sweeping reform. When it is not a great sweeping reform and when you undoubtedly examine the fine print, it actually denies a lot of money to a lot of poor people. And the fact that social workers have not been enthusiastic about it, is entirely because they don't understand the bill and most of the American public only understands Moynihan.

RON NESSEN. Let's go back a little bit. Now you do agree with the other two guests here that in principle the idea of a Federal floor on welfare is good, right?

Dr. WILEY. Oh yes, the principle of a Federal floor is excellent. The question is if you get the form of having a reform without the substance you have nothing. And if you take the momentum that has been generated by the militant pressure of welfare rights organizations on the welfare system which have exposed the inadequacies and the creaks and cracks which have caused a lot of people to be concerned about welfare problems, you take that initiative and you propose a token reform that does not really basically change the system. It seems to me that you're doing something that is deluding—doing a disservice to the entire country.

RON NESSEN. I'm not clear as to why you say this—not changing the substance. You're taking the responsibility for welfare away from the states.

Dr. WILEY. You're not, and that's what the people do not understand. This program is at least as complicated as the present program. It has layers and layers of administration in it. There will be a Federal Family Assistance Program. There will be a federal-state program to aid the aged, the disabled and blind. There will then be a supplemental state program to AFDC recipients—recipients would go to one place for food stamps, to another place for Family Assistance, to another place for supplemental aid. It would be, in fact, more complicated to the recipient than it is now.

Mrs. WHALEY. I think one of the major points that has to be recognized is that this legislation has been touted as finally giving some relief to the working poor.

What we have worked for is a federal subsistence for the working poor. In the original bill they were included. Now they are included in the state-supplemented program and we all know that in several states, particularly those in the South, can claim very little of the benefits now, and under this legislation now be able to forego their participation—simply give it to the Federal Government to administer—which certainly means the level of payments will be grossly inadeqaute.

The other population which is excluded is the unemployed head of the household. And Dr. Wiley has alluded to this and this is extremely crucial.

We've been concerned about keeping families intact. Mr. Moynihan himself said this bill would keep families intact. And immediately we see that this group is excluded from the Federal assistance.

RON NESSEN. Without meaning to contradict you, the bill is still being formed in Congress and some of these parts you mentioned—the Administration has said it would like, for instance, it would insist on including the working poor. I do want to ask Dr. Wiley, despite what you say in public I've always known you to be a realist—you don't really believe that $5500 minimum is at all politically realistic.

Dr. WILEY. With the reactionary Congress we have, with Russell Long and Wilbur Mills controlling those committees, no I don't think it's going to happen, that is likely to happen this year with those people. But the country has got to set the goal for itself for an adequate income for all people. It has just to say what it takes to live in our country today. And the Bureau of Labor statistics produced the figures upon which our $5500 demand is based. It wouldn't cost the country a nickel to set a goal of an adequate income. To define that $5500 is really what it takes. I might mention those figures were 1969. In 1970, it's $6000 for a family of four.

But we're talking about net income. Now you've got to set a goal of that kind of net income and when you talk about eliminating poverty you've got to talk about getting everybody, by work or by Federal income assistance, up to that kind of level. Now we have the money in the country to do it. We just don't have the political will.

Our organization is fighting to raise that issue and to fight for it and we say "$5500 or fight" and we mean just that.

RON NESSEN. In how many years would you think it would take them to reach that goal?

Dr. WILEY. We think it should be done this year.

RON NESSEN. But realistically.

Dr. WILEY. Realistically, it's as soon as the political muscle can be generated. As soon as a few of the Moynihans of this world start coming up for adequate income and get with the legitimate interests of poor people, we'll begin to move in that direction.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think we ought to study positive what needs to be done in this country. We need to set an adequate goal for income payments. We also need to have Federal administration to oppose the kind of different standards that are set in the various states, and thirdly we need a work program—or we need the government to back a work program, not a program to push people off relief but rather a program where the government says we will make jobs. We have 5% unemployment today where poor people could not get jobs even if they were trained for them.

Mrs. WHALEY. May I say the National Urban League says by 1976, the 200th anniversary of

this country, should be the goal to eradicate poverty.

RON NESSEN. Thank you very much. Well, we've heard three guests who represent organizations which seem to agree with the President's welfare proposals, in principle, but have a lot of disagreement with some of the details. This is Ron Nessen in Washington.

MR. WILEY'S HARD-NOSED BARGAIN

Washington's welfare families are about to receive some money to help meet their furniture needs, aid that should bring at least a bit of comfort and cheer to their often barren but over-crowded surroundings. Things many people take for granted—chairs, dressers and beds—simply have not made the meager shopping lists of people dependent on public assistance. The money is coming because Mayor Walter E. Washington was able to raise a $50,000 donation from the United Givers Fund's dividends and interest, another $50,000 from an undisclosed source and, from these two gifts, the possibility of a matching $100,000 from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

All of this is welcome news, but it leaves out the events that led to it. They focus on George A. Wiley, director of the National Welfare Rights Organization, who took charge of the bargaining with Mayor Washington and gave it this particular character. After Mr. Wiley learned that the city government itself had no money for the furniture, he led welfare recipients in two demonstrations at the welfare department headquarters, that wound up with rock and bottle clashes and more than 50 arrests.

Furthermore, he realized all along that most of his followers believed they were marching there to pick up checks. At a subsequent set of sessions with the mayor, Mr. Wiley hinted that he would reject an initial, good-faith effort by the mayor that had produced the UGF offer and the probable $50,000 matching grant from HEW. The ever-patient mayor somehow rounded up the rest, and after a total of seven hours and much speechifying by Mr. Wiley about how the first offer was a pittance and how the city was shirking its responsibilities, the aid was accepted.

Now many welfare families will cheer Mr. Wiley for his victory, and there's little doubt that he deserves some sort of an award for perseverance. But Mayor Washington, who didn't have to take this kind of treatment and the ugly tantrums that preceded it, seems to have taken the time and sheer hard work to do what Mr. Wiley might have been able to do just as well on his own—or *with* the mayor instead of against him. There are times when the politics of pressure may be necessary, and times when city hall must be the victim because Congress, the real overlord, wouldn't stand for it for a minute. But Mr. Wiley's antics have severely tested the sympathies of those who can do the most for the people he is attempting to serve.

SENATE UNIT SPOTLIGHTS "WORKFARE" ANOMALIES

(By Richard Wilson)

President Nixon called it "workfare" when he proposed to Congress in August 1969 a wholesale revision of national welfare policy with a $1,600 floor under the income of all families. It sounded attractive, even though more expensive.

Incentives to work would replace an unsatisfactory system that encouraged idleness, was unfair and was generally judged a monstrous failure.

The House passed a version of the Nixon welfare plan in April this year which required the working poor to register for jobs or work-training while receiving federal assistance.

But it was not until the "workfare" plan reached the Senate Finance Committee that there could be said to be anything like a firm grasp on its meaning, cost and magnitude.

On the probably sound assumption that hardly anyone outside the Senate Finance Committee, and certainly not the public at large, has the foggiest idea of what this colossal measure provides, here is some information:

Federally assisted welfare recipients under the present law numbering 10 million would automatically rise to 24 million, or an increase of one and a half times, in the first year of operation.

In 13 states the welfare rolls would be more than tripled.

In 16 states more than 15 percent of the population would be on welfare, led by Mississippi with 35 percent—yes, more than one-third—of its population on relief.

The total cost to the federal government of welfare would nearly double, from the present estimated cost of $4.5 billion to $9.1 billion.

Other information brought forth by Senator John J. Williams of Delaware in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee includes:

An unemployed woman heading a four-person family in New York on welfare and without income would receive more net income than a woman with an income of $7,000 earned at work. So who should work?

In Phoenix, Ariz., a woman with four dependents and $5,000 in earned income would take a drop of $5 in welfare benefits if she was promoted to a job paying $6,000. So how does promotion get you off welfare?

In Chicago a woman with four dependents and an earned income of $720 would receive total benefits of $6,142. But if she earned $6,000 a year at work, received housing benefits and paid her taxes, her total would be only $6,001. So why get a full-time job?

These are a few of the anomalies and contradictions which neither former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch nor the present secretary, Elliot Richardson, has been able to explain with any clarity to the Senate Finance Committee. They have arrived before the committee with their charts, beaming with confidence, and departed in confusion, not to say dejection.

What emerges is that there is a borderline, a shadowland, where incentive to work become highly problematical and subjective, depending on the personality of welfare recipients. It has to be borne in mind also that it costs money to work, in the form of transportation, clothing and meals away from home. For some the incentive to work must be powerful, indeed.

It becomes clearer that the Nixon welfare plan, if adopted, will be attended by a continuous procession of horrible examples which have aroused so much popular despair all through the history of publicly financed relief.

The Senate Finance Committee is probably the only barrier to the final adoption of some version of the Nixon welfare plan. Once this measure reaches the Senate floor, if it does, there will be attempts to increase the $1,600 income floor by double.

The idea was good. It was plausible in the beginning that the high "start-up" costs could be justified because the new system would lift people out of dependency and ultimately reduce the chronic costs of a permanent underclass in America.

Now, with the disclosures in the Senate Finance Committee, this premise becomes more doubtful, and the mind turns to the basic facts that federally supported welfare rolls will be more than doubled, the cost will be nearly doubled, and the incentives to work may not be sufficiently powerful.

AFL–CIO SPEAKS OUT ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at its meeting in Chicago on August 3, 1970, the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO issued a statement on higher education policy.

In that statement, the AFL–CIO stresses the urgency of financial aid to students. As education costs go up and tuition goes up and living expenses go up, our young people will be priced out of higher education unless we also maintain a rising level of student assistance.

The statement by the council describes the issue very well. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Today, more than ever before, it is essential that every young person have opportunity available for education beyond high school. There is need for a wide range of possibilities—colleges and universities, technical institutes, community colleges—designed to accommodate the varied interests, abilities, desires of young Americans.

Yet the United States today faces a serious crisis in higher education which may wipe out the progress we have achieved over the years and again create a situation in which only the rich will be able to afford college. The sons and daughters of working people will find college beyond their means if present trends continue.

On the one hand the costs of higher education have increased sharply and on the other hand federal funds and private contribution for higher education have both diminished. The result is that students and their families are having to carry an increasing share of the financial burden through higher tuition. Mounting unemployment has further added to the problem by making it more difficult for students to find summer jobs.

Tuition and required fees, on the average, have more than doubled in the past ten years. Dormitory charges have also doubled in the same period. Four years at the average state university costs $6,000 and as much as twice that for students from outside the state. At private universities a four-year education can cost as much as $18,000 to $20,000. These trends are rapidly accelerating to the extent that union members who have come to take it for granted that their children should go to college are now having to ask themselves whether they can bear the financial burden which would be entailed. For most families with more than one child of college age, the hope has already faded.

The problem is further compounded by Administration cuts in work-study funds, a program which has been particularly helpful to students from labor families. Even more dangerous is the Nixon proposal to discontinue federal subsidization of student loans for all young people coming from families with an annual income of $10,000 or more, a category which includes many union families. A student, each of whose parents is employed and earning only $5,000 a year, needing student loans of $2,500 a year and having to pay the current interest rate of 9¼%, would have to pay back $27,822, including interest, over a 20-year period. If he marries a girl from a similar background, the young couple could begin married life owing a mountainous debt of almost $56,000.

These facts add up to the question of whether higher education is to be available only to a rich elite or whether the opportu-

nity for higher education is to be the common heritage of all American young people. The AFL–CIO has always been firmly committed to the second of these alternatives.

If, then, higher education should be available to all, the second question remains: who is to pay for it? We reiterate the view, which we have often stated before, that tuition-free higher education like elementary and secondary education, is to the benefit of the entire society and the cost should not have to be borne by the students who receive it. Tuition-free community colleges located within commuting distance of students' homes provide the best hope for expanding higher educational opportunities. In addition, every young person should have available free higher education in a wide variety of institutions.

Today this cannot be regarded simly as a hope for the future; it is an urgent and present need if working people are to know that their children, as well as those of the rich, will be able to obtain the benefits of college education.

PERSPECTIVE ON DISENGAGEMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, seldom in our history has anything touched off more controversy and more inflamed oratory than the war in Vietnam. Feelings throughout the country have been intense and passions aroused.

Because of the high degree of volatility involved it is always welcome to find in the press a cool, objective, and analytical examination of exactly what is happening today and the course of recent events. Fortunately, there is such an examination available in this morning's Baltimore Sun, in the form of a column by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Richard Wilson. In the column he scrutinizes the train of events starting last summer when President Nixon made his historic tour of the world.

In the column he discusses the changed course of history that followed this Nixon visit to Vietnam, and he analyzes what has happened to our military and foreign policy since.

His column is well worth reading and I commend it to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIXON IS MOVING CAUTIOUSLY FOR MILITARY DISENGAGEMENT

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—It is a year now since President Nixon flew around the world, stopping in Vietnam and Communist Europe among other places, and the shape of events has changed. The change has been in the direction indicated by the President a year ago, but something new may have been added.

This new thing is hard to define and largely speculative but it would appear that the United States is in the first stages of what may prove in the next several years to be a large-scale disengagement from what were once considered its unavoidable world responsibilities.

Having said this, it at once becomes suspect as an exaggeration or as posturing some kind of profound insight. But it at least should be agreed that we are getting out of the fighting in Vietnam and not getting into a new fight anywhere else, including Israel.

But that is not all. We are beginning to talk about getting out of South Korea and to think about getting out of Western Europe. Once this process begins it takes on a velocity of its own as a kind of principle guiding separate actions, a subconscious sense of direction.

That is what has happened in the Nixon administration and it is not in practical effect so much different than what Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Mont.) and Senator J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.) have been advocating in varying degree all these years.

The element which threw them off was that in the process of disengagement Mr. Nixon does not propose to be badgered or have the United States taken advantage of. Senators Mike Mansfield and Fulbright could not see Cambodia in that light but only as an extension of the war and a reversal of the process of disengagement. Mr. Nixon viewed the Cambodia incursion as a modus operandi on the way to disengagement with the secondary effect of giving notice to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations that the United States would not permit itself to be taken advantage of while the process was under way.

The same conditions seem to apply in the matter of deploying anti-ballistic missiles. Mr. Nixon is not undertaking to do so anywhere near the scale projected by the Johnson administration, but because he does so at all blinds the peace forces in the Senate to this further modification of previous policy.

Foreign and defense policies have in fact been modified drastically in the year since Mr. Nixon flew to Asia and around the world to spread the word of the Nixon Doctrine. It was only a little more than a year ago since he turned American policy around beginning with the first announced withdrawals from Vietnam.

At this rate he will have completed the turn-around by the fall of 1972 and it is at least conceivable, with luck in the Middle East, that the United States will not be engaged anywhere in the world in a direct military confrontation. It could happen that a week would pass without a single American combat death. And if it prayerfully does, the change will have come so slowly that it may be scarcely recognized.

TEXAS TOURIST DEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOOSTS BIG THICKET

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have fought to establish a Big Thicket National Park in southeast Texas for many years. My bill, S. 4, would provide a park of not less than 100,000 acres in this beautiful area of Texas.

The establishment of the Big Thicket National Park would provide many benefits to the people of Texas and the Nation. One of the important benefits would be the increased tourism in this area.

The designation of an area as a national park greatly enhances its attractiveness to tourists. When the Big Thicket is made a national park, more people throughout the Nation will be informed of its beauty and aware of its fascinating and amazing natural features.

One of the many organizations which have endorsed and supported the proposal to establish the Big Thicket National Park is the Texas Tourist Development Agency.

The chairman of this agency, Mr. John R. McCarty of Dallas, Tex., was one of the many witnesses who appeared to testify in favor of my bill, S. 4, when field hearings were held in Beaumont, Tex., on June 12, 1970. These hearings were conducted by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McCarty testified strongly in favor of my proposal for a park of not less than 100,000 acres and stressed the importance of tourism to the state and its economy.

The newsletter of the Texas Tourist Development Agency carried a very interesting article about the Big Thicket and the hearings held on my bill in their June 1970, issue, on page 1. This issue was No. 10 of their volume 3.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

BIG THICKET IN HANDS OF COMMITTEE

(By Ben Holub, Jr.)

The fate of the proposed 100,000-acre Big Thicket National Park is now resting in the hands of a nine-man parks committee of the U.S. Senate with Senator Alan Bible of Nevada as chairman.

Thirty-five witnesses testified at a federal hearing in Beaumont June 12 before Bible, National Parks director George Hartzog and members of the parks staff.

John R. McCarty of Dallas, vice-president of Frito-Lay Inc. and chairman of the Texas Tourist Development Agency board, was among those testifying at the hearing.

Anyone wishing to submit further testimony that has any bearing on the creation of the park had two weeks following the hearing to file a statement. Bible's committee will evaluate all testimony, then wait for the parks service recommendation on how the area should be developed, if at all. Chief controversy at the Beaumont hearing centered around the size of the proposed park.

Senate Bil 4, introduced by Senator Ralph Yarborough, who attended the hearing to speak on behalf of his bill, asked Congress to claim 100,000 acres of the Southeast Texas wilderness area for creation of the park.

East Texas interests, including some chambers of commerce and owners of land on which the park would be located, favor a 35,000-acre park.

In his statement, McCarty stressed the importance of tourism to the state and explained how the addition of the Big Thicket National Park would help increase the number of visitors coming to Texas for a vacation. He said research by the Texas Tourist Development Agency clearly shows people are inclined to visit an area containing more than one national park. Texas now has Big Bend National Park and Padre Island National Seashore.

Congressman Bob Eckhardt of Houston spoke out for the larger park saying he did not think the 35,000 acres would be large enough. He also suggested a section of the park be named for the late Lance Rosier, the noted East Texas conservationist whose lifetime dream was the creation of a Big Thicket National Park.

O. R. Crawford of Evadale, president of the Texas Forestry Association; Arthur Temple of Diboll, owner of Temple Industries; Cecil Reid of Austin, executive director of Sportsmans Clubs of Texas; Jim Webster, Kirby Lumber Co. of Houston; and Herman Brown of Lufkin, manager of the Angelina County Chamber of Commerce, were among those testifying in favor of the 35,000-acre park.

Dempsie Henley of Liberty, chairman of the Texas Indian Affairs Commission and considered one of the authorities on the Big Thicket, endorsed the 100,000-acre park, noting that tourist dollars would well offset any loss that area industry might suffer.

SUMMER NEWSLIGHT ON TEXAS

Copy continues to appear across the United States as the result of TTDA's travel writer tour last November. Here are some of the latest entries:

Deane Heller of Key West, Florida, writing for King Features Syndicate, which is distributed nationwide, lends help in the cause to save the Big Thicket of East Texas. "Down East Texas way there's a new battle cry to save the Big Thicket, an unbelievable wilderness and last refuge of some of Texas' rare wildlife. It's being waged by a small but hardy group of dedicated citizens who have banded together to form the non-profit Big Thicket Association of Saratoga."

Continues Mrs. Heller: "The wealth of flora and fauna is staggering to the imagination. For example, there are an estimated 1,000 specimens of fungi and algae along in the Thicket that have not as yet been classified."

Of the Big Thicket, the magazine states: "Way down deep in the pine and magnolia shadows of East Texas, in a land called 'the biological crossroads of North America,' the Big Thicket Association is battling to save the last remaining botanical wilderness in Texas from the deadly hum of a chain saw. Time is running out. Once the big thicket blanketed 3,350,000 acres. Now only 300,000 acres remain."

THE B–1 BOMBER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, earlier today I made a few remarks on the B–1 bomber, which we have known as AMSA up until this past session of Congress. Those remarks were directed at an attempt to clear up what might have been some misunderstandings from a debate held earlier in this discussion of the military authorization bill.

Because we shall be voting tomorrow on the so-called Brooke amendment. While I do not think the Senate will be foolish enough to accept it, that chance always exists; so I think it is necessary now, more than ever, to back up a real blue chip in the deterrent stack; namely, the B–1.

A very fine article has been written by John L. Frisbee, senior editor for plans and policy, for the April 1970 Air Force Space Digest. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE B–1—BLUE CHIP IN THE DETERRENT STACK

(By John L. Frisbee)

The B–1, USAF's heavy-bomber candidate to replace the B–52, was conceived in 1963 as AMSA (Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft). Ever since, there have been almost continuous attempts to destroy it in embryo.

The B–1 has been attacked on grounds of nonutility, marginal utility, and disutility. Its critics have ranged from Whiz Kids to members of Congress to intellectuals of the campus, the think-tanks, and the mass media. Their analytical methods cover the spectrum from slipstick and computer to gut reaction. Notably—almost uniquely—the opposition has included no military men of renown from any of the services. The B–1 has been more than thrice-blessed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Not even the most dedicated B–1 opponent has questioned the ability of the US aerospace industry, with the technology of the 1970s, to build a better bomber than the B–52, basically a product of the early 1950s. Rather, B–1 critics have questioned the rationale underlying the requirement. Their key question has evolved from, "Will we need *this* bomber ten years hence?" to "Will we need *any* bomber by the end of the decade?"

So far, a majority of legislators has answered "Yes" to both questions, or has at least been unwilling to say "No" to either. And so the B–1 has survived. In mid-May a prime contractor will be selected to produce five prototype and two test models. If all schedules are met, the first true strategic bomber to be developed in this country in nearly two decades will fly in 1974. This says much for the viability of a concept that has been under siege for seven years.

But the B–1's greatest battle is yet to come—the fight for a go-ahead on production. If that battle is won, the new bomber could begin to join SAC's operational forces in 1978. By that time, the newest B–52s—the G and H models—will be from sixteen to eighteen years old. Their maintenance and modification costs, though not precisely predictable, are bound to be extraordinarily high.

The B–52 could, certainly, be kept operational for another ten years—perhaps longer—if we were willing to pay the cost. But how effectively it could penetrate Soviet defenses a decade from now is quite another question.

Visualize the odds against the B–36 (the newest of which would have been sixteen years old in 1970) in penetrating today's Soviet defenses. The performance gap between the B–36 and the B–52H is comparable to that between the B–52H and the B–1. And a weapon system that will not perform creditably in war is not a credible deterrent to war.

This brings us back to the key question, "Will we need *any* bomber by the end of the 1970s?" It is primarily a conceptual—not a technical—question. The answer will be affected by economic considerations (how soon and how many), but fundamentally, a decision must be based on need.

The question of need has to be examined in the context of US defense strategy, which is in a state of transition. During most of the past decade, our strategy has been to deter nuclear war by Assured Destruction—the ability of US strategic forces to survive an enemy attack, and in retaliation cause unacceptable damage to the aggressor. A corollary of Assured Destruction has been Damage Limitation, or the capacity to hold down the level of damage an attacker could inflict on this country. Damage Limitation received considerably less attention than Assured Destruction. Until recently, we have not had the technical means to defend against enemy missiles or to construct bomber defenses that promised to stop a high percentage of attacking aircraft.

Assured Destruction was achieved through a combination of land-based missiles, sea-based missiles, and bombers. As the missile force grew in size and reliability, the bomber was thought by earlier Administrations to contribute less and less to deterrence. Bombers took several hours longer than missiles to reach their targets. The bomber was believed easier to defend against, and to some it appeared needlessly duplicative of the destructive capacity of the missile forces.

Nevertheless, a reduced number of bombers was retained in the deterrent forces as insurance and because of certain characteristics unique to the bomber. It could, for example, be used effectively in a show of force, as in the Cuban missile crisis. It could carry much larger weapons than missiles, and was acknowledged to be useful against very hard targets that could not be destroyed by smaller warheads delivered less accurately by missiles. In this respect it provided a Damage Limitation dividend, as a counterforce system to be employed against hardened enemy missiles that might be held in reserve after an initial attack. The bomber also could be launched on ambiguous warning and recalled if the warning proved to be false. And the continued existence of US bombers forced the USSR to invest heavily in air defense systems, presumably diverting resources that might otherwise be used to build stronger offensive forces. Finally, the bomber force was regarded as a hedge against Soviet technological breakthroughs that might cancel or reduce the value of our missile forces.

All of these reasons for keeping the bomber alive and well were valid. And they will remain valid, along with other bomber contributions to deterrence, which will be noted later.

Nevertheless, many—probably a majority—of those who believed the bomber only marginally useful were convinced that a relatively low level of US Assured Destruction capability (perhaps twenty to twenty-five percent of the Soviet population and industry) was enough to deter nuclear war regardless of how many Americans might die in a Soviet attack on this country. Therefore, they questioned the need for *any* bombers and rejected the requirement for a new bomber to replace the B–52. This rejection has come to a head at a time when the bomber has, in fact, assumed more, rather than less, importance. The reasons relate both to strategy and to conceptual changes caused by technology.

For many months the Nixon Administration has been conducting an exhaustive study of national-security policy and strategy. There have been vague but persistent rumors that the President intended to revive a strategy resembling the "Massive Retaliation" of the Eisenhower-Dulles years, though it was difficult to understand the feasibility of such a strategy in view of the size and sophistication of Soviet strategic forces.

The first comprehensive, but still general, statement of the new Administration's defense policy was contained in President Nixon's "State of the World" message to Congress—UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1970'S: A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE. Many questions were left unanswered, but the message roughed in a nuclear strategy that is neither Massive Retaliation nor Assured Destruction at a minimum level.

Several passages in the President's message are pertinent to the future makeup of our strategic forces. (*Italics have been added.*)

The overriding purpose of our strategic posture is political and defensive: to deny other countries the ability to impose their will on the United States *and its allies* under the weight of strategic military superiority. We must assure that all potential aggressors see unacceptable risk in contemplating a nuclear attack *or nuclear blackmail or acts which could escalate to strategic nuclear war*, such as a Soviet attack on Europe.

For the foreseeable future Europe must be the cornerstone of the structure of a durable peace.

Our NATO allies . . . view the U.S. commitment to deter Soviet aggression as being based mainly *on our maintenance of a powerful strategic posture.*

The United States will keep all its treaty commitments. We shall provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us, or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security and the security of the region [referring to Asia] as a whole.

[*And in the section on General-Purpose Forces*]: The prospects for a coordinated two-front attack on our allies by Russia and China are low because of the risks of nuclear war and the improbability of Sino-Soviet cooperation. *In any event, we do not believe that such a coordinated attack should be met by U.S. conventional forces.*

A U.S. strategic posture adequate to prevent other countries from imposing their will not only on us, but on our allies, must meet two tests if it is to be credible to a potential aggressor. First, it must leave no

doubt in his mind that the U.S. would emerge from a nuclear exchange with some relative advantage over the attacker, in a position to defend itself against third nations, and able to recover more rapidly than could the attacker. Second, other nuclear powers must believe it a reasonable possibility that the U.S. would take some form of positive strategic action against them if they were to threaten really vital U.S. external interests. Such a U.S. force should have a stabilizing influence because of its multiple deterrent effect and since it could not be used rationally to initiate unprovoked aggression.

The strategy outlined in the President's message will require relatively large and versatile strategic forces, including a bomber that can retain its effectiveness well into the future. Also, some of the Soviet technological advances that the bomber has helped insure against have actually occurred. Since they threaten principally the effectiveness of US strategic missiles, they have the effect of enhancing the value of the bomber as a deterrent system. For example, the security of our land-based missiles is sensitive to the accuracy and warhead yield of enemy missiles. The unexpectedly rapid expansion of the Soviet missile force—particularly of the very accurate SS–9, which can carry a twenty-megaton warhead or three five-megaton warhead or three five-megaton weapons—is a real and present threat to American ICBMs.

The invulnerability of our sea-based missiles is sensitive to enemy antisubmarine warfare. In his Fiscal Year 1971 Posture Statement, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird stated that our Polaris submarines are still invulnerable, but that he could not guarantee continued invulnerability beyond the next five to seven years. For that reason, advanced developmental work was proposed on the Underseas Long-Range Missile System (ULMS), which would enable our missile-carrying submarines to operate in a vastly larger ocean area and still hit targets in the USSR or China.

The now-modest Soviet ABM system has an undetermined growth potential, and hence poses a future threat of uncertain proportions to both land-based and sea-based missiles. While ULMS will increase the Soviet problem of *detecting* US missile submarines, the longer flight time of ULMS probably will simplify the Soviet ABM *defense* problem so far as submarine-launched missiles are concerned.

In view of these Soviet counterforce developments, it would be a dangerous risk to allow the bomber element of the US strategic forces to deteriorate through obsolescence.

One of the bomber's greatest values as a deterrent has been given all too little attention. The bomber, in combination with missile forces, creates an almost impossible timing problem for an enemy planning an attack on the US. Put yourself in the shoes of the Soviet tactician considering a first strike to disarm the United States. The situation might look something like this:

Any one of the three US strategic systems, if used independently of the others, can cause an unacceptable level of damage to the USSR. For a surprise attack on the US, I must, therefore, plan it so that his missiles and bombers are reduced in effectiveness to a point where my defenses can handle them. It's particularly important that I get his bombers, since I want to hit only military targets. The bombers, because of their accuracy and high-yield weapons, have by far the best capability to hit my own hardened or mobile military targets in return. If I knock out the US bombers, the American President's options are reduced pretty much to attacking my cities with missiles. It then becomes a war against populations—a hard choice for any President. He may prefer to negotiate with us. How shall I plan my attack?

Now, US officials have said that they will not fire their missiles at my country until one of my warheads has actually exploded over US territory. It's reasonable to assume they mean this. Launching missiles on warning that may be ambiguous—perhaps even false—is simply too risky for them.

I'll use my land-based ICBMs with high-yield warheads against the hardened US land-based missiles. My submarine-launched missiles (SLBMs) are shorter range, less accurate, and have smaller warheads, but they will do very well to destroy his bombers if I can catch them on the ground.

The US Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) gives the Americans about twenty minutes' warning of attack by my ICBMs. Other US warning systems can pick up my SLBMs five to ten minutes before impact on SAC bases.

I'm going to optimize my surprise attack so my ICBMs will *arrive* over the enemy's missile silos at the same time my SLBMs hit his bomber bases. But wait a minute. That won't work. His radars will pick up my ICBMs even before I launch my SLBMs from a few hundred miles off the US coast. He'll flush his bomber force under positive control and, after my missiles have exploded over US territory, he'll give his bombers a go-ahead. And his surviving missiles, too.

Let's try it the other way. I'll optimize my attack against his bombers. I'll have to launch SLBMs and ICBMs for simultaneous *detection* by the US so as not to flush his bombers on warning. But that won't work either. If all goes very well for me, US radars will detect my SLBMs five to seven minutes from the most exposed SAC bases. Simultaneously, his BMEWs radars will see my ICBMs about twenty minutes' flight time away from US missile sites. That leaves the Americans twenty minutes to alert their National Command authority and maybe fifteen minutes after my first SLBM detonates over a SAC base to make a final decision, transmit orders, and launch their ICBMs.

Let's leave the Soviet planner with this dilemma. It will get worse for him when our satellite warning systems are perfected and when the B–1 becomes operational, with its faster reaction time, ability to disperse widely—even to highways if necessary—vastly improved penetration capability, and varied load of standoff and gravity weapons.

Several leading B–1 opponents have suggested that our need for a bomber may be obviated if the US adopts a policy of launching missiles on warning of an attack. That proposition can be put in a different way. If we do not have a bomber with a credible ability to penetrate Soviet defenses, *we would have to* launch missiles on warning, accepting the horrifying possibility, however remote, that the warning might be fallacious. That is a sobering thought.

Another plus for the strategic bomber is its usefulness in limited conventional warfare, as the B–52s have proved in Vietnam. Where heavy, concentrated firepower is needed, there is no substitute for the big bombers. The B–52s have had no fighters to contend with and very little ground-to-air opposition. But equally ideal conditions will not always be present. The B–1's supersonic speed, low-altitude capability, and advanced electronics will allow us to continue to use heavy bombers in a far less permissive conventional-war environment if future contingencies demand it.

But the B–1, a sophisticated and expensive aircraft, can be justified only if it makes a major contribution to the primary task of our strategic forces—deterrence of attack on the US and our allies.

The fundamental question, "Will we need *any* bomber by the end of the 1970s?" has been answered affirmatively by the Nixon Administration. So, it appears, has the next logical question, "Will we need *this* bomber—the B–1?" An economy-minded Administration is not likely to endorse a nearly $2 billion investment in developing and testing the prototype of a system unless it believes that system essential to national security. A reversal by DoD is unlikely unless there should be a gross reduction in the Soviet/Chinese threat, perhaps as a product of the SALT talks. The decisive arena has shifted from DoD (until two years ago strongly anti-B–1) to Congress (until two years ago overwhelmingly pro-B–1).

In his "State of the World" message, President Nixon said:

"Because planning mistakes may not show up for several years, deferral of hard choices is often tempting. But the ultimate penalty may be disastrous. The only responsible course is to face up to our problems and to make decisions in a long-term framework."

There is no decision on weapon systems to which that warning applies more pointedly than to the B–1.

A RAVE REVIEW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is not often these days that a group of young people gets a rave review. I suspect that that fact says more about what adults say and read than it does about what our young people do.

Therefore, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report that "The Suitcase Theater," a group of high school students from Michigan, has been performing in Europe this summer and has been receiving high praise for their production, "These Truths."

Mr. President, I am indebted to a letter from the Honorable Jerome H. Holland, U.S. Ambassador to Sweden, for a report on the success of this group in Europe. Ambassador Holland saw excerpts of the production at our embassy in Stockholm July 29.

However, I must admit their success comes as no surprise, for the Suitcase Theater has received good reviews in this Nation.

As a matter of fact, when I wired the troupe on the eve of its departure in June, I said:

> So let me thank the troupe in advance for the fine job you are bound to do in Europe this summer.

Now I would like to say thanks again, this time for making my prophecy correct.

To document the fact that I know a good thing when I learn about it, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Holland's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Stockholm, Sweden, August 4, 1970.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Senator from Michigan, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: On July 29, our Embassy was honored by the visit of the group of high school students from the Greater Lansing area known as "The Suitcase Theatre." The group was accompanied by their director, Mr. Powell Lindsay, Mrs. Lindsay and other interested citizens. It was a magnificent and heart-stirring experience to see and hear these talented youngsters present excerpts from their production ". . . these truths . . . ," a story of the life and times of the Negro in America. And of course their Embassy audience is but a small part of the vast group of people whom they are reaching here in Sweden and throughout

Europe. We have heard nothing but praise for their exceptional talent and for the wonderful appearance they make. What is even more important is the fact that the group represents various racial and religious groups—a hallmark of the American system.

Junior ambassadors such as these from the great city of Lansing help to make our tasks easier in explaining the American way of life and our accomplishments to the Swedish people. May I take this opportunity to add my congratulations to those of the many other people who have been privileged to hear and see this group.

I know that the President is very interested in young people such as these, and I would certainly appreciate it if you would use your influence to see if they might be invited to visit the White House at some time.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JEROME H. HOLLAND,
American Ambassador.

VIRGINIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, four Virginia specialists in dentistry are traveling in Brazil as voluntary instructors under the Partners of the Alliance program.

The Partners of the Alliance is a nonprofit, private organization which seeks to develop economic and social self-help programs throughout the Western Hemisphere. I believe it is a strong adjunct to the Alliance for Progress.

The Virginians now visiting Brazil to conduct seminars in dental techniques are: Dr. Paul Bauman, an orthodontist; Dr. Douglas C. Wendt, a specialist in prosthodontics; Dr. Albert Paulsen, a specialist in periodontology; and Dr. Charles F. Fletcher, who has worked extensively in the fields of dental trade and laboratory relations.

Virginia has made a number of contributions to the Partners of the Alliance.

I ask unanimous consent that a listing of Virginia's contributions to this program be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STATE OF VIRGINIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Virginia joined the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance at the end of the year, 1967. At this time, Santa Catarina, Brazil, was designated as the Sister State of Virginia.

Before that time, contributions for the partner's program were made primarily by high school students to various parts of South America as follows:

Yorktown High School raised $550 for materials for desks for students in 2 villages in Bolivia, $550.00.

Mount Vernon High School students raised $200 for hand tools to be used in a training center in Peru, $200.00

Falls Church High School students donated $200 for teaching aids to be used in Piaui, Brazil, $200.00.

Herndon High School students sent $70 for educational materials for a rural school in Ecuador, $70.00.

After Virginia joined the Partners of the Alliance, and Santa Catarina became its Sister State, the following contributions have been made:

Herndon High School students (Herndon, Va.) raised $450 for the Escola Serte (school) in Santa Catarina. The Herndon Business and Professional Women's League assisted in this project, $450.00.

The Business and Professional Women's League of Virginia contributed funds to equip a language center in Florianopolis, Santa Catarina, $100.00.

Dr. Roscoe Hughes of the Medical College of Virginia contributed several boxes of scientific books to the University of Santa Catarina, $100.00.

The Virginia Partners Committee sent hospital equipment and fishing equipment (the Atlantic Ocean borders the eastern coast of Santa Catarina) to the Partners Committee in S.C., and distribution was accomplished under the auspices of the Ministry of Health there, $26,000.00.

The Virginia Partners shipped medical supplies consisting of polio vaccine and worm infection medicine. (Varig Airlines of Brazil assumed the cost of travel) A U.S. Public Health doctor, a nurse, and a student went to Santa Catarina and established an immunization program for polio, and a worm eradication program, $18,950.00.

Chesapeake Seed Corporation of Virginia donated 100 pine tree seeds for experimental tree farm in Santa Catarina, $100.00.

POLLUTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT BY GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, mercury contamination of our Nation's rivers and lakes has been very much in the news lately.

In recent months, witnesses appearing before the Senate Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and the Environment have described the widespread presence of this chemical in our Nation's waters and the threat it poses to human life and health.

In the other body of Congress, the distinguished Representative from Michigan, Mr. O'HARA, has responded to the discovery of mercury with an imaginative piece of legislation. His bill would use the Federal Government's contract authority to require industries doing business with the Federal Government to take appropriate action to curb pollution of both air and water.

This legislation is particularly significant in terms of mercury pollution. An investigation by the Representative from Michigan has disclosed that of eight industrial firms charged by the Justice Department for contaminating waters with mercury, no less than five either presently hold Federal contracts or have held them in the past.

Recently, a House Judiciary Subcommittee held a hearing at which Mr. O'HARA testified on his bill. I found his testimony very enlightening on the extent that Government contractors contribute to the pollution of our environment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TESTIMONY BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES G. O'HARA BEFORE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, AUGUST 6, 1970

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee today to testify in behalf of my bill, H.R. 17222.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, deals with the federal government's responsibility to do everything within its power to discourage the pollution of our environment.

I will not spend the committee's time with rhetorical descriptions of polluted air, which we all observed in abundance over the eastern seaboard last week, nor with the deteriorating condition of our rivers and lakes.

Volumes have been written about the environment and the damage wrought daily by man's ecological insensitivity and headlong rush to increase the gross national product, often at the sacrifice of the quality of our air and water, and often with real threat to human health and life.

I do want to mention recent discoveries of mercury contamination of some of our greatest lakes and rivers—contamination which competent medical experts believe could prove deadly to humans.

Adjoining my Congressional district, a great natural recreational resource—Lake St. Clair—has been damaged, possibly irreparably, by mercury contamination.

Mercury is an insidious element, difficult to detect, and, in fact, was only recently discovered to be present in quantity in our waters.

Other pollutants are more obvious, and anyone with eyes and a relatively sensitive nose is well aware of what we are doing to our air and water.

Happily, more and more Americans are recognizing that our environment is being degraded. They are calling for action to reverse this trend.

Congress several years ago stepped to the forefront of the environmental conservation effort with landmark legislation to curtail air and water pollution. Today, with Americans demanding action and offering their strong support for legislation, Congress has stepped up its activity in this area.

Typical of this activity are the two bills before you today. Both apply old, accepted principles to the subject of conservation. If enacted into law, they will attack pollution in bold and effective ways.

At this point, let me say that I wholeheartedly support the legislation introduced in the House by my able colleague, the gentleman from Arizona. This legislation would enable every citizen who feels strongly about pollution of his environment and wants to do something about it, to fight it through the courts.

I hope that the subcommittee will see fit to recommend its enactment into law. Mr. Udall's legislation could be used by any citizen against any polluter. My bill is more limited, but I believe it would have a most beneficial impact on the quality of the nation's air and water.

The legislation I have introduced is aimed at a specific group of industries and businesses—those that do business under contract with the federal government.

Mr. Chairman, for many years the Congress has required that private firms doing business under contract to the Federal government guarantee their employees safe and healthful working conditions in performance of the federal job and that the employees be paid the prevailing wage in their area or industry and not less than the national minimum wage.

We did this through a series of bills, the first dating back to the early 1930s. The pace-setting bill, commonly known as Davis-Bacon, dealt with construction contracts. Walsh-Healey applied similar rules to procurement contracts.

The third bill, dealing with suppliers of services, was enacted in 1965. I was pleased to have had a hand in writing that law, along with a great Senator, the late Pat McNamara.

It has been a most effective instrument, benefitting hundreds of thousands of workers.

These three pieces of labor legislation threw the weight of federal contract authority behind fair wages and safe working con-

ditions for employees of firms doing business with the federal government.

These laws simply require that every federal contract contain guarantees in the area of wages and working conditions. Those firms who will not sign such a provision, cannot be considered for federal contracts. Those firms who accept federal contracts and then violate the provision applicable to safe working conditions and fair wages can be placed on a list which is then circulated to all federal departments and agencies and be denied contracts with the federal government for a period of three yeras.

Recently, it occurred to me that the Service Contracts Act could be used as a legislative template for application to pollution control by federal contractors. H.R. 17222 is the result.

This bill would require that all contractors hired by the federal government to perform work in excess of $10,000 pledge, as part of the contract, that they will comply with all local, state or federal regulations against air and water pollution which apply to them, and further with any additional standards or regulations which the Secretary may deem proper in keeping with his responsibility to prevent damage to the environment. The bill further requires that any federal contractor failing to abide by this clause, and whose contract activities result in further air and water pollution, will be required to take any corrective measures necessary to abate the pollution.

To protect the public interest, no payment will be made to the contractor until the Secretary of the Interior determines that the anti-pollution clause has been satisfactorily met.

Following the pattern of the labor bills which I described earlier, the Secretary is directed to prepare a list of contractors who do not abide by their obligations under the terms of this act. The list is to be distributed to all federal agencies and those on the list can be barred from receiving federal contracts for a period of three years or until the Secretary certifies that the firm has agreed—again to the Secretary's satisfaction—that in the future the contractor will comply with the terms of the contract.

Finally, the Secretary is directed to prepare, and to distribute to the appropriate federal agencies, a list of those firms whether federal contractors or not, located either in this country or outside it, whose activities have significantly contributed to pollution of United States air and water. This list would also be circulated among federal agencies and those firms would be denied federal contracts until the Secretary certifies that they have provided assurances that they will control pollution by their plants and facilities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a tough bill, and it is meant to be. I do not for a minute believe that the federal government should be in the position of subsidizing a polluter, or of tacitly endorsing pollution in the execution of a federal contract.

To our credit, we are moving forward in the national effort to control air and water pollution. We can assume that by exercising the present air and water pollution control laws, we will eventually catch up with the federal contractor who either wantonly or carelessly pollutes the environment.

But we would do so after the fact, and would have no way of forcing him to clean up what he has already messed up. In addition it could take months—and in some instances it has taken years—to force compliance under the present laws.

Finally, under present statutes, the federal government must be invited by the governor of a state to take action against an intrastate polluter.

My legislation, Mr. Chairman, would put industrial firms interested in lucrative federal contracts on notice that they could not pollute in performance of those contracts. It would encourage those firms who have been federal contractors in the past to begin immediately to take corrective action against pollution. In any event, any firm who wants federal business would be forewarned that no pollution would be tolerated.

Since pollution control devices installed by a plant in order to comply with federal contract obligations would in all probability be used for *all* plant production, this legislation would have a generally salutory effect on industrial anti-pollution efforts.

The power of such action should not be underrated.

The federal government is, undisputably, the nation's largest purchaser of goods and services from private enterpise. The General Services Administration informs me that it enters into some 700,000 procurement contracts annually. The Defense Department reports more than 250,000 contract "actions" amounting to $10,000 or more.

Mr. Chairman, there is at this time little factual data available on the extent to which federal contractors are guilty of pollution.

However, in preparation for my testimony today, I attempted to gather information which would indicate the scope of the problem.

You will remember that last week the Justice Department filed suit against 10 firms which it accused of discharging mercury into rivers and lakes in seven states.

Of those 10, two (Oxford Paper Co., Rumford, Me. and Weyhauser Co., Longview, Washington) are presently working on federal contracts amounting to more than $10,000. Three others. Diamond Shamrock Co., Muscle Shoals, Ala., Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., Augusta, Ga., and the Pennsalt Chemical Co., Calvert City, Kentucky, have previously held substantial federal contracts and can reasonably be expected to seek federal contracts in the future.

Another major mercury polluter, which claims to have halted discharges into the Detroit River and Lake Erie but was one of the first linked to mercury pollution of those waters, is the Wyandotte Chemical Corp., which also possesses contracts with the federal government.

This is just the tip of the iceberg. Virtually every expert with whom I talked indicated that they believe that a considerable number of federal contractors number among the polluters now being identified in lawsuits and legal actions across the nation.

If this bill becomes law, we will be able to move immediately to require that they do their work for the federal government in a manner that will not dirty the air or foul a river.

The idea of using the federal government's contractual power to achieve such an objective is not new. In 1965, President Johnson issued Executive Order 11288, which was primarily aimed at abating pollution from federal facilities.

However, Section Seven of that Executive Order went beyond federal facilities and directed that the "head of each department, agency and establishment shall conduct a review of the loan, grant and contract" and I emphasize contract, "practices of his organization to determine the extent to which water pollution control standards similar to those set forth in this order should be adhered to by borrowers, grantees or contractors with respect to their operations in the United States."

The results of this executive-ordered review were to be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

It is, I think, appropriate to say that this section of the Executive Order received little attention. I have reviewed the reports. Most of them dealt heavily with their loans and grants, and only lightly, if at all, with contracts.

Some agencies, notably the Defense Department and the Tennessee Valley authority, did report the inclusion of anti-pollution clauses in certain contracts, but generally these contracts had to do with construction or the use of land, not procurement contracts, to which my legislation is primarily directed. The present administration has also directed the agencies to review, as part of their responsibility to abate pollution, how contract practices affect pollution control efforts.

In his executive order 11514, President Nixon asked the heads of all federal agencies, consistent with Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act, to "review their agencies statutory authority, admnistrative regulations, policies and procedures, including those relating to loans, grants, contracts, leases, licenses or permits in order to identify any deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit or limit full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act."

The Executive Order calls for submission of agency reports to the Council on Environmental Quality by September 1, 1970.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be frank about this legislation. It was introduced early this year in response to discovery of the contamination of Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie by Mercury from Dow's plant in Sarnia, Canada, and from the Wyandotte Chemicals Corp. plant in Wyandotte, Michigan.

The contamination from the Dow facility has had a devastating effect upon sports fishing in Lake St. Clair. In addition to the dollar loss to businesses that rely upon sports fishing to generate customers, there has been an incalcuable loss in recreational opportunity on the lake.

It was in response to this serious situation that I introduced this legislation. I saw it as a vehicle for informing the public and the Congress about the extent to which companies holding federal contracts contribute to environmental pollution and the destruction of our ecology.

The legislation itself is not perfect. For one thing, it emphasizes water pollution, when I intended that the legislation would apply to all types of pollution. If President Nixon's plan to form a National Environmental Protection agency becomes reality, then the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior in my bill should properly be transferred to the director of that agency.

But, I have full confidence in this subcommittee and know that it will use its wisdom and expertise to temper and perfect my bill.

In conclusion, let me just repeat two main points: my preliminary evidence indicates that a number of industrial firms doing business with the federal government are among the nation's major polluters.

Until our present laws catch up with them, which may be some time, they can continue to pollute while collecting money from the federal government.

This legislation would provide a tool for swift action against those firms, while serving notice to all firms who hope to do business with Uncle Sam that they will have to take appropriate anti-pollution action.

We have enacted general legislation, and we are making progress in the fight against pollution. But we would remiss, Mr. Chairman, if we did not take every opportunity to control pollution.

At the present time, the federal government is in a position of passing laws against pollution while at the same time sanctioning pollution by its contractors. This legislation would put an end to that.

DR. LESTER HUSSEY, NEW PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the course of an individual's career, there is no greater honor than to be chosen as

the top elected officer of the organization which represents one's own field of activity.

Recently, Dr. Lester Hussey, a Spokane, Wash., optometrist, was elevated to the position of president of a major national health care organization, the American Optometric Association. This was duly reported by the Spokane Spokesman-Review and the Spokane Chronicle.

Dr. Hussey is a native of Spokane, where he attended high school and was graduated from Whitworth College.

Following completion of his studies at Whitworth, Dr. Hussey attended the Los Angeles College of Optometry, from which he was graduated with the doctor of optometry—O.D.—degree in 1938. He has been in practice ever since that time in Spokane, where he has become a highly regarded leader in his church, in civic and service organizations, and within his own profession.

Dr. Hussey has given himself unstintingly to the work of such community service organizations as the Spokane Central Lions Club Blind Aid Committee, the Spokane Rehabilitation Center, the Washington State Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the Spokane Employ the Handicapped Committee, and a number of other civic groups.

During more than 32 years of service to his community and his many patients, Dr. Lester Hussey has also found time to serve effectively as lay leader of the Spokane District United Methodist Church. He and his wife have raised two fine sons. One son attends the Claremont, Calif., College of Theology as a graduate student preparing for the Methodist ministry; the other will soon enter his second year of preoptometry studies at the Pacific University College of Optometry in Forest Grove, Oreg.

Dr. Hussey has also been a powerful force in his local and State optometric organizations. He has served many years in various capacities within the American Optometric Association, which he now serves as president.

I congratulate Dr. Lester Hussey on his record of achievement which lead to selection by his fellow optometrists for the highest and most respected position his profession can bestow. I am proud to note that, again, one of our native Washingtonians has come to the forefront when effective leadership in his area of interest is of paramount importance. I feel sure that Dr. Hussey will do an effective job as president of the American Optometric Association, and I know all the members of the Washington State congressional delegation share my hope that the year ahead will be satisfying and productive for Dr. Hussey and the organization of the 15,000 members he represents as president.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MONDALE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the TV-radio section of the Saturday Review of August 15 contains an excellent article entitled "Mondaleism," written by Robert Lewis Shayon. The article commends one of our most able and articulate Senators. I hope that this kind of forthright, honest appeal to the American people will gain additional advocates and practitioners.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

MONDALEISM

(By Robert Lewis Shayon)

Television news recently exposed Senator Walter F. Mondale to national audiences in a big way, and, having discovered him, it would do well to put him on camera more frequently. He practices a vivid, new style of political communication, which I christen Mondaleism and which ought to replace the old style, called McLuhanism. The latter, as all political disciples of the Canadian prophet now know, adjusts one's rhetorical image to the medium employed.

If you use radio, get hot; if television, stay cool. Heat and cold in TV politics are mutually exclusive: The life of one is the death of the other. If you're hot on television (like the Nixon of 1960 and 1964) you repell; if you're cool, you involve. The thermal difference between the old and the new Nixon on TV, according to his McLuhanized brain trust that fashioned his 1968 campaign image, meant the difference between success and failure.

Since then all politicians have obeyed McLuhan's First Law of Politics, and the result has been civic entropy. This concept, borrowed from the Second Law of Thermodynamics, suggests that effective energy depends on transacting states of being: As long as hot and cold interact, there is life; when the contraries are neutralized, there is rundown, nothing, frozen assets.

Senator Mondale illustrated how much useful, civic energy can be radiated by being hot and cold at the appropriate moments. First, *CBS Evening News* showed him pounding the table during a Senate subcommittee hearing, while he heatedly told the chairman of the Florida Citrus Growers that employers of migrant workers are mangling and destroying the lives of underpaid and undereducated workers.

The witness had indicted NBC News for smearing all migrant workers as "bums" in that network's recent documentary on migrant labor, *Migrant—An NBC White Paper*. Senator Mondale slammed the polished Senate table in moral indignation and told the witness that it was a migrant worker boy on the program who had described himself despairingly as a "bum," because of the rootless, hopeless conditions of his youth. The Senator's action was intensely human, a reflex of the years of dedicated commitment he has made to the improvement of the plight of the migrant laborers (years, oddly enough, during which no TV cameras were present, until NBC made the hearings news with its own program). The heat was truly on, and it was quite a welcome shock to see a politician acting like a man and not a politician.

The cool part of the Senator's energetic behavior pattern came a few days after the hearing, when CBS invited him to be the guest of its weekend program *Face the Nation*. There were no explosions as he talked about the state of the powerless poor in America: the blacks, the Indians, the people of Appalachia, the Mexican-Americans. But there was controlled conviction as he warned of the dangers inherent in the South's resistance to desegregation of the schools, and he expressed shock at the continued apathy of the American people over the wretched conditions of the subgroups in our nation who have no one to speak up for them in the councils of power. "I can't live with what I've seen," said the Senator, "and I feel it is my duty to do all that I can to get the nation to shift policies." The assertions were dispassionately made, or, so it appeared, superficially, but the heat in them was apparent. Politicians do not usually make such personal statements on television programs.

Senator Mondale, questioned about the resistance of blue-collar workers to the demands of black citizens, declared his faith in the former. They helped to elect him in industrial Minneapolis. They are decent citizens, the Senator said. But his expressions of shock at the "apathy" of the electorate to injustice to minority groups stood in contradiction to his faith. He was hot and cold, here as well, but that is also a good thing. A politician who is all hot or all cool suggests a computerized mind busily clicking as it manipulates. Senator Mondale transacts within himself as he does with his fellow citizens. He may blow hot or cold, but he blows an honest breath. As long as there is an energy gap between American ideals and American practices, there is a need for politicians who are two and one at the same time. Television, take note of Mondaleism.

AWARD OF 30-SHIP DD–963 PROCUREMENT TO LITTON INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on June 29, 1970, I made a statement in this Chamber in which I seriously challenged the award of the 30-ship DD–963 procurement to Litton Industries, Inc. I challenged it on several bases. Among my observations were the following:

First. The rationale for awarding a $2 billion shipbuilding contract to a company already carrying the largest new ship construction backlog in the industry—a backlog already so diverse as to test management capability even without the addition of 30 new highly complicated destroyers. It is to be remembered that the Navy has already awarded a contract for nine LHA ships to this same shipyard. And prior to that the Navy announced this shipyard as winner of the as yet unfunded FDL program.

These contracts are in addition to submarine and merchant contracts presently under construction. The problems connected with handling a complex and diverse shipbuilding backlog are well-known. And the Pascagoula facility is a new and untested facility with no experience in handling a huge and highly diversified backlog.

Second. The dangers from the standpoint of the U.S. Government of concentrating a large portion of our new shipbuilding programs—including $2 billion plus total package procurements—under one corporate entity in the very face of the problems engendered by doing this in the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. case. A failure on the part of this shipyard's management in just one of these programs could have a severe impact upon our Navy's posture for the 1970's.

Third. Use of the "multiyear" contract developed by the McNamara regime, which requires that Congress pay tremendous "Cancellation Charges" should it decide in future years not to make appropriations for continuance of the program. This concept transfers control, for all practical purposes, out of the hands of Congress and virtually precludes an effective congressional review on an annual basis.

Fourth. The dangerous impact on fu-

ture competition leading in the long run to higher procurement cost in destroyer construction of an award of the Navy's entire destroyer program for the 1970's to a shipbuilding company which has already constructed a new shipyard on the basis of prior total package awards enabling it to drive out the proven destroyer-building capability throughout the country with a resultant serious impact on our defense mobilization base which the Congress has tried to protect over the years.

Recently, the President's Blue Ribbon Defense Panel Report of July 1, 1970, was released. In connection with the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel Report, I was fortunately able to obtain a copy of a staff report on navy ship procurement and construction made to the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel but which has not as yet been made public although no classification restriction has been placed upon it.

That staff report of outstanding experts, prepared under the cognizance of the first Comptroller of the Department of Defense, Wilfred J. McNeil, corroborates independently the very points that I made in my challenge of the Litton award.

Among the observations, conclusions, and recommendations of these highly knowledgeable and qualified experts are the following:

(1) Yet, if the Navy goes ahead with its announced intentions to seek series type production contracts for major ship programs in a single yard, there will be almost total concentration of major Navy work in three . . . yards—Newport News, Litton, Electric Boat . . . over a significant period of time. During this hiatus for the remainder of the yards, they may well lose their capability to respond to Navy shipbuilding requirements or go out of business altogether. Although the Navy cannot and should not attempt to keep all its former suppliers of ships in business the maintaining of a responsive production base and a healthy, competitive environment . . . is certainly as important as experimentation with new procurement techniques.

If recent history on moderately large Navy ship orders is any indication, large package ship procurements constitute a serious risk to the contracting shipyards' corporate survival. The DD963 destroyer program currently planned for 30 ships represents about $3 billion. A ten percent loss in performing on this contract ($300 million) would exceed the net worth of either of the shipyards competing for that program by at least a factor or two.

(2) As concentration of work in a few yards progresses with a high degree of specialized in each, there will be serious reduction in competition for Naval ships. In addition, there could also be a substantial reduction in the nations' total shipbuilding capability. This loss of a competitive environment in itself could offset the economic advantages of series production . . . The Navy . . . with respect to its combat vessels, must be concerned not only with the maintenance of an adequate production base but also with the continuation of a healthy competition within that base . . .

(3) In order to (a) insure an adequate production base for combat ships and (b) Continue to generate competition between shipyards for most classes of ships—The Navy should take such action as is appropriate to distribute major multi-ship prime contract awards among two or more yards.

(4) In order to (a) maintain a healthy competitive environment and (b) Insure a viable production base for Navy combat ships and auxiliaries—Prime contracts for series production of a single class of Navy ships should be awarded to more than one yard whenever the total order exceeds ten ships.

(5) In the case of the DX (DD963), the Navy could by now have a prototype ship virtually ready to sail and less money would have been spent than has by now been paid for paper only.

There it is, Mr. President, straight from the experts picked by the Department of Defense—experts who never consulted or contacted me—and experts with whom I have had no contact with regard to this subject or the DD–963 program.

It would appear, Mr. President, that the Department of Defense does not let its right hand know what its left hand is doing—that the Department of Defense acted directly in opposition to the strong advice and recommendations of its own chosen experts.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1970

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am pleased and honored to cosponsor the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 introduced today by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH). This bill is farsighted and seeks to meet directly many of the problems faced by this Nation in its transportation policies.

I am particularly pleased that the bill faces squarely the problem of housing destroyed by Federal highway construction. On June 19, I introduced S. 3992, a bill to authorize the use of highway trust funds to construct housing where necessary in order to assure that there is satisfactory, decent, safe, and sanitary housing comparable to the one from which a person is being displaced before the highway construction can go ahead. It provided that the funds needed to replace the housing would be included in the construction costs of federally aided highway projects.

Therefore, it is with a great deal of satisfaction that I see that section 17 of the bill provides that:

The Secretary shall approve as a part of the cost of construction of any project under any Federal-aid program which he administers the cost of (1) constructing new housing, (2) acquiring existing housing, (3) rehabilitating existing housing, and (4) relocating existing housing, as replacement housing for individuals and families whenever he determines that a proposed project on the Federal-aid system cannot proceed to actual construction because replacement housing is not available and cannot otherwise be made available as required by law.

Section 17 contains other provisions that are equally innovative and farsighted. Upon the affirmative recommendation of the Governor of a State, the Secretary of Transportation can approve the use of highway funds for the operation of public transportation facilities. The Secretary can approve funds for the operation of public transportation facilities including the purchase of equipment, to reduce losses in those cases which will facilitate expanded service, and facilitate the continuation of service which would otherwise be reduced or abandoned.

This fits in directly with the bill (S. 3499) I introduced February 24, 1970, which would provide Federal funds for retirement of debt incurred as the result of capital equipment purchases by public transportation agencies where otherwise service might be reduced or abandoned or where low-income riders would be adversely affected. I am hopeful that the Senate can make this greater commitment to public transportation this year.

I wish to again commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on his comprehensive and forward-looking legislation.

A REIGN OF TERROR IN AMERICA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, a reign of terror exists in America today.

One needs only to look at the headlines of the morning newspaper to prove this tragic and frightening fact.

Here is a sampling:

OMAHA.—Policeman killed when dynamite explodes in his face while investigating a citizen complaint.

MINNEAPOLIS.—Dynamite explosion rips Federal Building, causing a half-million dollars damage. Twenty sticks of dynamite shatter windows blocks away and hurl 300-pound concrete blocks through the air.

ATLANTA.—Three businesses damaged by firebombs.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—Man charged with bombing two department stores.

WASHINGTON.—Telephoned bomb threat forces evacuation of United States Courthouse.

Mr. President, I hasten to point out this is only a single day in our country. Couple these terrorist activities with the sniper killing of a policeman in Chicago, add the death of a judge after he and his jurors were kidnaped at gunpoint from their own California courtroom, and place with this a dozen other such incidents which are occurring with an all-too-certain frequency in every part of this Nation. It is then that you realize the magnitude and significance of what is happening in America.

We do, indeed, live under a reign of terror.

The foundation of organized government is threatened by these terrorist tactics. No person is safe. No building affords any degree of protection. We are at the mercy of these killers who stalk every city day in and day out.

These anarchists have resorted to terror tactics in a determined effort to undermine organized government in this country. Public officials, policemen, and the average citizen are being forced to live in fear of another bombing.

This wave of terrorist attacks threatens now to sweep our entire country—from ctiy to town and from the campus to the streets.

It is imperative that we act without delay. Congress must take immediate and positive steps to see that these anarchists are dealt with promptly and severely. We must stop this wave of terrorists attacks before they undermine the structure of our government.

It is imperative that we arm our State and local police with the weapons they need to combat these attacks on our in-

stitutions and our way of life. We must give them the tools they need to operate in a climate of terror that exists in every part of this country.

It is for these compelling reasons that I have introduced S. 3924, a bill to prohibit the transportation and possession of explosives when not in compliance with the law. The bill is now before the Committee on the Judiciary. I will assure the Senate that I will encourage the committee to report this legislation to the Senate without delay. By the same token, I now ask that the Senate consider this bill at an early date after it is placed before this body and act on it with a sense of urgency demanded by the situation at hand.

We cannot afford delay. Lives are at stake. Property must be protected. All this—and more, too—for the life of our cities and even our country is seriously imperiled by the wave of anarchy and terror which is now sweeping America.

Our lives and our Government is threatened from within. We must act now—or I am afraid it will be too late.

EARTH WEEK

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on the motion of North Dakota Governor William L. Guy last week, the National Governors' Conference meeting in Osage Beach, Mo., unanimously supported a resolution for the Governors to declare the third week in April Earth Week in their respective States.

This is a very significant step toward making Earth Day an annual event, one which I enthusiastically support. Last fall, when I proposed the Earth Day effort, we felt it would have been a success had 300 to 400 colleges and universities joined in. However, last April 22, we saw a dramatic nationwide participation of 2,500 colleges and universities, 10,000 high schools and grade schools involving eight to 10 million students, and additional thousands of communities.

Earth Day represented a great national awakening to the crisis of our environment. And its greatest meaning will be if it is seen as a beginning—a beginning of a momentous, persistent, well-organized national effort built on environmental groups in every community in the land, to restore the quality of the American environment.

An annual Earth Week would be an invaluable event in continuing the involvement that is going to be essential to meet the environmental challenge. As the Governors' Conference resolution said, there is a compelling need to encourage a continuing commitment by all interests—including education, agriculture, business, labor, and civic and private organizations—to work to solve our grave environmental problems.

Furthermore, an annual Earth Week could provide a yardstick for our environmental progress. In looking back, it would assess whether we actually are making headway in dealing with this country's environmental crisis. In looking forward, it would greatly assist the Nation in establishing new objectives and priorities for meeting this critical challenge of providing quality as well as quantity in American life.

In addition to the Earth Week resolution the Governors' Conference adopted important resolutions regarding the mercury pollution disaster and the need to establish a national environmental clearinghouse to register chemicals of all sorts and monitor their impact in the environment.

As chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources and Environmental Management of the Governors' Conference, Governor Guy is to be commended for the excellent work of the committee and the conference in taking these important and forward looking environmental positions.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the three environmental resolutions—Earth Week, National Clearinghouse, and mercury standards—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at this point:

EARTH WEEK

Whereas, there is an urgent need to promote a broader awareness and understanding of the environmental crisis facing each and every state in the United States; and

Whereas, there is a compelling need to encourage a continuing commitment by all interests including education, agriculture, business, labor, and civic and private organizations, to work to solve these fundamental environmental problems;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that we as Governors assist in focusing the nation's attention on environmental problems and their solutions by declaring the third week in April "Earth Week" in our respective states and seek the broadest participation in its activities.

NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE AND REGISTRATION OF CHEMICALS

Whereas, over 6,000 chemicals are released into our air, water and land; and

Whereas, there is a need to study and analyze all chemicals before they are introduced into our environment; and

Whereas, there is a need to continuously monitor all chemicals in the environment;

Now therefore, be it resolved that the National Governors' Conference urges that a national clearinghouse be established to 1) register all chemical compounds released into our environment, 2) pre-screen each chemical as to its ecological effects prior to its introduction, and 3) continuously monitor these chemicals in our environment, and that this action by the member Governors be transmitted to the President as evidence of our sincere and genuine concern.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION STANDARDS

Mercury contamination of the Nation's streams poses danger to the health and well-being of our people and has brought forth expressions of protests and dismay from all parts of our Nation.

Approximately one-third of the states have streams which are involved with mercury contamination, thus indicating a need for corrective activity on the federal level.

The states directly involved with this grave problem have, by their respective separate actions, diligently pursued diverse courses of remedial and corrective measures, all well intentioned but lacking in uniformity so essential in interstate matters. Thus, due to the interstate nature of our streams any corrective activity involving regulatory measures should emanate on the federal level and should afford a just and equal criteria for all of the states involved.

It is imperative that certain measurable minimum amounts of allowable mercury outflow should be established which would not constitute a health hazard to the people of America. The Federal Water Quality Administration is the appropriate agency to initiate corrective measures which would be effective and binding throughout the several states; therefore, the National Governors' Conference urges the Federal Water Quality Administration to immediately initiate action for the determination of a minimum amount of mercury outflow which would not constitute a hazard to public health and upon such determination promulgate regulations having equal application throughout the Nation sufficient to insure that such minimum mercury outflow is not exceeded and that such regulations contain appropriate enforcement provisions.

COCA-COLA AND ITS MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARM WORK FORCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I wish to share with Senators and the many other persons concerned with the plight of the farmworker, the testimony of Mr. J. Paul Austin, president of the Coca-Cola Co., before our committee last month.

Coca-Cola was called to testify following the public revelation in the recent television documentary, "Migrant—an NBC White Paper," that it was directly involved in the problems of migratory labor in its Florida citrus operation. Testimony by the Project for Corporate Responsibility further confirmed that Coca-Cola indeed had farmworkers that were living and working under less than desirable conditions.

In a forthright statement before the subcommittee, Mr. Austin recognized the problem and admitted to Coca-Cola's corporate responsibility for correcting this situation. In his prepared statement and in response to questions, he made specific reference to his company's knowledge of the problem for over a year. Since learning of the problem, a thorough study was commissioned to develop a comprehensive plan for correcting the problems.

Coca-Cola now has a plan of action which it believes will put that company on the track of correcting the situation. It is spelled out in some detail in their statement, which I will submit for the RECORD.

I think I can speak for most of my colleagues on the subcommittee when I say that we were impressed and encouraged with the ambitious efforts and intentions of Coca-Cola. We are all deeply concerned that Coca-Cola will institute the plan as soon as possible, and that it be carried forward to fruition without any undue delay.

The subcommittee will continue its interest in the plan, and we intend to maintain a close watch on its progress. Equally as important is our hope that implementation of the plan will set a precedent for all agribusiness throughout the Nation to institute similar plans. Perhaps with this action we will begin to see progress toward the solution of the plight of the farmworker—a plight which continues to be one of the greatest blights upon our American vision of economic and social justice for all.

Mr. President, in view of the significance of the Coca-Cola statement, and the great interest expressed by so many

persons upon the problems of the migrant, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Austin be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF J. PAUL AUSTIN

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am accompanied by Mr. J. Lucian Smith, the President of The Coca-Cola Company Foods Division.

Although The Coca-Cola Company grows only some three percent of the Florida citrus crop, we have become directly involved in the problems of the migrant worker. Throughout the United States, there are some three million farm workers; more than 250,000 of them are characterized, in the terms of this Committee's 1969 Report, as migratory workers. The Coca-Cola Company employs in its citrus groves in Florida approximately 300 full-time groves employees and a daily average of about 1,000 seasonal workers—migrants—over the eight month orange harvesting period.

As a citizen, I am concerned about the plight of every migratory worker in the nation; as a corporate executive I am directly responsible for the migratory workers employed by my Company. For the past year and a half, we have been examining the problem of the migrant in our citrus groves in an attempt to develop a program through which he can live and work in human dignity and economic security. The question we have asked is not whether to help the migrant worker; but how to help him—in a lasting way for himself and his family.

As this Committee well knows, the problem of the migratory worker in America is an enormously complicated one. It is, first and foremost, a human problem of severe psychological isolation. It is an economic problem involving health, education, citizenship and family structure. The migrant worker has problems of malnutrition, physical handicap and mental health, and most significantly, he suffers from a profound sense of futility.

To the migrant, the problem seems overwhelming. To the migrant's employer and the migrant's government, the problem is equally complex and frustrating. Money can build houses and buy food, but money alone cannot provide the environment in which a man can live and grow with human dignity, economically secure in a life motivated by hope for himself and his children.

We do not pretend to have all the answers to this complex question, but we are determined to do something about it. Portions of the program we have instituted may not work as we planned, but we are dedicated to a persistent and successful effort to place the employees in our groves on a parity with all other Company employees.

Our interest in citrus operations began with the acquisition of the Minute Maid Company in 1960. In the summer of 1967 these operations became part of a new Company Division. The Coca-Cola Foods Division, of which Mr. J. Lucian Smith was appointed President.

In late 1968 I began to read more and more about the crusade of Cesar Chavez in California on behalf of migrant labor. I called Mr. Smith in Houston and asked him to make certain that workers in our groves were not living in the sub-standard conditions that Mr. Chavez described for the workers in California. Mr. Smith personally visited the groves in December, 1968. He was so upset by what he saw that he came immediately to Atlanta to talk to me. He told me that many of the migrants in our groves were living in conditions that "could not in conscience be tolerated by The Coca-Cola Company." At that meeting he and I agreed that we must establish a program to correct these conditions and commit whatever funds and talent were necessary to do the job.

At that meeting I told Mr. Smith that my experience as Vice Chairman of the National Alliance for Businessmen had convinced me that the so-called "unemployables" could be placed on corporate payrolls and with appropriate job training and special care were capable of becoming permanent members of the nation's labor force.

Our first instinct was to move promptly and change the physical situation in which the migrant worker found himself trapped. We soon realized, however, that merely to provide housing and transportation, without facing up to the basic human problems involved, would do little more than temporarily ease the hardship of the migratory worker. A culture of despair and poverty, vested by generations of neglect, had to be rooted out and replaced. To do so involved the entire spectrum of social services and skills: child care, nutrition, adult education, psychological assistance and medical treatment.

We established a task force of both Company personnel and outside consultants, including Scientific Resources, Incorporated (SRI), of Union, New Jersey. The task force used a variety of study techniques.

During February, 1970, SRI sent three men and one woman into our citrus groves, one of whom worked as a migrant so that he could experience the life of the migrant in his job and his environment.

They talked to the migrant workers and their families and interviewed them in depth, to discover their psychological attitudes and their view of their major problems and needs.

They examined the housing of our migrant workers, and their problems in obtaining health care, education and other basic social services from the private sector as well as from government agencies.

They discussed the plight of the migratory workers with local, state and federal officials in Florida and representatives of local groups, religious and social, that had been active in the field for many years.

The task force made its recommendations to me in March of this year. I approved the recommendations and their immediate implementation. Mr. William Kelly, an experienced personnel executive of our Company, who was a member of the task force, was appointed a Vice President of the Foods Division with the sole duty of getting this job done.

We all realized that if the program were to be a success, it was essential that the migrant workers themselves participate in the development of the solution to their own problems. In recent years, as a result of our nation's experience with a variety of anti-poverty programs, we have come to recognize the importance of self-help and participation by the disadvantaged themselves in programs to raise their standard of living. We believe this is also true with respect to the migrant worker. He is the individual most immediately affected by our program and if it is to have its maximum impact, he must recognize that he has within himself the capability—the power—of improving his condition.

Many of the most important segments of our program were suggested by the migrant workers. For example, they repeatedly expressed the need to identify with the Company, the desire to own or rent their own homes at fair prices, the need for job security and life and health insurance, for training programs and grievance procedures, for better communication with their superiors, and a real measure of involvement in the communities in and near which they live.

From the Company's standpoint, we wish to identify those among our migrant workers with the basic talent and leadership ability to rise not only in our citrus operations but throughout the whole structure of our organization. Every migrant with the talent and ability to do so will have the same opportunities to rise in The Coca-Cola Company as any other employee. One of the key responsibilities of the vice president in charge of this program will be to identify and help motivate the migrant workers with this potential. In short, our plan is to place every groves and harvesting worker in the same status as every other employee of The Coca-Cola Company.

THE SEASONAL HARVESTING EMPLOYEES

Last year, during the eight month orange harvesting period, The Coca-Cola Company employed an average of 1,000 seasonal harvesting workers per day. Like most of the Florida citrus industry, they had no health, retirement or life insurance plans, and no job security. There are 86 housing units for their families and dormitories to accommodate about 400 male workers. In this group, we found a deep sense of hopelessness and futility.

These are the migrants who work only during the harvesting season, and then, often only a few days a week. We believe that our first responsibility is to provide as much full-time employment as we can for these workers. Beginning with a selected group, we intend to provide full-time employment with all the benefits that The Coca-Cola Company provides to its full-time employees. This will include the same retirement and life insurance plans, the same two to four weeks vacations and eight holidays, and the opportunity to enter the same training programs. As full-time employees, they will also be entitled to participate in the same tuition refund plans available to all Coca-Cola employees.

Currently the seasonal harvesting employee is paid by the piece. Beginning with this first group of harvesting empoyees, we will provide a basic hourly wage, on top of which piecework bonuses will be paid, somewhat similar to the salary and commission arrangement for salesmen of many major corporations. The combined salary and bonus will be significantly higher than the money they are presently making. In this way, we hope to combine a sense of security, both in pay and in job, along with the incentive necessary to maintain and increase productivity. If this program works and productivity increases—as we believe it will—we propose to extend it to cover 200 employees by the end of its first year of operation; 500 in two to three years and at least two-thirds of our harvesting employees in five to seven years.

We plan to organize our harvesting of oranges and lemons, and the work that must be done in the groves to maintain and care for the trees during the non-harvesting period, in a way that will provide full-time employment for the largest possible number of migrants. We must replace generations of despair, with hope and ambition and this will require a major and concerted array of social services. Sufficient time and patient understanding are essential.

Although our objective is to convert as many seasonal employees to full-time status as possible, the process will of necessity be gradual. During transition and thereafter we will need a number of migrant seasonal employees to handle the peak harvesting load. These seasonal harvesting employees will be placed in the same status as other seasonal employees of the Company, such as many of the men who work in our processing plants. Their pay will be increased, and they will be covered by special life insurance and health care plans. Their dormitories will be modern and sanitary with adequate recreational facilities. They will be offered three meals a day at cost and will be provided, free of charge, with transportation to and from neighboring communities. We hope to instill in these migrants the desire to become full-time employees of the Company.

FULL-TIME GROVES EMPLOYEES

Our task force revealed that the pay and benefits of full-time groves employees were in line with local citrus industry standards, rather than with the standards of the Foods Division. Thus, these employees had no retirement plan, only one week of vacation and five holidays per year. They received health benefits only after one year of employment and life insurance benefits of $1,000.

Effective September 1, our plan will place these employees in the same status as all other full-time Coca-Cola employees. They will be included in the Company retirement plan. They will receive two to four weeks vacation each year depending on their length of service. Their health insurance benefits will become effective thirty days after employment and life insurance benefits will be raised to $5,000. Their wages will be initially increased by 23 percent.

HOUSING

At present we provide housing rent free to approximately sixty percent of our groves employees. The remaining forty percent rent or own their homes. It will always be necessary for some of our employees to live in the groves. For them, we will provide modern and sanitary housing and dormitories and the maintenance services necessary to keep that housing clean, decent and liveable.

Early in our strategic planning, however, our long range objective was to have as many employees as possible own their homes. We have already surveyed forty acres of land, on which we are arranging for the construction of 60 to 70 houses at prices and mortgage payment schedules within the means of our citrus employees, and with appropriate recreational facilities and power and sewer service. These houses will be available exclusively for purchase or rental by our employees. We hope to use existing state and federal housing programs; but we are prepared, if necessary, to do this through Company-arranged private financing.

SOCIAL SERVICE CENTERS

We have decided to establish four permanent social service centers and one mobile social service unit for our groves and harvesting workers. The first of these centers and the mobile unit will be in operation at the beginning of the orange harvesting season in late November. The other three centers will be in operation within a year from that time. The centers will provide a one-stop service for the worker and his family. These centers will provide the physical facilities and professional personnel for: child care and pre-school training and education; adult education; medical care; family and social counseling; recreation; special tutoring for children attending local schools; and information centers on local, state and federal programs.

In addition to professionals, the centers and the mobile unit will be staffed by paid members from the migrant community itself. These staffs will be specially trained to work with migrant workers. The mobile unit will be operated in a manner similar to federal "outreach" programs. The unit and its personnel will seek out the migrants and their families, where they work and live and provide basic social services and medical care to them.

GENERAL PROGRAMS

There are a variety of other problems to which we have also directed our attention. For example, migrant workers spend substantial amounts of time in buses that break down too often. We have ordered twenty-five new buses, each with toilet facilities. Ten buses have already been delivered. These buses will efficiently transport workers to and from the groves and provide sanitary toilet facilities at the location of their work.

Finally—and most important in the long run—we have begun research into the tools used by the migrant workers. We will put forth our best efforts to the task of developing mechanical and other devices to ease the burden of this work and make the individual more productive.

This, in brief, is the program of our Company to deal with the migrant workers in our employ. I do not underestimate the difficulty of bringing hope to these men and women, for themselves and for their children. And I do not want to overpromise. Generations of abuse and neglect cannot be rooted out in weeks or even months. But we have looked at this problem with the best people we could find, and we believe the programs we are instituting will move a long way toward providing for the migrant and his family human dignity, motivation and hope.

Let me be absolutely clear on one point. As we begin our work on the program, we will meet many difficulties and certain portions may not work in the field as we have planned them on paper. We will seek other solutions where those we have do not seem to be working. We intend to put whatever resources are within our command to solve this problem and to do it promptly, humanely and permanently.

While I recognize that our major and most direct responsibility is to those in our employ, I am also mindful of our obligations as citizens and human beings. We have already informed other citrus growers and employers of migrant labor that our entire experience will be available to them as they begin to deal with their problems in this area.

CONCLUSION

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, neither you nor I alone can solve the problems of all the migrant workers in this nation. We employ only 1,000 migrants in 20 counties in a single state. There are more than 250,000 migrants working in 900 counties in 46 states.

These men and their families have been too long neglected by the entire nation in which they live and work. Only a massive, concerted and persistent effort by federal, state and local government can root out the sub-culture of poverty in which they barely survive.

Government housing programs specifically designed for the migrant must be enacted and funded. Special health and education programs must be created for the migrant and his children. Federal, state and local social services, now denied the migrant because of arbitrary residence requirements and out-right discrimination, must be opened to him. Outreach programs, by which government officials will seek out the migrant where he lives and works, must also be established. Until our citizens and their elected representatives, at every level of government, commit the resources and talent necessary to solve this problem, migrants and their families—one million human beings—will continue to live in poverty without hope. This nation and the states and communities in which the migrants live and work have the resources to solve this problem. The only question is whether they have the determination. We must, as a nation, show the migrant that there is hope for him in our country and that above all his children can aspire to break the cycle of poverty to which they have been condemned for so many generations.

Yet government alone cannot solve this problem. Through years of experience and the work of dedicated federal employees and legislators like yourself, the government has tried to help the migrant worker. Unfortunately, the impact of most of its programs has been marginal at best.

In 1968, largely because government, acting alone, met the same frustration in its attempt to deal with the problems of the hard core unemployed in our urban ghettos, the President formed a National Alliance of Businessmen. In partnership with the government, the NAB created the JOBS program to help train and employ the hard core disadvantaged in the ghettos of our largest cities. I was privileged to serve as the first Vice Chairman of the NAB.

I believe the time has now come to form a National Alliance of Agri-Businessmen to train and employ in dignity and with fair wages the migrant workers of our nation. I urge this Committee to consider such a program and recommend it to the Congress in its report. A National Alliance of Agri-Businessmen, working in partnership with the government, can do for thousands of rural migrant workers what the National Alliance of Businessmen has done for thousands of ghetto dwellers.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let us recognize that the migrant represents a phenomenon in our society. The migrant and his family have the motivation to travel hundreds of miles across our country seeking one of the hardest jobs in our economy. If that motivation is fired with self respect and special training, we can reclaim hundreds of thousands of our citizens and create a major addition to our nation's work force. It is this inherent motivation of the migrant that gave me the confidence last March that the program of The Coca-Cola Company will work.

THE OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, at this week's annual meeting the American Bar Association, the organized bar paid tribute to OEO's legal services program. It is legal services fifth anniversary, and the lawyers in this program have already had a major impact on our society.

For a basic principle of a democratic system is that it is a government of laws, not of men. But to those Americans who have been denied access to our judicial and legal institutions, there is a feeling that the system is repressive and unyielding. To them, America is a country governed by men, not laws.

OEO's legal services programs has gone a long way toward changing this fatalistic attitude. To many, legal services has meant the difference between hope and despair.

By insuring the opportunity to obtain counsel—to have representation in and access to courts and government agencies—we insure that grievances will be redressed through legal channels.

The attempt to provide legal representation to all Americans is not only a recognization of a basic flaw in our system—it is also an affirmation of our deep faith in the potential of this system. By accepting the necessity for society to be challenged in order to come viable, we have begun to breathe life into the words "equal justice for all."

On this fifth anniversary of the legal services program, it is appropriate to pay tribute to those lawyers and bar association officials who have struggled so long to make "equal justice" more than an empty slogan. As a result of their efforts, more and more Americans are able to depend on responsive institutions and forums for the redress of legitimate grievances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials on the legal services program—one from the New York Times

and one from the Washington Post—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

ATTORNEYS FOR THE POOR

In what was once regarded as a citadel of rigidity, there are new stirrings on behalf of the legally deprived in the United States. At the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in St. Louis, the fifth anniversary of the Office of Economic Opportunity's legal services program as well as the fiftieth anniversary of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association are being celebrated today. The fact that the A.B.A. is choosing to honor these lawyers and programs for the poor is a symbol of their acceptance in the courts.

Nearly 2,000 attorneys now work in 850 neighborhood law offices in hundreds of communities. They are representing people as clients, not simply as charity cases; in the process these dedicated young lawyers are making legal history in many fields affecting the most disadvantaged of Americans. So well have these O.E.O. attorneys performed that, paradoxically, the big city law firms have had a hard time competing for the talents of top graduates who often choose to enter the less remunerative field of anti-poverty law and legal-defender representation.

In the course of serving nearly a million clients, the O.E.O. attorneys have won important judicial decisions protecting and broadening the rights of tenants, consumers, food-stamp users, migrant workers and families on welfare.

The O.E.O. legal services program was funded for $54 million this year; $61 million is proposed for fiscal 1971. At least this amount is necessary to expand the services of the nation's biggest legal bargain—the talents of its finest young attorneys working for the poor.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 11, 1970]

POVERTY LAW HAS NOT BEEN POOR LAW

In his "State of the Judiciary" address—on which we shall be commenting at length tomorrow—Chief Justice Warren Burger paid tribute to the performance of the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Among the many antipoverty efforts begun in the mid-Sixties, this has been one of the more quiet and more effective. It began on the assumption that many of the poor are not only denied their rights by law, but that few lawyers are available to protect those rights which do exist. "As late as five years ago," writes Bernard Segal, president of the American Bar Association, in the current ABA Journal, "less than 2 per cent of the legal needs of the poor of the country—more than 20 million of our people—were being filled." Five years ago this week, in a move that it was proud of then and is prouder of now, the American Bar Association embraced and endorsed the Legal Services Program.

Today, approximately 850 LSP offices operate in 49 states, staffed by 2200 lawyers and funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity for $53 million. In a real way, it is the nation's largest and most powerful law firm. The major accomplishments of the program can be listed under a variety of headings. First, there has been the day-to-day service—consumer cases, divorces, garnishments, repossessions. Many of the LSP clients have problems that do not require court action; often, only advice is needed, or a phone call to the proper authority. Second, test cases brought by LSP lawyers have resulted in the expansion of such previously narrow areas as landlord-tenant law, welfare law, public interest law, the administration of food programs. Third, the program has developed new kinds of legal forums for the resolution of disputes outside the courts—to lighten the strain on an already overburdened court system.

The program has not been without failures, nor has it lacked critics. Regarding the latter, however, it has had the right kind of critics—like Sen. George Murphy and Gov. Ronald Reagan of California. They have repeatedly tried to undermine legal services lawyers, but their bumbling efforts have usually led nowhere. Elsewhere, the governor of Missouri recently vetoed two LSP projects in his state; but his veto was overridden by OEO director Donald Rumsfeld, who stood by the poverty lawyers in the field.

One reason the Legal Services Program has the backing of both liberals and conservatives in the organized bar is the awareness that law is above partisan ideologies. Contrary to the rantings of some current "revolutionaries," the system can be changed, the overthrow of injustice can be orderly and the law can be converted from an enemy to an ally.

The same law theoretically applies to everyone and there is no reason that an impoverished inner city client should not receive the same first class service and intelligence that is available to others. Increasingly, such service and intelligence are being provided; in thousands of cases, the practice of poverty law has proved to be anything but poor law.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY OF FORCED INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial of the Mobile Register, dated August 14, 1970, and an editorial of the Montgomery Advertiser-Journal, dated August 16, 1970, be printed in the RECORD as an indication of the thinking of the people of Alabama and the South regarding President Nixon's trip South in support of the Nixon administration's policy of forced immediate desegregation of the public schools of the South.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mobile Register, Aug. 14, 1970]

REPUBLICAN HOAX ACT ON SOUTH'S SCHOOLS

President Nixon and his bureaucratic entourage are coming South this Friday to bring more Republican political hypocrisy on school integration. Depend on it.

The junket to New Orleans for a huddle with "key Southern leaders" well may be the biggest hoax in the whole history of the "desegregation" crusade initiated and spearheaded by political liberals, an element diversely reported to be exercising increasing influence in and on the Nixon administration.

Out of the hypocritical political huddle in New Orleans will come nothing of value to the South. It will not produce freedom of choice for children in school attendance. It will not produce equal treatment for schools in the South on racial integration.

Its basic purpose is not educational but political. It is not designed to establish a policy of fair play between regions as a replacement for the double standard that wields a federal force blackjack in the South as other regions continue to practice wholesale segregation with impunity.

This hypocritical Republican political junket to put on an act of friendly understanding and helpfulness toward persecuted Southern states logically may be construed as stemming from the forthrightness of Sen. Strom Thurmond, Republican from South Carolina, in jumping down the Nixon administration's throat with both feet for its open sorry treatment of the South.

Even before and more particularly since Senator Thurmond delivered his blasts with no punches pulled, the question has been asked in political speculation among both liberals and conservatives whether Mr. Nixon could carry the South in 1972 if he offers himself for reelection and the Republicans renominate him.

The question may have been overtaken by obsolescence already. Whether George C. Wallace again becomes a third party candidate or not, the South may be beyond the reach of Mr. Nixon two years from now if the national Democratic party puts together a platform and candidate ticket of any substantial appeal in this region.

As of today, we would say that Richard Nixon has had it politically in the South if confronted with any promising alternative to which the majority of the electorate could turn.

Southerners who think and care will not be misled by the junket Mr. Nixon is leading into the South. They know in advance from bitter experiences that a soft-soaping on school integration is the most the South can expect from it.

They know the real motive, brought on by political fright, is to try to patch up the Nixon image that has just about struck rock-bottom in the South on the integration issue.

Most Southerners can recognize a hoax when they see it with their eyes wide open.

[From the Advertiser-Journal, Aug. 16, 1970]

FIDDLING WHILE THE SOUTH BURNS

Congressman William C. Cramer, Florida Republican, is only one among many who have predicted the nation (meaning the South) "may be headed for the worst school crisis in its history unless the Supreme Court immediately comes back off vacation and does its job."

Schools under orders to establish a "unitary" system in September have not been told what this means. Montgomery is one of the exceptions. At least we do have a plan, a zone plan, however it works in practice. In some areas, notably the new Carver district, the "white flight" courts have referred to is already on.

In a few other systems, Alabama federal judges have acknowledged that the effect of their orders, obeying the Fifth Circuit's mandate, will probably result in all-black systems. And even within some systems where this is not expected to happen there will probably be pockets of re-segregation as whites either move out or send their children to private schools.

As Cramer said, the Supreme Court must answer such critical issues as whether racial balance is required in schools, whether massive forced busing can be ordered, and whether the South must continue to live under a different set of rules than apply to other sections of the country.

In March, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger said the Supreme Court had a clear duty to resolve all these questions. It had the opportunity in the appeal of the Charlotte busing order, which covered most of the questions still dangling, but took off on vacation.

Normally the Justices do not return until October, well after many communities will have been involved in integration turmoil with no guidance provided by the Supreme Court. Many district judges are utterly baffled as to what the law is.

The court also recessed without hearing—as it has consistently refused to hear—a northern de facto case, this one from Cincinnati.

Administrators in many sections of the South have no earthly idea what is expected of them in September. They are to prepare

"unitary" programs without a definition of what this means. Cramer said:

"School officials are faced with a mass of confused, contradictory and often unreasonable rulings from the lower federal courts . . .

"This is no way to run our courts. It is no way to run our schools . . . Our courts seem determined to play some kind of numbers game with our children. For the first time in its history, America may be headed toward the establishment of racial quotas."

The neighborhood school concept, an ancient and honored one in this country, has been dis-established by the courts in many cases—whether by zoning (which pretends to recognize neighborhoods but does not), pairing, school closing and transfers, and other devices, most aimed at one result dictated by the social gospel of the times, a mix ratio.

Many of the future planners in Washington believe the whole thing could be solved by closing all neighborhood schools and busing students into one huge educational complex. This would be the ultimate solution, they say. But the burgeoning of private schools indicates otherwise. It could complete the job, already begun, of wrecking public education.

This is a totalitarian nightmare, but we are fast approaching it.

The Cramer Amendment to the 1964 Civil Rights Act is law, but totally ignored law. It says that "desegregation shall Not mean the assignment of students to overcome racial imbalance." The Fifth Circuit has ignored it, as have other southern courts, the most flagrant example being the Charlotte panzer plan to bus students by the thousands hither and yon to achieve the mix goal.

No one knows where it will all end. The reckless manipulation of school children has now acquired a momentum of its own, light years beyond anything mentioned in the original *Brown* decisions of 1954–55.

The Supreme Court, which could have at least tried to answer some of the riddles and inequities, needed its long summer rest too much to address itself to this, the most disturbing year in southern school integration. Maybe the Justices quietly decided they had no answers and would try to pick up the pieces in October, when it will be too late.

Even Senator Mike Mansfield has suggested that the court should abandon its long summer and go into an 11-month year. We fail to understand why a court constantly complaining of its heavy backlog should aggravate the situation by its extraordinary recess.

Not that we would expect any surcease or that the Justices could unscramble this egg. But it would be vaguely reassuring to know that they were trying, even as hundreds of school boards and superintendents are trying, fumbling in the dark.

Perhaps Chief Justice Warren E. Burger hinted of the reasons for the Supreme Court's strange withdrawal symptoms. In a speech before the opening assembly of the American Bar Association Aug. 10, he said the court was inundated by class action suits. He referred specifically to anti-pollution and consumer litigation, remarking that "we should look more to state courts familiar with local conditions and local problems."

That has a familiar ring. Just 15 years ago the Warren court turned over school desegregation cases to federal district judges for the same reason—they were more familiar with local conditions and problems. Then the appellate courts and the Supreme Court took these powers away from district judges, a fact lamented in the Sumter County decision by the three-judge court back in June.

The decision, written by Judge Frank Johnson, said that "effective with the commencement of the 1970–71 school year, the student body in the Sumter County school system will, in all probability, be composed of only Negro students."

The court's hands had been tied by Fifth Circuit orders, by the Supreme Court's action and inaction, and by the Justice Department. Johnson's rebuke was about as strong as a lower court could be:

"In the past 18 months, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, under which Court's decision this Court is expressly bound, has reversed district courts in scores of cases for attempting to innovate in a manner such as the Sumter County board here suggests.

"Thus we find ourselves under a compulsion that requires the entry of an order in this . . . case that will probably result in an all-black student body, where nothing in the way of desegregation is accomplished and where neither the white students nor black students are benefited. However, the United States, through the . . . Department of Justice, insists upon a strict application of these legal principles to the Sumter . . . system. Faced with these clear mandates from the appellate courts and the insistence of the government that they be applied, we have no alternative except to apply them."

The Supreme Court, at the time this melancholy finding was handed down, still had more than two weeks before recessing. The three-judge court seemed to have made an unusual plea for the high court to take judicial notice of what was happening. But the Supreme Court did nothing on this, the Charlotte case or other critical school situations.

The Justices needed their rest and couldn't be troubled with such trivia as impossible orders which were to be effective before they returned.

NEED FOR ACTION ON INDIAN POLICY AND PROGRAMS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, history and events have converged to provide the Congress with a unique opportunity to address itself to one of our Nation's oldest domestic problems—the plight of American Indians. While Indians and the problems which beset them have been the subject of countless public and private explorations down through the years, with manifold theories, programs, and schemes being advanced for the ultimate solution of this long-standing and perplexing problem, the degree of interest and concern shown by the public and others for the Indian people has reached an all-time high.

The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy was chairman of a Special Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education, with the final work being completed by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, Senator MONDALE, Senator FANNIN, and other equally dedicated Members of this body. Their findings and recommendations offer hope for improvement in at least one area of critical importance to the Indians and those in the Indian field. In addition, scholars, authors, journalists, advocate groups, and so forth, have, during the past several years, examined the full range of social and economic ills which combine to form a seemingly insurmountable barrier which prevents Indian citizens from sharing in America's bounty. And the Indian people themselves through new and traditional leadership are articulating their needs in a forceful manner with the just demand that their people be given an opportunity to enjoy a better way of life.

Our own actions here in the Congress during the Kennedy-Johnson years have contributed significantly to changing circumstances in the Indian field. Indians are now recipients of new-found aids emanating from several major Federal departments and agencies with an identifiable expenditure of more that $500 million in the 1970 fiscal year alone.

But what has this rediscovery of our Nation's first citizens and an infusion of new-found financial resources into the Indian field really contributed to the lives of the rank and file tribal members? Without belaboring you with a review of complicated statistical tables, one needs only to examine any set of standard indexes to know that Indians, as a group, continue to occupy the lowest rungs of our socioeconomic ladder.

The present administration has addressed itself constructively to the Indian problem through President Nixon's recent message to Congress on the America Indians. In reading the message, I was encouraged to note that the President has proposed several bold departures from traditional practices in the Indian field which reflect his own personal desire to cope with this longstanding problem. On July 15, I stated here in the Senate my support of these proposals in general. It is my hope that all of us will give careful considerations to the President's proposed Indian programs.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I plan to launch a series of formal hearings on the President's proposal and accompanying legislation on September 21 and 25, 1970. These hearings will undoubtedly continue and I hope result in the passage of legislation, during the forthcoming 92d Congress.

This is a problem area that cannot be treated lightly. In order to realize lasting results, we will make certain that Indian people themselves become the center of any hearing process that we launch, so that their views and suggestions will have the proper influence upon the legislation before us.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my belief that we stand on the threshold of an opportunity to contribute to an improved livelihood for thousands of Indian men, women, and children who are living under conditions of poverty through no fault of their own—other than that they are the victims of unfortunate historical and legal developments. I am hopeful that Members of both parties will join with me in an effort to consider the President's proposals at the earliest possible date.

I ask unanimous consent that a press statement by Senator JACKSON, released August 18, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE HEARINGS ON INDIAN POLICY

Chairman Henry M. Jackson of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee today announced public hearings for September 21 and 25 on President Nixon's recent message to Congress on American Indians.

Jackson said the hearings would start at 10 a.m. each of the two days in Room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building, and be conducted by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs with Chairman George McGovern presiding.

"President Nixon's message proposed a

number of changes which merit careful consideration by the Congress," Jackson said. "I will soon be requesting the views and positions of national and regional Indian associations and tribes on these recommendations.

As Chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee I will also want to hear a discussion of other alternatives. New policies and new programs must, I believe, originate in and be shaped by the Indian community if they are to be effective.

"By the same token," Jackson said, "whenever it is desired, the Indian community must be given full opportunity to administer and make decisions concerning programs which determine the quality of community life."

Jackson also said, "The hearings will continue over several months and a full scale effort will be made to probe into the special problems of our first Americans."

OIL IMPORT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the decision by President Nixon to continue the present mandatory oil import program is good news not only to those of us from oil-producing States but, if properly understood, should be good news to American consumers in all States.

It is most fortunate that recent events in the Middle East have brought on a situation that several of us have warned of for more than 2 years, and I hope the higher prices and shortages of imported crude oil and industrial fuel oils that have resulted will be only temporary. But it seems that a crisis such as this is sometimes necessary to prove the fallacy of dependence on a foreign source for a commodity as vital to this Nation as oil.

Without again belaboring the arguments against a tariff plan, which the President has now rejected, I would like to remind my colleagues that this would have been another attempt at price and supply regulation that has already proved to be a dismal failure in the case of natural gas.

We are now confronted with a definite shortage of natural gas brought on by restrictive Federal pricing policies.

The oil import tariff plan was designed to control domestic crude oil wellhead prices and would have discouraged development of additional gas, as well as oil supplies.

I told the President last week that I was concerned about the ability of this Nation to meet its energy requirements and that I had worked hard for 2 years in an attempt to get Government officials to recognize the problem before it reaches crisis proportions. I commended him at that time for recognizing the problem and taking action to find a solution.

Also to be commended for his untiring and most effective efforts to bring the proportions and seriousness of the problem to the attention of the President is my good friend and colleague from the other body, Representative GEORGE BUSH, of Texas, as well as the distinguished Representative from Wyoming, JOHN WOLD.

A number of Senators have worked long and tirelessly in bringing the matter into the proper perspective and debating the merits of self-sufficiency in our prime energy resource. Among these are the able and distinguished Senator from Texas, JOHN TOWER, the Senator from Oklahoma, HENRY BELLMON, the Senator from Kansas, BOB DOLE, the Senator from Alaska, TED STEVENS, and others.

This and recent policy changes by the Federal Power Commission in natural gas pricing are the first steps in a national energy policy that will encourage the development of the abundant energy resources we have and provide assurance that we will never be dependent on sources beyond our control or subject to blackmail by the countries controlling those sources.

And it is a major victory, the dimensions of which hopefully will never be realized for the consumer who prefers to pay reasonable prices for a dependable supply rather than to save a cent or two on a gallon on a source that might double in price overnight or which could be cut off completely.

COMPETITION OF SMALL BUSINESS WITH INDUSTRIAL LEVIATHANS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it has long been the belief of the American people that small business and manufacturing is necessary for a healthy and vigorous spirit of competition. Today, as we all know, the small businessman finds it ever more difficult to compete with the industrial leviathans. Large-scale firms have made effective use of computers, electronic data processing, and other costly processes and have thereby reaped great competitive advantages.

Changing times and new challenges now demand that small businessmen alter their methods of operation to take advantage of computer technology. By doing so, smaller firms could make optimum use of data relating to payrolls, inventory, purchasing, billing, sales, and so on. Electronic data processing offers a tremendous potential for small businessmen to compete on more favorable terms. EDP systems are not only efficient, but for many of the time-consuming tasks which small business must perform, it can also be more economical. Some firms are already utilizing computers and electronic data processing, but most small businessmen are not yet aware of the promise which these methods hold for the future.

Mr. Robert L. Chartrand, specialist in information sciences to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, recently wrote a penetrating and informative article on this question which was published in Business and Economic Review 1970. I call it to the attention of Senators to the business community in the belief that it can be of inestimable help in putting small business into the best possible competitive position for the trying decade ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPUTER SUPPORT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(By Robert L. Chartrand) *

Electronic data processing technology represents man's innovative ability to overcome many of the problems inherent in collecting, indexing, storing, manipulating, and retrieving information. The impact of this technology on the public and private elements of our society has been pronounced. In the governmental realm, a recent report stated: "No single technological advance in recent years has contributed more to effectiveness and efficiency in Government operations than the development of electronic data processing equipment."[1]

The application of the computer and its ancillary tools to business problems also has proceeded at an accelerated pace. Today, while many larger corporations have tested and invested in electronic data processing (EDP) systems, a significant portion of the small business community remains unconvinced of the desirability or feasibility of using this new approach. At the same time, however, there is a growing awareness that the contemporary small entrepreneur must avail himself of those mechanisms and services which will allow him to survive in an age where competition is increasingly sophisticated and unrelenting.

There has been a recognized need on the part of the Federal Government—executive branch agencies and legislative branch components—and various private sector groups for an overall strategy to be conceived which would lead to a marshaling of resources to address the problem of linking the small business community with the potential of the computer.

An examination of the problem area has permitted the identification of three critical requirements for future action. First, a carefully coordinated investigation of user (that is, small business) needs for electronic data processing support should be initiated. The fragmentary data now in existence require updating, and should be analyzed in the light of state-of-the-art developments of the last few years. The responsibility for organizing this activity should be negotiated through discussions between cognizant government and business organizations.

The second vital requirement is related to identifying those hardware and software developments of the immediate past and foreseeable future in terms of their application to the multitudinous problems of the small businessman. The small business community is increasing at a substantial rate: 200,000 new small firms since 1961; 50,000 now taking their place in the competitive milieu every year. The role of industry in helping to match the new devices and man-machine techniques with the discrete applications cannot be underplayed, but the contributions of governmental groups also must be delineated and evaluated.

The third requirement, critical to an improvement of the status of the small business, is for a much enhanced program of orientation and education of the small merchant in terms of the support which can be gained from utilizing electronic data processing. The level of technical literacy must be raised, and a willingness to seek out and listen to counsel must be engendered. Although industry increasingly has provided information to the public about the pro's and con's of the new machine technology, the degree of understanding remains inadequate for the needs of our times.

INFORMATIONAL NEEDS OF THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

The small businessman who would compete successfully in the complex, dynamic environment of mid-century America must

Footnotes at end of article.

be in a position to acquire, filter, correlate, store, process, and retrieve key information relevant to the present and future operation of his firm. This information may concern the day-to-day production of materials, analyses related to marketing surveys, fiscal planning, or data on counterpart organizations (both large and small) within the same competitive realm.

Changing times often require a change in the mode of operation of a business establishment. In many instances, the question of whether or not to use electronic data processing is raised. At this juncture, the owner or manager may wish to consult with one or more of several possible outside experts. These could include business equipment manufacturers, service bureau corporation representatives, management consultants specializing in information system design, trade association personnel, or, perhaps, a trusted accounting firm.

Before coming to grips with the many factors involved in considering the utility of EDP to a given company, its management may choose to review the basic elements and interrelationships existing within the organization.

When considering the introduction of a major innovation, such as electronic data processing, which may affect the future vitality and profit making capacity of a corporation, there are several questions [2] which might be considered carefully by management:

1. What new information can be secured through data processing to help me manage my business more efficiently?

2. Can the needed information be developed by organizing available data? In other words, is this a problem that data processing can solve?

3. Is the volume of data to be processed into the needed reports too great for manual handling, and is it sufficient to justify data processing?

4. How frequently is the information required?

5. Can the data to be processed be readily accumulated?

6. Can savings be generated by automating the present system? Or, to phrase it differently, will a better system necessarily increase profits?

The benefits from a survey of company operations and informational needs may be many, regardless of the ultimate decision concerning the acquisition (or not) of a data processing capability. The perceptive businessman knows that new retailing and manufacturing concepts and practices tend to reduce the margin for error. He also knows that he must obtain, on a continuing basis, that information which allows him to make the correct decisions: this may take the form of balance sheets, inventory records credit management listings, and other supporting data.

Many reasons have been offered by EDP users and providers as to why these devices should be employed, but predominant among these is the fact that for certain applications they are more economical. Four factors which reflect the economy being sought, and the ways in which EDP can contribute to attaining a more efficient working system, are:

1. computers provide new time dimensions for the working day and for the human concept;

2. computers provide more efficient and effective controls over human error;

3. computers provide large capacities for storing information, and the capability to access rapidly this information; and

4. computers provide automatic organizational, administrative, and management controls.[3]

Some information systems consultants will use the amount of paper work which must be created and handled in a company as a guideline for determining whether EDP is required. One rule of thumb is that, if you have enough paper work to keep one or more persons busy full time, you should at least check into the possibility of using electronic data processing; it may be cheaper than your present method.[4] Some companies which have chosen to use EDP declare that significant benefits may result even though costs remain essentially the same. In a number of recorded cases, decision making information has been made available as the result of processing routine paperwork. In an article entitled "Electronic Recordkeeping for Small Marketers," the example of using EDP to handle invoice billing is given, with this comment:

"As a byproduct you might get reports upon which you can base management decisions. Such reports might show: sales broken down by territory, item, or salesman; commissions and statements for salesmen; a history of accumulated past sales by customer; and credit analysis by customer." [5]

The problems faced by the retailer, the manufacturer, the marketing manager, and the wholesaler often are strikingly similar. When a confrontation of the problems takes place and the hard decision must be made regarding the allocation of existing or projected resources, the businessman must strive to understand definitely which personnel, equipment, and procedures he should add, delete, or change. The small businessman, in considering the integration of computers into his operation, must review the characteristics of EDP-oriented systems: first, thorough systematization of control and planning procedures must be effected; second, an array of problem-solving techniques must be reviewed, experimented with, and selectively applied; third, equipment selection must be based on an overview of the entire operating system; and fourth, delineation of current requirements of management must take place.

In determining which equipment is to be used and for what types of applications, it is imperative that the small businessman identify, assess, and then discuss with others his needs for information. He must review thoroughly the time constraints which govern his operation, the requirements for heavy volume processing of mathematical data, and the kinds of output which must be utilized in his operation. A number of small companies have expressed the opinion that they could not afford EDP if it were used only for the processing of routine records. They pointed out that the "real savings come when they use the information for making management decisions." [6]

Many retailers have found that EDP can help them. While small businessmen often were reluctant to invest in their own computers, corporative arrangements permitted utilization of the new tools. In New York City, the firm of Archie Jacobson, Inc., made the decision to invest $1,000 for an initial equipment capability and spend $140 per month for processing. The benefits were these: a pinpointing of weaknesses and strengths in their stocks, the ability to analyze supplies by units and prices, and better timing in scheduling merchandise arrival for less lag before it went on the selling floor.[7]

The small manufacturers also are using EPD. A small business requires a short delivery time and accurate, quick billing. In many instances, it must be able to respond rapidly to sudden market shifts, which result in rush requests, special billing and pricing situations, and the anticipated impact upon production projections. Several examples of small manufacturers' use of computers appeared in the volume prepared by Alexander M. Blanton and Joseph Traut and their associates at the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard University. In "Computers and Small Manufacturers," the following examples signified the role of EDP in this environment: [8]

"Cleveland Controls, Inc., a small firm with less than $2 million in sales and about 80 employees in the combustion instruments and controls industry is using a UNIVAC 1004 for a number of applications, including highly complex, nonstandard [sic] billing. The 1004 has not only solved the company's billing problems but as one company official expressed it, 'timely, highly detailed and accurate reports' are reeducating management about a business they thought they knew. 'In fact,' said Julius C. Weinberg, secretary-treasurer, 'they are providing us with solutions to problems we didn't know existed.' "

Her Majesty Underwear Co., a highly volatile apparel industry with approximately 500 employees, faces a common industry problem—an inventory of thousands of different styles, models, and sizes, coupled with the need for extremely fast response to sales demands. Her Majesty is using an IBM 1401 for inventory control, payroll (by piece rate), and other applications. The latest information available indicates that the company plans further applications, including automatic rescheduling of production integrated with existing inventory control. "This, along with the order-invoice processing presently being carried out on the computer," said T. J. Ford, director of data processing, "should provide a degree of scientific management never before realized—or even anticipated—in a garment concern."

Another company, Cooper Textile Mills, with about $3 million in sales and 90 employees, faces the problems of the textile industry—a squeeze on profit margins, intense competition, and high vulnerability. The company has been using an IBM 1440 since the first months of 1964, and Sanford Nemitz, comptroller, said recently that already the "net results have been vividly reflected in a widening profit margin." Nemitz went on to point out that the computer has become an important tool for management in the textile industry as a whole, because "in the most competitive industry in America, textiles, intelligent, alert management must use current data—not history—to survive."

A same-day-delivery policy on all orders has carved out a market niche for a $6 million, 80-employee company manufacturing high quality industrial control apparatus. According to the company's vice-president, "top management must recognize the computer's potential—in today's world the manager of a small company can no longer afford to operate with a green eyeshade and quill."

EVOLUTION OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING

During the past two decades, the ingenuity and production efficiency of computer manufacturers have resulted in increasingly more powerful and flexible EDP equipment and software. The evolution of data processing systems is thought provoking because it illustrates the fact that the need to process data is centuries old.

Perhaps the chief impetus to the invention and use of new data processing machines has been the much discussed and often maligned "information explosion." The needs of the user more and more are dictating the type of equipment produced. Similarly, software—sometimes defined [9] as "the ancillary techniques and aids needed for proper utilization of an EDP system"—is being designed for the tailor-made needs of various user groups. The power of the computer now surpasses even the most optimistic prognostication of 10 years ago. But the emphasis is changing perceptibly, many people believe, to devising, testing, and perfecting computer programs which will allow the fullest utilization of the hardware potential. A tremendous effort has gone into the writing and testing of software, and key personnel in consulting firms, equipment manufacturers, government, and private user

Footnotes at end of article.

groups continue to expend vital energy and money to this end.

The investment in equipment and software must be understood by the small businessman. Business applications are diverse and may require a modest computer configuration but a variety of computer programs. Some of these may be provided as part of a basic "package" by the computer firm which sells or leases the equipment. Other requirements may necessitate the writing of special programs. In planning for a computer installation today, the prospective owner must anticipate software costs which at least equal those of the equipment being obtained.

The technological development of electronic data processing usually is referred to in terms of "computer generations." The "first generation" of computers, which appeared in the middle 1950's, embodied the vacuum tube as the main electronic component. The "second generation," dominant in the late 1950's and early 1960's, utilized the transistor—the advantages: required less space and maintenance, could perform calculations more rapidly, and was more reliable. The "third generation" computers, introduced in 1964, featured miniaturization of components, which reduced costs, were faster than predecessor machines, and were even more reliable.

As the cost of computers has decreased in relationship to the benefits to be derived, as the space required for housing EDP units has lessened, and as the software has been more closely attuned to the needs of the small businessman, a realization of the potential of the second- and third-generation devices for use by the small business concern has come into being.

In 1950 the cost per bit—in this case, defined as "a unit of information"—was in excess of $2.60; today, the cost is 20 cents per bit. Time-sharing systems, where multiple users can simultaneously use a computer system, are expected to lower EDP costs to "one-tenth of that incurred under existing modes of operation." [10]

The cost of time sharing may be considered in two basic categories: (1) the cost of data processing per se, and (2) the cost of communications' circuits. Survey findings indicate that computer centers external to the business firms can perform many tasks on a reasonable price scale; "average" costs reportedly range between $325 and $350 per month. One computer center charges $350 for 50 hours of teletype console time, while another center charges $325 a month for 25 hours of shared time. The variations are many, ranging from a flat monthly charge to a yearly fee plus a per-item charge.[11]

The speed with which problems are handled often is a key factor in business applications. The speed of "first generation" computers was measured in seconds; "second generation" equipment in microseconds; and "third generation" devices in nanoseconds. To place this in a meaningful perspective, a nanosecond is to a second as a second is to 30 years.

The question of EDP support costs was disdiscussed in the hearings on "Economic Concentration" before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly; [12] the discourse between Senator Philp A. Hart and Byron L. Carter contains interesting information on the cost of EDP services to the small businessman. This discussion is reprinted below.

"Senator HART. In your prepared statement, which most certainly is interesting, you indicated, at least in a couple of places, the cost of the several services to the smaller retailer. I think you mentioned it in the case of the camera shop in California, which has a cost of about $125 a month, and you cited two other installments but did not identify the cost. What is the typical cost to the smaller retailer?

"Mr. CARTER. This varies according to reports produced and the work done. The average retail store pays about $100 a month. Now, this means that there are many below this figure and many above. An average accounts receivable job runs about $76 a month. In anticipation of the possibility of this question, I made some notes before I left. They are just pencil notes, but I called one of our data centers and said, 'Just read me over the phone some of your typical billings.'

"They read me figures of a pharmacy in Williamsport, Pa., their July billing, for their services. This particular store is a rather large pharmacy having 23,000 transactions processed by the data center for the month of July. They received a sales and inventory report, a clerk report, a profit and loss statement, and balance sheet for $119.50.

"Senator HART. A month?

"Mr. CARTER. This is a pretty good sized pharmacy.

"They also had us provide their customers with statements—265 statements at $63.38.

"There is a drugstore that received only the accounts receivable service, keeping the rest of his [sic] records manually, 336 statements, $68. There is a clothing store in Lancaster, Ohio, which received a retail sales inventory, profit and loss and balance sheet, for $83.80.

"There is a specialty store in West Virginia that got only a sales report on 5,000 input lines for $30.13. There is a photo processor in Dayton, Ohio, with 153 statements, profit and loss and balance sheet for $52.30.

"Senator HART. These are interesting to a person who believes that the presence of smaller manufacturers and businessmen is necessary for vigorous competition. They are very welcome. As you describe this advanced technology, instead of tolling the demise of the smaller entrepreneur, it would seem to indicate that it makes available to the smaller manufacturer a means for effectivley and more vigorously competing. Is that a fair conclusion?

"Mr. CARTER. I believe it is a fair conclusion. They will certainly be on a par, on an equal basis. There would be no opportunity, in our opinion, for a larger business to become more efficient than a smaller business if the smaller business is alert and takes advantage of the modern methods."

With the development of versatile EDP systems in the past few years, the small businessman has many more options available to him than previously. He may wish to perform certain routine functions on an in-house machine, while sending more demanding computer-oriented jobs to a service bureau. The use of keyboard or the more elaborate display terminals opens up many possibilities, and can free him of the problems which are concomitant with establishing and managing a company (i.e., internal) EDP facility.

APPLYING SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY TO SPECIFIC BUSINESS PROBLEMS

The small businessmen of the nation, faced with a competitive situation that includes not only large companies but numerous new small firms, must reassess the ways in which they can operate more effectively. In selecting which applications (or company operations) are to be upgraded, either through the improvement of manual procedures or the introduction of EDP, they will have to consider the objectives they would like to attain as the result of their efforts.

Indicative of the objectives rating priority attention by American small business is the response of 100 companies—with an average number of 125 employees—to a survey discussed in Dr. Donald H. Sanders' "Introducing Computers to Small Business." [13] The eight classes of firms are: construction, durable manufacturing, nondurable manufacturing, transportation-communication, wholesale-retail trade, finance and insurance, service and miscellaneous, and petroleum. Table 1 represents the primary objectives of the sampled firms:

TABLE 1.—PRIMARY OBJECTIVES OF SAMPLED FIRMS, BY NUMBER OF FIRMS AND BY INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION

Primary stated objectives	Number of firms, by industry class								
	Construction	Durable manufacturing	Nondurable manufacturing	Transportation and communication	Wholesale and retail	Financial and insurance	Service and miscellaneous	Petroleum	Total number firms [1]
Timesaving	4	4	4	1	8	9	10	8	48
Cost reduction		4	2	1	4	8	6	7	32
Greater accuracy		2	4		2	4			12
Better customer service						4	3		7
New information:									
Sales analysis		2			2				4
Cost analysis		1	1						2
Inventory control		2			1				3
Financial data					1	1			2
Greater prestige						1	3		4
Meet government rules						1			1
Better control					1	2			3
Expand business							2		2
Spacesaving						1			1

[1] Total does not equal 100 because several firms had more than 1 primary goal.

Within the realm of business activity, computers have been, and are being used, in conjunction with handling data on payrolls, inventory, record keeping, billing, purchasing sales data, the preparation of reports, and various types of management analysis and summary forms. Experience has shown that as users of equipment become more sophisticated in their understanding of

Footnotes at end of article.

what EDP can do, this awareness is followed by their expansion of requirements for EDP support. This may mean an increased in-house capability or additional support from a service bureau organization. It should be noted that the order in which applications are implemented is important. A small business firm may choose to "start small" with nothing more elaborate than an inventory listing on a weekly basis. Table 2 contains an example of an inventory analysis:

TABLE 2.—ILLUSTRATION OF INVENTORY ANALYSIS

Item No.	Item (card) count	Percentage (items)	Annual units	Unit cost	Annual dollar sales	Cumulative dollar sales	Percentage (dollars)
T7061	1	0.01	51,553	3.077	158,629	158,629	0.48
S6832	13	.12	243,224	.317	77,102	1,652,385	5.0
G9655	81	.74	6,768	4.876	33,001	4,957,154	15.0
T3320	93	.85	4,250	7.369	31,318	5,254,583	15.9
K5322	110	1.0	8,680	3.286	28,522	5,882,489	17.8
K2026	132	1.2	27,581	.930	25,650	6,609,538	20.0
H1981	209	1.9	52,765	.379	19,998	8,261,923	25.0
G9282	308	2.8	1,105	14.676	16,217	9,914,307	30.0
G9034	352	3.2	2,690	5.475	14,728	11,004,881	33.3
G9102	538	4.9	11,378	.980	11,150	13,219,076	40.0
H9339	626	5.7	22,224	.450	10,001	14,276,602	43.2
G9109	879	8.0	7,391	1.054	7,790	16,523,845	50.0
S5251	1,099	10.0	56,304	.115	6,475	18,209,277	44.1
M7868	1,352	12.3	9,984	.556	5,551	19,828,614	60.0
H3762	1,747	15.9	21,683	.205	4,445	21,844,523	66.1
S5634	1,835	16.7	23,796	.181	4,307	22,042,809	66.7
S6121	2,198	20.0	7,239	.490	3,547	23,662,146	71.6
K2018	2,615	23.8	3,571	.840	3,000	25,050,149	75.8
M6621	3,198	29.1	1,500	1.650	2,475	26,438,152	80.0
G2374	3,296	30.0	1,212	1.876	2,274	26,834,724	81.2
M2643	3,747	34.1	1,138	1.720	1,957	27,793,107	84.1
S7822	4,395	40.0	3,509	.450	1,579	29,015,872	87.8
K2174	4,934	44.9	1,042	1.256	1,309	29,742,921	90.0
S5904	5,494	50.0	2,337	.475	1,110	30,403,875	92.0
S6219	6,593	60.0	15,360	.050	768	31,395,306	95.0
K2068	7,329	66.7	3,494	.176	615	31,891,021	96.5
H3772	8,790	80.0	2,842	.120	341	32,618,070	98.7
N9773	9,098	82.8	2,439	.123	300	32,717,213	99.0
M2613	9,889	90.0	3,750	.048	180	32,915,499	99.6
G2605	10,439	95.0	198	.505	100	32,998,118	99.8
S6132	10,966	99.8	0	.062	0	33,047,690	100.0
M3742	10,988	100.0	0	.073	0	33,047,690	100.05

Source: "Scientific Techniques in Business Operations," Data Processing Information, Series B3 (White Plains: IBM Corp., Apr. 25, 1963), illustration of inventory analysis, p. 6.

As noted earlier, many small businessmen gain confidence in the role of EDP in performing useful support tasks and, as times goes by, plan to move into additional application areas. The need for a strategy often goes unrecognized, and there have been occasions when money has been spent unwisely because there was no allowance for controlled growth.

In summary, there is documented evidence that the small business community is taking seriously the potential of EDP and systems methodology for various routine and unique applications. A consensus is commencing to form that a more refined approach to management planning and scheduling is "paying off." Other benefits high on the list of those who have actually invested in EDP services are manufacturing control applications and the performance of sales analysis. Actual experience in implementing EDP-centered systems, however, shows that most small businesses start by converting routine accounting and finance operations, which may, in the long run, be of less benefit than some of the more sophisticated tasks.

ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION FOR THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

In reviewing the needs of the small businessman for information, and in discussing the applications which lend themselves to EDP support, there is a third factor which requires intensive study. The management of the small business company must determine whether to establish a computer capability on the premises, owned (or leased) and staffed by the firm, or to rely upon external EDP equipment and personnel. Five alternatives may be posed, the first involving the "in-house" option and the latter four treating the "out-of-house" choices:

1. the establishment of an in-house EDP capability, including the purchase or rental of equipment, creation of an internal staff of programmers, analysts, data converters and operators, and possibly some form of educational course to orient managers and workers to the role of EDP;

2. the creation of a "joint usage" arrangement, where two or more companies establish an EDP center supported and used by each participating firm;

3. the use of a data center's EDP capability, which involves obtaining computer time on an hourly charge basis;

4. the contracting out to a service bureau, where charges usually are based on the fulfillment of an entire, clearly delimited, job; and

5. the utilization of a remote terminal, "timesharing," system, with keyboard or display devices tied via communication lines to a central processor.

The last four alternatives afford the small businessman a greater computer capability than he might otherwise possess. Service bureaus have been used heavily by small businesses for many years.

In selecting which alternatives to pursue, the small businessman may consult with organizations which retain professional staff experienced in EDP systems.

A national group which has concentrated on the technological needs of small business is the Association of Data Processing Service Organizations (ADAPSO). This association strives "to set performance standards, provide for the interchange of experience and data between members, and conduct a series of seminars, regional meetings, and conventions."[14] The American Management Association (AMA) also has become active in sponsoring orientation seminars discussing the role of EDP in the smaller company.

The decision to form an in-house automatic data processing facility usually is accompanied by a determination to unsettle existing procedures and personnel as little as possible. Redesign of an information system can be considered as having two equally vital facets: technical and political. The human element must understand and accept what is happening, or the firm may experience serious difficulties for longer than is necessary.

The selection of specific EDP equipment is based on the data processing requirements of the firm and the information which has been gathered on available equipment. The problem of gaining sufficient knowledge to make an intelligent decision is a significant one for the small businessman. Certain key factors should influence the selection of EDP equipment:[15]

1. which computer offers the greatest anticipated payoff,
2. how do costs compare,
3. what is the reputation of the manufacturer,
4. are other firms in the same locality using the equipment and capable of giving backup support in case of emergency,
5. what is the maintenance factor,
6. will there be product support by the manufacturer,
7. will there be compatibility with existing systems, and
8. what are its error-checking characteristics.

Along with studying the type of computer to be purchased or rented should be an investigation of what it would cost to establish and maintain an internal EDP staff. Should a full-time systems analyst be hired so that advice on the development of the system can be provided on an ongoing basis to management? What level of programing skills is needed, and are there shortcuts which can be taken? How many operators and data conversion personnel are needed, and should the latter function be performed out of house? These questions, and many others, may plague the prospective owner of an EDP facility. The number of business applications to be performed with EDP support also has a bearing on the number of computer personnel needed.

At this point in our discussion, it would be wise to consider seriously an important, but often neglected, point: is the small businessman basically dissatisfied with his present data processing capabilities? As the performance and costing ramifications of using an external capability, such as a service bureau, are set forth, the admonition of R. F. Neuschel should be remembered:

Footnotes at end of article.

"The choice of methods must be based on what work needs to be done, not on what a machine is capable of doing. This point may seem elementary, yet failure to heed it is probably the greatest single cause of unsound or unnecessarily expensive office machine applications." [16]

The decision to contract out is made for one or more reasons:

1. the service bureau can perform the job more cheaply;

2. the burden of operating an EDP center resides with the external systems group;

3. the requirement for EDP support does not justify the establishment of an in-house facility; and/or,

4. the staffing problems can be avoided, especially in the competitive (i.e., high-salaried) EDP categories.

The dilemma which may cause some "soul searching" is this: does the small businessman want to bring in an "objective" outsider to perform the feasibility study and system design, thereby revealing company secrets and problems, or is it better to train his own staff people and rely upon their knowledge of the operations and objectives of the company? These numerous decisions are difficult, but the alternatives posed should not be ignored.

Many service bureaus operate much as they did in the "early" days of the industry; that is, by collecting, processing, and delivering job-oriented data on a regular basis. The spectacular change of the industry in the past few years has involved the creation of "time-sharing" services. Some experts predict that by 1975, 90 percent of all computers will be on-line.[17]

The "time-shared" system allows multiple customer use of a central, remote computer external to their own firms through the placement of remote stations (usually keyboard-type terminals) in an office of each small company. Time sharing, it must be remembered, is only one type of service rendered, and the spectrum of service bureau-type corporations is broad.

Since the new emphasis is on time-shared systems, service bureaus, large and small, are analyzing the current and immediate future state-of-the-art offerings—EDP equipment (central processors and storage units), display devices, communications gear, and the large variety of software needed to support the families of new equipment—and are trying to decide which configurations will serve them and their customers best. Cost effectiveness is paramount in such considerations. In "The Challenge of the Computer Utility," the positive and negative factors related to the use of time-sharing services are listed.[18] These factors are reprinted below.

Cost effectiveness arguments

Positive factors:

1. Fast response.
2. Reduced user capital investment.
3. Better utilization of computer power.
4. Better balance between user needs and user costs.
5. Greater computer power for user.
6. Convenient access to broader data and procedure base.
7. Flexible system augmentation and modernization.
8. Reduced user maintenance and operating costs.

Negative factors:

1. Cost of communications facilities.
2. Executive control requirements.
3. Reliability and maintenance problems.
4. System saturation problems.
5. Lost time due to "swapping."

Much is being learned every day about the vast potential and limitations of time sharing. Both government and business elements are raising questions regarding the need to regulate the EDP communications duality which is coming into increasing prominence. The flexibility provided by time sharing is highly desirable for many business applications, but there is a recognized need for a study of this new development and its impact on both the EDP and communications activities of the nation. The figure below (not printed in RECORD) depicts a hypothetical basic time-shared system.[19]

As the small businessman surveys the types of support offered by the service bureau community, he will note that some firms specialize in only one application (e.g., payroll); others limit themselves to one to three task areas; while the remainder will contract for any type of a selected client industry. The scope of services may range from data conversion (key-punching) only to complete processing. Most service bureau firms concentrate on commercial applications, but a number of companies are willing to provide support for scientific applications.

The need for ready access to information regarding which service bureau companies will undertake what kinds of service is growing. In the field of computer programming, for example, a firm named International Computer Programs prepares a quarterly catalog listing operating programs used by others.[20]

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The small businessman of today has reached a crossroads where he must decide which path of action to take. The criticality of his decision is affected by the number of competitors, a more volatile competitive environment, higher costs of investment and operation, and a need for ever better information for survival and attainment of his entrepreneur goals. The possibilities are many, and in order to arrive at a meaningful decision, a great deal of time and thought must be invested. The repeated demand for better tools and techniques with which to compete and attain success continues, and must be met by the innovative genius of American industry. Of equal urgency, however, is the requirement for the small business community to orient and educate itself regarding the proper role of EDP in its daily operations and plans for the future. If the public and private forces responsible for the vitality of the business sector of our nation cooperate and communicate, the prospects for the small businessman are excellent.

FOOTNOTES

*Robert L. Chartrand is Information Sciences Specialist, Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

The views expressed in this article are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Legislative Reference Service or the Library of Congress.

[1] Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, Report to the President on the Management of Automatic Data Processing in the Federal Government (Feb., 1965), p. 1.

[2] Byron L. Carter, "Data Processing for the Small Business" (New York: MacFadden-Bartell, 1966), p. 27.

[3] "An Introduction to Basic Computer Concepts" (Minneapolis: Control Data Corp. [no date]), p. 7.

[4] James M. Adams, Jr., "Electronic Recordkeeping [sic] for Small Marketers," *Small Marketers Aids*, n. 84 (Small Business Administration, Oct., 1962), p. 2.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid*, p. 2.

[7] Leonard Sloane, "Small Stores Turn Increasingly to Electronic Data Processing," *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1966, p. 1.

[8] Alexander M. Blanton and Joseph Traut, "Computers and Small Manufacturers" (New York: Computer Research and Publications Associates, 1967), p. 33.

[9] U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations Report No. 938, 89th Congress, 1st Sess., p. 6 (1965).

[10] Manley R. Irwin, "Small Business and Time-Shared Computer Systems," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, VII (Spring, 1967), 23.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary (Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly) Hearings on Economic Concentration, Pt. 4, and Concentration and Efficiency, 89th Cong. 1st Sess. (Aug. 24–26 and Sept. 9–10, 1965).

[13] Donald H. Sanders, "Introducing Computers to Small Business" (Park Ridge, Ill.: Data Processing Management Association, 1966), p. 41, Table XVI.

[14] Boris Yavitz and Thomas M. Stanback, Jr., "Electronic Data Processing in New York City" (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 64.

[15] W. E. Perry, Jr., "Don't Be Afraid To Use a Computer," *Administrative Management*, XV (Jan., 1963), p. 50.

[16] R. F. Neuschel, "Management by System" (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 228.

[17] Manley R. Irwin, "The Computer Utility: Competition or Regulation?" *Yale Law Journal*, LXXVI, n. 7 (June, 1967), p. 1300.

[18] D. F. Parkhill, "The Challenge of the Computer Utility" (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1966), p. 139, chart 6–1.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 97, fig. 5–1.

[20] *I.C.P. Quarterly* (Indianapolis: International Computer Programs).

SENATOR ALLOTT REPLIES TO PROFESSOR GALBRAITH

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the New Republic of August 15 contains a letter from the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) rebutting a number of arguments advanced by Prof. John Kenneath Galbraith in an earlier issue.

So that all Senators may benefit from the distinguished Senator's arguments, I ask unanimous censent that his letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR ALLOTT REPLIES TO JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH

The proposals Professor Galbraith outlines in your June 13 issue are sufficiently interesting, and his tone is (typically) sufficiently shrill to merit a substantial response.

Galbraith wants to unhorse all those legislators who want the United States to play the role of "universal gendarme and Communist hunter." If this is his objective, he can retire to his chalet in Gstaad, Switzerland, forthwith and write another book about the perils of affluence. I know of no Senators who want the US to play the role Galbraith describes. But let us press deeper into the causes of Galbraith's depression.

Galbraith is depressed by the fact that considerable power in Congress is controlled by what he calls "the committee mandarinate," and that turns out to be committee chairmen, many of whom do not agree with Galbraith about the politically true, good and beautiful.

The professor suggests three solutions to this terrible problem.

The first "and most conservative" is to disregard seniority and have an election between a liberal and a conservative for each committee chairmanship. The Speaker of the

House and the Majority Leader in the Senate would pick the two candidates. This raises a number of questions, three of which are: (1) Does the Professor think that the criteria of "liberalism" and "conservatism" are sufficiently objective and noncontentious that this would be feasible? (2) If, not, does the Professor think that the Speaker and the Majority Leader can be counted on to interpret these categories in a manner acceptable to the Professor? (3) Why does the Professor's obvious passion for participatory democracy not extend to an attack on the powers of committee chairmen?

The Professor's second and "practical" solution is for all congressmen and senators who are "serious" about "peace and racial decency" to vote for those Republicans as committee chairmen to replace those Democrats who do not interpret the public will and national interest the way the Professor prefers. The success of this proposal would depend on the truth of the assumption that "the Democrats would abandon the Southern warlords and white supremacists before they would abandon power to the Republicans." The Professor says this proposal is less "romantic" than his third proposal, but more about that in a moment.

Suffice it to say that this proposal fails on two grounds. First, the assumption is almost certainly false. Second, the assumption would never be tested because it would require very substantial blocs of what, for want of a better name, we shall call Galbraithians in both Houses of Congress, and it would require close cooperation between them. The Professor does not venture a guess as to how many votes he would count now, or how many will be hatched in November. His reticence on this point is eloquent.

The Professor's third and "more romantic" plan is for the Galbraithian Bloc to caucus before the party caucuses and threaten to vote for whichever party puts up the most attractive slate of candidates for chairmanships. Again, given the likely attendance at this early caucus, it is hard to underestimate the terror this threat would pose to the vast non-rebellious majority in Congress. Galbraith says that this proposal is "impractical" and I cannot imagine a more convincing appraisal.

The real solution to the Professor's problem is so simple, and straightforward that one does not need a Galbraith Doctrine of Social Reconstruction in order to discover it. If he is weary of the Democratic Party and its predictable committee chairmen, let him perform an act of radicalism which would be wondrous to behold. Let him vote Republican, and let those legions whose votes follow his guidance do likewise.

Of course Professor Galbraith will not be content with committee chairmanships that will result when the Republicans organize the Senate next November. Consider the following data, which lists current committee chairmen and their most recent ADA ratings, and *one possible* line-up of Republican committee chairmen and their ADA ratings:

Committee	Present chairman	ADA	Future	ADA
Space	Anderson (New Mexico)	44	Curtis (Nebraska)	0
Agriculture	Ellender (Louisiana)	17	Miller (Iowa)	17
Appropriations	Russell (Georgia)	17	Young (North Dakota)	6
Armed Services	Stennis (Mississippi)	6	Smith (Maine)	33
Banking and Currency	Sparkman (Alabama)	11	Tower (Texas)	0
Commerce	Magnuson (Washington)	78	Cotton (New Hampshire)	17
District of Columbia	Tydings (Maryland)	89	Prouty (Vermont)	39
Finance	Long (Louisiana)	0	Bennett (Utah)	6
Foreign Relations	Fulbright (Arkansas)	67	Aiken (Vermont)	56
Government Operations	McClellan (Arkansas)	11	Mundt (South Dakota)	6
Interior	Jackson (Washington)	78	Allott (Colorado)	6
Judiciary	Eastland (Mississippi)	0	Hruska (Nebraska)	6
Labor and Public Welfare	Yarborough (Texas)	78	Javits (New York)	100
Post Office and Civil Service	McGee (Wyoming)	39	Fong (Hawaii)	33
Public Works	Randolph (West Virginia)	78	Cooper (Kentucky)	50
Rules	Jordan (North Carolina)	6	Scott (Pennsylvania)	56

The average ADA rating for the current Democrat chairmen is 38.7. The average for the future GOP chairmen is 26.9. I should say two things. I for one do not accept the ADA catechism as a reliable index of liberalism. And a Senator's overall ADA rating often does not accurately reflect the performance of the Senator in the area of special concern to his committee.

Still, I think one thing is clear. Neither the Democrats nor the Republicans are pleasing to the ADA. This is, among other things, a sign of national health. It is also proof that Professor Galbraith and kindred spirits should quit looking for parliamentary gimmicks to inflate their minority position into a powerful force. The unadorned truth is that the American people do not want and, consequently, do not send to Congress men whose views conform to the Galbraith Vision of a Rational America.

I cannot conclude this response to Professor Galbraith without addressing myself to the tone and substance of his argument for new political alignments. Galbraith practices the Charles River Variant of that old phenomenon, McCarthyism. Those with whom the Professor disagrees are not merely mistaken, they are parliamentary lapdogs of the Pentagon. They suffer from "a knee-jerk response to the military establishment." They are unwavering spokesmen for the military. These people are not to be confused with those who consistently vote the preferences of those who agree with the philosophy the Professor espouses. These are not knee-jerk lapdog spokesmen for the ADA. Rather, they are creative statesmen seized with republican virtue. Of course all this is a tiresome, transparent semantic game which I should have thought readers of *The New Republic* would find distasteful.

Professor Galbraith, as is his wont, only interrupts his name calling long enough to venture one statement of hard fact, and the results are not such as to encourage future such departures. (He describes the District of Columbia, as "the nation's greatest urban concentration of black citizens," which, were *The New Republic* widely read on Chicago's South Side, would occasion widespread laughter. At the time of the 1960 census the black population of Chicago was 812,637, compared with 411,737 in Washington, D.C.)

The Professor also wants the United States to escape from "the superpower syndrome." This is an item from the Professor's inexhaustible inventory of social diagnoses. Its precise meaning is not self-evident, and the Professor does not see fit to make the general reader privy to it. Perhaps readers of *The New Republic* are supposed to understand this jargon; perhaps they are supposed to hold their peace and nod affirmatively when such jargon is dispensed. I am left to puzzle as to whether Professor Galbraith would prefer we were not a superpower; or thinks we are not; or should not be; or should follow his advice and cease to be.

Galbraith wants to reestablish civilian control over foreign policy and the military budget. Let us take these one at a time.

Who does he think controls foreign policy today? Perhaps there are Faceless Militarists who function in the Professor's cosmology the way the Gnomes of Zurich function in other conspiracy theories of history. Who does the Professor want to control foreign policy? Surely not the State Department; the Professor has never been bashful about broadcasting his derision of that Department. Readers will be pardoned for assuming that he wants more control vested in the Presidency. But that deathless doctrine has gone the way of all flesh. Thus summer's eternal verity is that Congress should control foreign policy. The only thing more puzzling than the Professor's tergiversations on this subject is the fact that he has not considered turning foreign policy over to the Supreme Court.

Now about establishing civilian control over the military budget. At the risk of being deemed a reactionary, I would like to inject some grubby facts into the vestal purity of the Professor's thinking. First, these are the facts about the way Secretary of Defense Laird—a demonstrable civilian—has reduced the military percentage of the budget:

Fiscal year	Dollars for defense (billion)	Percent of Federal budget
1960	$45.9	49.8
1961	47.4	48.8
1962	51.1	47.8
1963	52.3	46.9
1964	53.6	45.2
1965	49.6	41.9
1966	56.8	42.2
1967	70.1	44.3
1968	80.5	45.0
1969	81.2	44.0
1970	79.4	40.1
1971	73.6	36.7

The following are the facts about the nondefense origin of increases in the Federal budget during the last decade:

1960–68 Government spending, nonmilitary and military

[In billions]

1961	$97.8
1962	106.8
1963	111.3
1964	118.6
1965	118.4
1966	134.6
1967	158.2
1968	178.8
Nonmilitary spending:	
1961	50.4
1962	55.7
1963	59.1
1964	65.0
1965	68.9
1966	77.9
1967	88.2
1968	98.3
Total increase: $47.9 billion. Up 95 percent.	
Military spending:	
1961	47.4
1962	51.1
1963	52.3
1964	53.6
1965	49.6
1966	56.8
1967	70.1
1968	80.5
Total increase: $33.1 billion. Up 70 percent.	

Finally, some additional information about the defense resources.

THE TREND OF DEFENSE RESOURCES—CONSTANT DOLLARS IN FISCAL YEAR 1971 PRICES

[Billions of Dollars]

	Fiscal years—			
	Prewar, 1964	Peak VN War, 1968	1971	Change, 1968–1971
Defense budget	$66.8	$89.1	$71.8	−$17.3
Other Federal programs	$87.2	$117.2	$135.6	−$18.4
Intra-Government	−$3.6	−$5.1	−$6.6	−$1.5
Total	$150.4	$201.2	$200.8	−$.4
Gross national product	$775.8	$914.0	$1,020.0	
Percent defense budget to GNP	8.8	9.7	7.0	−2.7
Percent defense to total Federal budget	43.4	43.2	34.6	−8.6

One cannot help but notice the complete absence of data in the Professor's argument. I am reluctant to believe that American liberals are content with such vacuous theorizing. It does not constitute a solid case for reform of anything.

If the reforms Galbraith wants were achieved, would he be happy? I doubt it.

Readers will recall that the seniority system became entrenched in the House as a result of a successful liberal assault on the powers of the Speaker around the turn of the century. Now we are told that the seniority system stands between the Republic and bliss.

Again, the elephantitis of the Presidency is a contagion contracted from the Democrats. Galbraith, and his fellow hired pen, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., have labored tirelessly for three decades to bring about an ever more powerful Presidency. (Of course in undertaking to improve upon the balance struck by the Founding Fathers, they were sustained by belief about political facts that was more important than all the theories they concocted: they believed that the Democrats would only take short and infrequent sabbaticals from the White House.) The seniority system and the expanded Presidency are, simultaneously, triumphs and aggravations for liberal "reformers." One can hardly suppress the suspicion that giving a reformer a victory is like giving a toddler a handgrenade. Neither gift is in the long term interests of the recipients.

Of course Galbraith has had some experience with the waywardness of current events. Professor Galbraith is in the running for the Millard Fillmore Political Effectiveness Trophy. Readers will remember Filmore had probems with parties disintegrating under him. Galbraith, when not pioneering a new literary form (the magazine article book), divides what must be his copious spare time between making Harvard what it is today (of diminished stature) and making the Democratic Party what it is today (of diminished strength). The latter is a service to his country for which a grateful nation will honor him when the last copy of *The Affluent Society* has been remaindered. Galbraith lashes Congress for tolerating a "gerontocracy." It appears the "youth movement" may have the same problem.

Galbraith, 61, speaking for the young, tells us that young people think "that the Establishment is not serious." There are many of us who, upon reading that, and upon reflecting that Professor Galbraith is a member in good standing of the Establishment, feel renewed respect for the judgment of young people.

GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLOTT TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of the vote today on the motion to override the President's veto, the able Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF MAJORITY LEADER AND MINORITY LEADER TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the vote tomorrow on the amendment offered by the able Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the able majority leader and the able minority leader be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1971—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE), pursuant to the order of yesterday, laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

The House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 16916) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes", returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States to the House of Representatives

(For President's veto message, see p. 28170, proceedings of the House of Representatives of August 11, 1970.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 16916) making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, returned by the President on August 11, 1970, without his approval, and passed by the House of Representatives, on reconsideration, on August 13, 1970.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is: Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time consumed be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous agreement, the Senate will vote at 4:30 p.m., the time between now and 4:30 p.m. to be divided equally and to be controlled by the majority and minority leaders, or whomever they designate.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not think we really need a speech today—

from the Senator from Washington—before we take action on the overriding the President's veto of the Office of Education bill. We have had plenty of speeches and rhetoric about the needs of education already—what the schools and the students need now is their money.

We made every effort to get this bill to the President early this year. By acting upon the final conference version in July, we did get this bill to the White House months earlier than last year and earlier than at any time during the last decade. Not since 1959, when the fiscal 1960 appropriations was enacted July 14, had the Congress taken final action on an education appropriations as early as we did this summer.

All along, our goal has been to get the money in this bill to the states and local school districts as early as possible. In less than 2 weeks, schools reopen for the new academic year; 52 million children return to classrooms; hundreds of thousands of teachers commence new programs of instruction.

So as chairman of the subcommittee on the education money bill, perhaps it would be somewhat remiss of me if we did not review this matter in some detail.

Let me begin with the figure of 289 to 114—this was the vote last Thursday by the House in overriding the veto, and this figure provides the Senate with the opportunity it has today.

Only a short time ago, the Senate demonstrated its support of the education appropriations bill for fiscal 1971. We voted our approval 88 to 0. I repeat, 88 to 0. The House passed this same measure by 357 to 30.

Those of us who worked hard—and there were many on both sides of the aisle—in perfecting and refining this bill thought we had disposed of the matter for this year. We had turned our attention to other pressing problems—specifically, as far as the Senator from New Hampshire and I were concerned, to the other portions of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill involving health and welfare services and the labor programs appropriation, which are also pressing at this time.

We thought that 445 yea votes out of 475 voting Members of the House and Senate was substantial enough to impress the President on what the legislative branch considered an appropriate minimum amount of Federal money to help provide a better education for educationally deprived children in the elementary and secondary schools—for additional teaching equipment and audiovisual materials—for badly needed guidance, counseling, and testing—and for assistance in overcoming language barriers under bilingual education.

I repeat, we thought that 445 yea votes out of 475 Members voting from both Houses was an overwhelming, stamp of approval of the bill. So we turned to other pressing problems, because we thought we had reached agreement on what should be provided—the bare minimum—for educating the handicapped children and providing job opportunities for students and adults under vocational and adult education.

Education for the handicapped is not only a worthy humanitarian program—it is anti-inflationary. It helps make productive taxpaying citizens of thousands who might otherwise be tax burdens and consumers of welfare.

We agreed that something had to be done on student loans. We provided a small increase, I think too small, to help the students and parents who needed a little assist to complete their educational program. And we added a few dollars—sadly needed—for continued construction of our rapidly expanding community colleges.

We added $25.5 million for libraries and $50 million for instructional materials in elementary and secondary education—the vast bulk of those funds, matching grant programs.

Right now—this very day—in not one of our States is there a library in every elementary school. In 16 of our States, 50 percent or more of the elementary schools have no library facility at all for millions of elementary schoolchildren. To me, this is deplorable. This lack of library facilities seems to me to be truly inflationary.

Yes, we added funds for libraries and money for books and library equipment. Surely that cannot be a poor investment. The President's "right to read" program would truly be empty rhetoric without these library resources.

But now the President has disagreed with us—and here we are again.

The White House is saying that everything we did was wrong and that everything it does is right.

That really is what a veto is all about. It ignores compromise—and we made many compromises before reaching final decisions on this bill.

The Senate gave up $362.7 million in conference with the House. We understand what it is to reach a common ground. I, also, suspect that the Congress knows something about what causes and what does not cause inflation. For the life of me. I cannot agree that investing money in raising the educational level of young people and adults in our Nation is inflationary. Surely it has the opposite effect. No one would seriously suggest that kids in school are inflationary.

We in Congress are very concerned about inflation. We in the Congress are just as concerned about inflation—in fact, maybe even more, concerned than the President—who I know, in all due respect, has great concern.

High interest rates are the real villain of inflation, not education. Long ago—last December, to be exact—we granted the President authority to act on credit and high interest rates—but nothing has been done. So to raise a strawman, and blame education and young people in school for inflation, seems to me to be a most inconsistent and illogical approach to the problem.

Congress is not being political or fiscally irresponsible in giving a high priority to education. To neglect the needs for education and other domestic problems in this country is to court disaster.

The real inflation in this education money bill is the inflation that would be caused by the failure of the Congress to adequately support these programs.

If we fail to act today—and these Federal matching funds which are less than 10 percent of the total education investment fail to reach the States and local schools now, then the States and those schools will have to raise local taxes or they will be forced to add substantially to the unemployment roles in thousands of communities. If they have to go to local financing, which is most difficult, it usually comes from taxes raised on property, whereas the Federal Government, for its share, raises taxes by the more equitable method of the income tax.

I do not see how these thousands of local school districts can do otherwise. There the tax will fall upon everyone, high, low, and medium income alike—and it is not a very equitable tax for this purpose.

More importantly—Mr. President—if we in the Congress fail to support these programs for the education of our youth and adults, there will be a far greater price our society and governments will pay in the future. The price of ill-educated, undertrained young adults, finding it impossible to compete in the modern labor markets and dropping out of life, is too enormous to calculate.

Educational programs help make it possible for all to compete and not cop out.

ADVANCE FUNDING

Generally, it is conceded that the Congress agreed to a $453 million increase over the President's budget—but there is a point to be made here.

The administration's request was really for $5.3 billion—of which $1.3 billion was for advance funding. This is a 2-year program, I must say in all fairness, but the Senate agreed with the House in disallowing this amount even though the administration requested that the Senate restore that House cut.

The main reason for our doing that was that all of the school authorities in the United States, in the thousands of local school districts and institutions of higher education, agreed that if they knew what they were going to get early this year, they need not have the advanced funding. It was much more important, therefore, to get it settled now, than to be late with the education bill.

My point is that, considering the full amount of the budget request, if we add this request for the advanced funding of $1.3 billion, we would end up approximately $885,729,000 under what the President actually requested Congress to provide.

Of course, priorities within education are at stake here, together with the basic philosophy of Federal sharing in the costs of educational programs.

To sustain this veto is to scorn decisions arrived at after long, tedious, and painstaking deliberations.

Sustaining this veto would be turning our backs entirely upon all of the au-

thorizing legislation which also survived painstaking review by Congress. We would turn our backs upon 52 million schoolchildren returning to classrooms during the next few weeks. We would cancel the promise to share in these costs, which has been a long-standing promise of Congress, to all the schools, colleges, universities, and State and local officials.

Vocational education is another program in which we added $54 million. The President, in his message, deplored that increase.

We must neither scorn vocational education nor shortchange these programs. Local communities, especially the community colleges, are the special place where so much can and is being done to improve vocational education and the opportunities thus afforded youth and adults.

As John Gardner, a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare so aptly put it—

> An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing, because plumbing is a humble activity, and tolerates shodiness 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.

Mr. President, let me make a point or two about the veto message.

The President has indicated that some education programs are outmoded and ineffective; this is true. The committee agrees with that premise. All of us at the Federal level, as well as in the States and local schools, must continue to do all that is possible to make these existing programs effective—or change them—or repeal them.

But the proper method of change—for any President and for any Congress—is the lawful process of modification or repeal by legislation, through the legislative committees, not fiscal strangulation.

Impacted aid is the best example to cite in this bill. The way to squarely approach this problem is by considering impacted aid a payment in lieu of taxes.

When we talk about evaluating, I do not know how many study groups, task forces, and commissions have been appointed in HEW over the past few years. I know that there has been a rash of them over the last 18 months, to study this program and that program, and that is fine; but most of them have not come to any conclusions. If they have, there has not been much change. This evaluation process, which seems to be a continuing one, is all right.

But while we are evaluating, while we are studying, we cannot say to the children of the Nation, "You stand aside while another study is being made." They have to report to school next month, and the schools have to go on while we are evaluating these things. They should run parallel, and we are working under the conditions as they are now, what the law is now and that is what we tried to do in this bill.

The veto message said that not enough had been provided for research and innovation. This bill provides more than $132 million for research, planning, and evaluation of education.

In the special research and training account alone, this bill provides $90 million—an increase of $9,752,000 or 12 percent over last year. Together with the House, we felt that the increase was more than sufficient. I applaud the fact that we are looking at these programs, but until we do something to make the change, until we do it legislatively or through administrative regulation or through administrative programing down in the Department, these children have to go to school. This is most important, and this is what the bill had to be geared to do. The President wanted $28.2 million more, but together with the House we felt this lesser increase more than sufficient. Outside of that special account, we approved funds for research, planning, and evaluation within all of the other major program areas. That places an additional $41,915,000 available for these research, planning, and evaluation purposes. That is a total of $132 million—an increase of $18 million or 16 percent over 1970.

Yet, the irony of the veto message was that it stated that not enough had been provided for research and innovation.

One of the startling ramifications of this veto is that the President vetoed his own desegregation plan in which the Congress included an amount of $75 million for this purpose.

It makes one wonder just how serious this administration really is about providing equal opportunity for all children in all our schools.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield, but I would like to finish my remarks first.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am a little surprised at that statement. The President asked for twice as much money as the committee gave him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The President asked for $150 million. Nevertheless, the two Houses—mainly, in conference—decided that we could make a good start for $75 million and the rest of it could be provided after legislation is enacted. But $75 million was cut out of this bill, because the need was justified under the premise that it must be spent and implemented by September 30—less than a month and a half from now. That is the answer to the question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Except that the Senator suggested some lack of good faith on the part of the President. I certainly do not suggest any lack of good faith on the part of the conferees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not suggest that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The fact is that they cut the request in half in that particular area.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not say anything about lack of good faith. I said that I wonder how serious they are not to at least take the $75 million and make a start, when we have a definite understanding that the remainder will be asked for later when the authorizing committees have acted.

The Senator from New Hampshire and I suggested that in the beginning—that the entire amount be put in the supplemental bill and not in this bill, because we were well on our way toward beginning to mark up this bill. The money was all to have been spent by September 30, 1970, and $75 million would be sufficient to cover the necessary amount. That was vetoed. I never mentioned the words "good faith" in this speech at all.

That is the irony of it. Of course, the $75 million had to go out with the vetoed bill. But the legislative processes sometimes have to be considered in these decisions which involve the veto of a bill. We have all agreed that this will come up in a subsequent request and it will receive, I suspect, very sympathetic consideration. Some other educational requests probably will come up in supplementals before we get through here.

The President in vetoing this bill took some pride in the increases that he recommended for education and implied that this should be plenty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the President's veto message printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Now, what about the supplemental requests that Congress is bound to receive before it concludes this session? Should Congress now disallow all such additional requests that are bound to flow up from the Budget Bureau? Disallow them because they might be too much?

It is hard to determine whether the administration is suggesting that this is plenty for today, or whether before the end of the fiscal year or the end of this session we will need more. An increase will be requested before the end of this session, just as sure as I am standing here.

Mr. President, I am not going to take much longer. Other Members have remarks they wish to make. But I want to emphasize that the needs and the issues have not changed since July 28. They are precisely the same as they were when the Senate voted 88 to 0 in support of the bill.

I understand and I know this is correct—that part of the displeasure of the administration, and particularly the Budget Bureau, was that they had strong objection to the fact there was a great deal of mandatory spending involved in the bill. If there were not mandatory spending, they would have free rein to establish their own priorities within education. They do not want any mandatory spending for education. They want to be able to establish their own priorities. Yet Congress also has the high responsibility to establish its priorities.

In Congress, we do not operate in a vacuum. We listen and adjust. There was plenty of give and take on our committee, between the House and the Senate. There is no give downtown—no sitting down and reasoning together among reasonable men and over varied viewpoints.

We heard scores of witnesses, all of

them highly competent and dedicated and thinking people—for hour upon hour and on every aspect of this most important subject involving the future of our Nation.

We came up with a very reasonable bill—fiscally. A bill that helps meet the bare minimums required.

The Bureau of the Budget and the White House were not exposed to those same dedicated people and those well thought out views. We were and we are entitled to some respect for our conclusions and to our 88 to 0 vote in the Senate.

The House is entitled to some respect for its overwhelming verdict also. I must say that we arrived at our initial verdicts independently.

We should vote today on this veto in the same manner—independently—and know that we will.

The responsibility of what is needed to adequately maintain our school systems—to meet these needs within our capabilities—must be shared by the Congress with the administration.

Others, I am sure, will speak about the total Federal budget for 1971, but I want to stress that those of us on my subcommittee also had that in mind. We did not operate in a vacuum as we considered the educational priorities within the bill itself.

When all of the totals are in, appropriations this session will be under the President's total budget.

So, we get down to the nitty-gritty of priorities, of what the priority will be for education. On priorities, there can often be a matter of honest difference.

If one is in touch with the people, education of our young people is of the highest priority. We in the Congress have been in touch with the people on this important question.

EXHIBIT 1

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 16916, an Act making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

I am determined to hold the line against a dangerous budget deficit.

I am determined to hold the line against the kind of big spending that would drive up prices or demand higher taxes.

For that reason, I am today returning, without my approval, two bills the Congress has passed that would increase the Federal budget deficit by nearly one billion dollars.

1. *The Independent Offices Appropriations* bill, which includes funds for urban development, exceeds my budget request by $541 million. I am mindful of the urgent needs of our cities, which is why my original request for urban renewal, water and sewer grants and housing subsidies was *double* the outlays in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration.

I am vetoing this bill because it would help drive up the cost of living, harming the people it is most designed to help. This kind of excessive spending would also help cause the kind of huge deficits that drive up interest rates, which would make it impossible to speed the recovery of the housing industry.

2. *The appropriation for the Office of Education* is $453 million over my budget request.

My request would have produced 28% more spending than in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration.

My budget asked $3.97 billion for the educational purposes covered by this bill—an increase of $972 million in spending over fiscal 1969. In addition, I have committed myself to ask the Congress for an extra $350 million to fully fund the school desegregation program as soon as the Congress provides authorizing legislation.

This is only part of what the Federal government provides for education programs generally. *Total* spending on Federally supported education programs will reach nearly $12 billion in 1971, the highest figure in history and substantially more than was provided for 1969. Thus the question is not one of cutting the present level of school funds. It is not even one of whether to increase school funds. It simply is a question of how *much* they are to be increased—and for what purposes.

Last March I stressed the urgent need for wide-ranging reforms in Federal aid to education. This bill raises the spending on old approaches that experience has proved inadequate, rather than moving boldly on the new approaches that we need—and it cuts requested funds for such forward-looking programs as dropout prevention, educational opportunity grants and research.

My veto of both these bills is painful, but necessary to hold down the rising cost of living.

We cannot have something for nothing. When we spend more than our tax system can produce, the average American either has to pay for it in higher prices or in higher taxes.

At election time it is tempting for people in politics to say "yes" to every spending bill.

If I were to sign these bills that spend more than we can now afford, I would be saying yes to a higher cost of living, yes to higher interest rates, yes to higher taxes.

I flatly refuse to go along with the kind of big spending that is wrong for all the American people. That is why I must veto these bills which add an extra billion dollars of pressure on prices.

Taken individually, there is much that can be said in favor of every spending bill, including the ones I have vetoed.

But a President is not elected to see any one bill in isolation. He must see them as part of a whole, because his constituency is 200 million Americans.

Acting in the best interest of the nation as a whole, and concerned with the average family struggling to make their incomes meet rising prices, I have drawn the line against increased spending.

I urge the Congress to reconsider the spending course it has taken, and to place first priority on achieving our goal: a healthy economy, expanding through peacetime activities, with reasonable price stability.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1970.*

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the matter.

Before yielding to the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), I want to mention that he and the rest of the subcommittee have spent hours and hours, many weeks, with the chairman on the bill. I also want to say that at no time during the independent review of this matter, with all the witnesses, was there a single taint of any kind or a single suggestion of partisanship. We looked at this matter solely and independently. We looked at the bare, minimum needs of what is required for education in this country, and we arrived at that independent conclusion.

Now, Mr. President, I am ready to vote, and I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) such time as he may require.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Washington very much.

Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement because I find it necessary to vote to override the veto of the President of the United States on this bill.

If any man in the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle should be supporting the President's veto, ordinarily it should be the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare.

I wish I could vote to sustain the President's veto. I am an administration supporter. I am a Nixon Republican, and I make no bones about it. I like, whenever possible, to take a position supporting my President.

When the bill passed the Senate, I was one of the four Members who voted against its final passage. The bill, although devoted to what is a primary need in this Nation, that of public education, had been increased in the House of Representatives over the budget, and had been increased in the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. Then, when it reached the floor of the Senate, between $115 million and $125 million was added by amendments.

So that it went beyond the amount the subcommittee, led by the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington, had originally reported to the full Appropriations Committee, and beyond the Appropriations Committee's recommendations.

I voted against it. I thought we had added too much.

Then it went to conference. I am frank to say that I had hoped, when we went to conference, that we could reduce the bill more than we succeeded in reducing it. But we did reduce it substantially, because when the bill went to conference, it was nearly $1 billion over the President's budget. We almost cut that figure in half. When it came out of conference, it was $453 million over the original budget, but it was nearly $375 million under the bill that passed the Senate.

Frankly, I felt that we had done an excellent job. I felt that we had reported a bill that was held in restraint and held as near the budget as we could accomplish on this very sensitive and important subject. I said on the floor that I hoped and believed in this case that the President would sign the bill, because we remember that last year this bill was vetoed and the veto was sustained in the House. At that time—and I was very active in that project—we succeeded in passing a new bill with a total 2-percent cut which the President signed.

I felt this year that we had produced as good a bill as we could and that if we had to do it over again, we would not be able to do any better. We should bear in mind that the real obstacle in this

bill is the impacted area funds. The reason that the school districts and the people of this country are so vitally interested in impacted area funds is that they are the only funds in this whole $4 billion bill that go into the school districts with no strings attached, so that the local school boards can use them for their most pressing needs.

I think everyone will agree that the formula under which the impacted area funds have to be appropriated is an outmoded and distorted one. For example, the money goes into some of the counties and localities adjoining Washington where Government employees who work in the District live. These counties are rich in resources and they receive a disproportionate share of the funds.

The way to attack that situation, as the Senator from Washington has just said, is through the legislative committee to give us a proper formula in lieu of taxes, a formula which would be more equitable.

Mr. President, I think I understand why I have trouble with the President on this matter. He has been kind enough not to put me on the spot, for which I am very grateful. I believe he knows of my embarrassment.

I still believe in my heart that if this bill had hit the President's desk alone in the course of the appropriation bills that came along, he would have seen his way clear to sign it. However, it came there with another bill. This bill was $453 million over the budget. The other bill was $600 million-plus over the budget, I believe. The President very justifiably felt that he should hold the line and he vetoed both bills. By his action the President was performing his sworn duty as Chief Executive. I admire his courage, and I respect him for it.

Mr. President, I am compelled to vote to override the veto for three reasons.

The first is that the field of education is so vital that if there is an exception to be made, I believe it should be made in this bill. Bear in mind that the same subcommittee, led by the same Senator, the Senator from Washington, must go on now and cope with a bill to cover the fields of health and welfare that involve many more problems.

The second reason why I feel I am compelled to vote to override this veto is that the Senator from Washington and the other members of the subcommittee who were conferees along with the House Members in working out a final bill were willing to make concessions and were willing to help reduce the bill by nearly half a billion dollars. Having obtained those concessions, I feel honorbound to stand by the collective results, because had I then turned and voted against my own committee and against the conferees and against those who had yielded on many points, I would be violating my own duty to the chairman and to the others who had worked so hard throughout so many weeks to bring this bill to final passage.

The third reason that I feel I must vote to override the veto is because it is my honest opinion, after 10 years on this subcommittee and after nearly 10 years as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that if this veto were sustained and the bill were sent back and we had to start all over again, we would delay getting the money to the districts and make it impossible for the school districts to know what money they could depend upon as they go into the coming school year for the hiring of their teachers and laying down their work. If we did all of that, I am quite positive that we would not come up with any better bill from the standpoint of holding to the budget than this bill. It would be just as big. We would have marched up the hill and marched down again.

So, to keep faith with the chairman and with the members of the committee and hoping that I can still be effective to an extent as we try to deal with the twin fields of health and welfare and bring in a bill on those matters, I feel that I am to the best of my ability supporting the cause of education in the legislative process we have been through and, yes, still supporting the President of the United States, even though he felt it necessary to veto this bill.

For those reasons, I am compelled reluctantly and sadly to vote to override the veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, someone else controls the time. However, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I asked the Senator to yield because I am a member of his subcommittee. I know how much the position he has taken this afternoon means to him. He has been a loyal administration supporter. In fact, pursuant to his long training and experience, he has also been a great friend of education.

Now that the "crunch" has come, I, for one, am not surprised to find the Senator on the side he has taken, as announced this afternoon. He is always fair with the members of his subcommittee. That goes without saying, but I am happy to be able to say it again. He is also scrupulously honest with his own convictions. It is a pleasure to serve in the Senate and on the committee and on the subcommittee with him. I honor him for the statement he has just made.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for his very kind words. I appreciate them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, and the ranking minority member, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, who has just spoken. It has been my privilege to serve with both of them for years on the Committee on Commerce, at which time the chairman of this subcommittee from the State of Washington was the chairman of the Committee on Commerce; and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire was the ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. Through 7 years of close association with them I learned of their great impartiality, ability, and dedication to the Government.

Mr. President, no Senator rises to speak glibly about overriding a Presidential veto. It is not a "fun" course to override a Presidential veto. It is not pleasant for anyone and it is far more difficult for Senators across the aisle than it is for us. We realize that only patriotism moves them to vote to override a Presidential veto, especially when the President is a member of their own party. Mindful of that, and having served on the committee with them, I know of their dedication to education.

In more than 13 years on the Subcommittee on Education, I have served with Senators like Lister Hill, Wayne Morse, John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Joe Clark; and from across the aisle Senator Smith of New Jersey, who is a Princeton man and who went back to some connection with Princeton, Senator Ives and others, all of whom worked devotedly. We worked together on the National Defense Act of 1958. Now we are about to determine if congressional or Executive judgment of education needs of the country shall prevail.

In its veto message on H.R. 16916, the administration devotes little attention to the state of the education system or its needs. I am chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which deals with the Bureau of the Budget. In questioning its spokesmen last year I found that of their 178 hearing examiners who pass on the whole budget of the United States and recommend to the President with respect to the needs of education and health, there is not a single health professional and there is not a single education professional in that group. So it is not surprising that they would recommend to the President that he whack away at education and health.

The reasons for the veto, as set forth in the message, in the press, and in the debate on the House floor, embrace the whole spectrum of the national economy. The bill was vetoed not because of its relationship to the education system, but for its relationship to the price structure.

I ask Senators to consider when they can recall any administration program for a military contract appropriation limited and cut back because of its impact on the economy.

When does any Senator remember an administration asking us to cut a military appropriation because it was inflationary? To the contrary, as we have noticed in administration after administration, let there be a desire to pursue war in Indochina, to construct fabulous boondoggles like the ABM, and Congress and the public are deluged with sophisticated technological information and rationalizations. But never a word of how the economy—the price structure—will suffer from expenditures for such

unproductive white elephants as the Indochina war and the ABM.

Fifteen to $20 billion this year for the war. While all other budget requests totalled are for less, there is a Defense Department budget request of nearly $75 billion. Where is the administration's fear for the inflationary impact of that budget request?

Why is the financing of education, housing, and veterans' care alone weighed for impact on the national economy, while the case for military expenditures for wild adventures overseas deals as though need were the only issue?

The administration does not deny the education system needs this money. It argues only with respect to its effect on inflation, spending, and the price structure.

The administration, in other words, does not deny that the education system needs this bill, because the administration cannot deny that the country needs it.

I say the school system of the country needs the $4.4 billion in this bill, which is about one-fifth of the cost for the war this year. The President said he did not veto it because of the $4.4 billion. As he said in his first message, in the first line on page 2, he was vetoing it because it is $453 million more than his budget request. However, all of it is only about one-fifth of the cost of the war in Vietnam for 1 year.

IMPACT AID

As I have said, the school system of the country needs the $4.4 billion in this bill. School districts educating children of Federal employees need to have the Government pay its share of local school costs, which is all that impact aid amounts to. For this, Congress provides 90 percent of the entitlement, $126 million more than the President asked.

At Randolph Air Force Base in San Antonio, Tex., 90 percent of the income for the school district serving that Air Force base is from impact aid. The few businesses around there would not begin to support the education system there.

We send military people overseas and then complain about building facilities to educate their children. Who lives in these areas? It is the soldiers, the airmen, the sailors, if it is a naval base, and their children.

We ask these military people to serve in foreign fields; should we not give their children a chance, the same chance as if they lived away from that base in a more affluent community?

If this money is not appropriated, who would make up that amount, other than parents and other local property owners? And why would not the economic impact be the same, no matter what the source? Or does the President contemplate that the Federal contribution would not be replaced, and education standards for these children should decline?

He does not bother to say that. He does not come clean with a full answer. He only states the veto is "necessary to hold down the rising cost of living." Is not a higher school tax in a local school district an increased cost of living? The districts do not have the resources, because of the loss of tax-exempt Federal property.

In order for a dollar to be spent for impact aid, two conditions must be present: First, children must be there by reason of a Federal activity. If 30,000 airmen were stationed at a base and there were no children, there would not be one penny of impact aid payable. Second, tax-exempt Federal property must be involved. In World War II, if there were 1,000 airmen going to school under contract with private companies, those companies were taxpaying; the impacted aid would not apply. So two factors must be present: children brought in as a result of activities of the Federal Government, and there must be tax-exempt property.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

A $3,750,000 increase Congress made for bilingual education is part of the $453 million that prompted the veto.

This program is aimed at one of the most costly social conditions in the country—the failure of the education system to teach and train children from non-English speaking families. Two-thirds of these non-English speaking families speak Spanish. No group has a higher dropout rate than this one. The reason is that an English-language school system does not reach them, especially in the early grades.

The social and economic expense that results from this gap in the education system is many times $3,750,000. Every penny spent to teach these children in a language they understand means a gain in self-reliance and financial income for non-English speaking, who thereby become proficient in English also.

Bilingual education enlarges their earning capacity and reduces their dependence upon public services. It enlarges their contribution to the national income. It would be hard to find an activity where more can be accomplished with less money.

There are 3 million children from non-English-speaking families in this country and an appropriation of only $25 million, or only eight and a third dollars a child.

TITLE I—ESEA

Much the same can be said for the $161 million increase the bill carries for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This title funnels money into better education for children from poor families.

How else will we break the poverty cycle that is such an expense to all levels of government, except by education that compensates these children for a lack of intellectual and cultural development at home? Money spent for title I is not inflationary; it is anti-inflationary, because it is the only way to reduce the infinitely greater financial expense to government of poverty.

There are 8 million children in these poverty brackets. The increase of $161 million is an increase of $20 per child. Education is not inflationary; war is inflationary.

Mr. President, there are 52 million schoolchildren in this country. Eight million come from poverty families; $20 a child for education in these areas is not inflationary.

SCHOOL EQUIPMENT

Another item that led to this veto was $50 million Congress added for the purchase of school equipment under title III of the National Defense Education Act.

At a time when technology is able to enhance teaching techniques, especially with children having learning problems, it is the worst kind of economy to eliminate this item, as did the President's budget. Congress has provided $50 million, not in addition to a budget request but as the entire amount that will be available.

It is a much smaller sum than the school system can profitably use. But it is a vast improvement over the false economy of the administration budget, and the President's veto message. A properly equipped school is a more economical school. Children learn better and faster. It is against every interest of our country to deny money to properly equip schools.

Mr. President, I taught in rural schools from the primary grade to the eighth grade. I taught in higher education. I taught at Texas University Law School. I can say that a school that is not equipped properly is half as efficient as a school that has proper teaching aids. We heard in our subcommittee how modern aids can help in teaching.

SUPPLEMENTARY SERVICES—GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Effective guidance and counseling are among education's most useful tools in helping children with learning difficulties. Children who lack parental guidance and motivation become the problems of the school system. Yet these services are difficult for local school districts to provide, and where they exist, they have been stimulated by Federal support. This is why we added $23 million to the program, bringing it to a level of $143 million. With the problems we have in schools today, this $23 million for counseling amounts to less than 50 cents per pupil per year for the 52 million schoolchildren in America.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Another item in dispute is the $43 million more than was budgeted for vocational education.

Vocational education is the means whereby 8 million Americans last year improved their vocational skills. We are reading these days of skilled workers reaching a plateau of income, when their skills have taken them as far as they can go. These millions of people can advance only by learning. The $43 million is $5.33 per person for upgrading our work force.

CONSTRUCTION AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGE SUPPORT

Community colleges are the bread and butter schools for over 2.2 million young people who cannot afford the expense of a 4-year education at an institution away from home. Community colleges go where the people are, and where the need for vocation-oriented courses is greatest.

The administration calls for a suspension this year of Federal grants for construction of these colleges. Should Congress accede, the education facilities for

middle-income Americans will be seriously crippled.

Federal funds make up less than 10 percent of the construction money for community colleges: but it is important "seed" money, stimulating much greater contributions from State and local governments. The working parents of college-age children will find themselves priced still further out of the education system unless we support community colleges.

Land-grant institutions are in much the same category. The administration wants to phase out payments to land-grant institutions, many of them serving poor rural areas and still developing into full-fledged colleges and universities. The budget provides nothing for them. Congress provides $10,080,000.

NDEA STUDENT LOANS

The largest item Congress added for higher education was for student loans out of the national defense student loan fund. The bill has $243 million for this purpose, $66 million more than proposed by the budget.

A low budget request of only $177 million was part of an administration effort to reduce direct loans and increase guaranteed loans from lending institutions.

That plan does not mean any longrun saving to the Federal Government. As loans are repaid and interest collected, the money will be returned to the Government, whereas Federal subsidies to private lenders will not be recouped.

Applications from educational institutions show that there is a great demand among students for NDEA loans. Both programs have a necessary role in student assistance. The bill will extend and support them both.

Mr. President, the whole point of the National Defense Education Act, of which I had the privilege of being a coauthor, was to make loans available to students. Now I go to different colleges and students tell me, "I do not know of anyone on the whole floor who was able to get a loan." Many more students need the loans. The budget request would reduce lending below the level of last year. We just heard this morning that the American Bankers Association want the student loans program phased out and all loans to be made through banks—at 9¼ percent interest.

This is no long-range way to save money for the Federal Government. The money is collected from the students. The same principle applies as did to building dormitories at the end of World War II, which the students paid back. There is a greater demand now for student loans under NDEA than ever before. These programs have a necessary role in student assistance. We have had five programs inaugurated in the time that I have had the privilege to be on the subcommittee. There was no previous Federal program for direct money to students except the GI bill. Now we have five such programs.

LIBRARIES AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

Another source of difference between the budget and the appropriation bill is in library support and educational television. Congress added $12 million for public libraries, $5 million for services and $7 million for construction. For college library services, we added $5.4 million, and for educational television, $7 million.

Every State has a backlog of applications for public library grants. These buildings and their materials are the information storehouse for the entire citizenry, for self-education as well as for entertainment and enrichment. The $7 million for construction could be used within many individual States. Yet the budget proposed nothing. The $7 million in the bill will be the only federal money available.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

The bill increases money to educate handicapped children by $10 million over the budget. Many school systems still have no special programs for the handicapped. We all know that great economic dividends flow from money spent to help these children. They, too, often become heavy consumers of public services, unless they are saved by specialized education. There are 5 million handicapped students in this country. This $10 million is only $2 per pupil. It takes far more in teacher training and equipment to educate a handicapped child than a nonhandicapped child.

In all these sectors, which comprise the major increases over the budget, Congress has added a minimal amount of money because we found it was needed for each specific program. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate go over these categories in minute detail.

A sound education system is the foundation of our national strength and our national economy. Approval of this bill by the Senate will help assure that we keep it sound. We do not have a large appropriation for the education of the 52 million schoolchildren and the 8 million college students in America. This total bill is only one-fifth of the cost of the war in Indochina. I think it more important to educate Americans than to kill Asians.

For this minimal bill, I beseech my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote to uphold the action of the Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to urge that the veto by the President be overridden this afternoon when the Senate has an opportunity to address itself to that question, which will be in just about 1 hour.

Mr. President, earlier this morning I had the opportunity to meet in Boston with a distinguished group of educators from my State of Massachusetts. Among them was the commissioner of education, Neil Sullivan, and executives from the State board of education. There were also superintendents and representatives from several school systems in the State. There were representatives from the State associations for principals, for teachers, and for school committees. There were some college students who have studied the needs for students and there were several others. It was a broadly based and well-informed group of educators from Massachusetts.

I come back to the floor of the Senate with a renewed sense of urgency about the importance of the action to be taken by the Senate this afternoon in the vote on overriding the President's veto.

Mr. President, during the course of my meeting this morning, there were a number of very impassioned statements made by various representatives of those groups. These are men and women who have made careers in the field of education. They are professionals in their field, who have a deep understanding and a deep concern about the potential consequences of the President's veto being sustained.

Without exception, Mr. President, those men and women, one after another, as they spoke from their hearts about the educational needs of the people in my State, reiterated most emphatically and dramatically what would be the cost in terms of educational opportunity to the young people of Massachusetts if the President's veto were not overridden.

I remember the statement of Neil Sullivan, the commissioner of education for Massachusetts, who pointed out how the number of children of families on aid to dependent children, who are included in the formula for title I of ESEA, will increase in Massachusetts next year by some 22 percent, yet, he pointed out, even this bill vetoed by the President will increase funds for title I by only 11 percent. Even with this increase, there would have to be a curtailment of existing educational opportunities in the school systems generally around the State of Massachusetts. Without the increase, at the figure proposed by the President, consequences would be drastic. As Commissioner Sullivan said:

> The conference position would at least enable title I to absorb some of the cost represented by the added AFDC population; the President's position spells doom for many aspects of the current program.

In other words, Mr. President, even with these increases, the $453 million that we have added will be unable to meet the increasing demands to provide a continuing effort and to live up to expectations for the next year's school budget.

I remember the statement of Donald Graves, the director of the Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical School, one of the finest vocational technical schools in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and generally throughout New England, talking about the progress that has been made in the field of vocational and technical training, and what would be the impact if we were not to receive the increased appropriations that have been provided in the conference report.

I have here a statement by Dr. William Ohrenberger, the Boston superintendent of schools, who says:

> The presidential veto of the Educational Bill is a serious blow to the children of not only the Boston Schools, but of schools throughout the country. Congress, through its passage of both this and preceding Education Bills, has truly recognized that education is the only means by which an individual or nation may move ahead. Nothing

is more important to the future of our nation than a proper investment in the education of our children.

He also talked about what the impact would be on the Boston school system if this veto were sustained.

Finally, Mr. Lawrence Creedon, superintendent of schools of Quincy, Mass stated in part:

If the President's veto is sustained Quincy will either be forced to abandon many of the programs that I have cited or redirect its limited funds from development in other critically needed areas to the support of those programs. A loss in federal assistance to the Quincy Public Schools would mean a re-assessment of the school building program, including the replacement of existing elementary schools that are now more than 100 years old and major renovation of existing high school facilities that have not been updated in the past fifty years.

This is only a sampling, Mr. President, of the comments and the statements made by distinguished Massachusetts educators.

I think the situation in Massachusetts is perhaps not unlike that in many other States. In 1967, Massachusetts received some $93.9 million, in terms of Federal help and assistance. In 1968, that amount was increased to $99.2 million. In 1969, the amount went down to $90.7 million, and in 1970–71, with the administration proposal, it would be only $90 to $95 million. In other words, under the original Nixon administration proposal, Massachusetts would actually have received a reduced amount of funding under what it received 4 years ago, in spite of the fact that tens of thousands of new students have been added to the school rolls, and in spite of the fact that the cost of education has risen approximately 13 percent per year.

Mr. President, in my State we rely, in terms of resources being made available to the various school districts, largely on the property tax. Seventy-four percent of all the funding that is provided for the education of young people in Massachusetts' primary and secondary schools comes from property taxes, as compared to a national average of some 52 percent of the funds for school districts that are raised from property taxes. Therefore, as in many of the old New England States that resort to the property tax for educational support, the sustaining of this veto would provide an extraordinary additional burden on all of the property taxpayers in the old communities and old cities of those older States that are already, at the present time, in an extremely tight and difficult situation.

Mr. President, the allegation has been made by the administration that this increase of $453 million is really an inflationary measure. But I wonder, Mr. President, why we do not hear any suggestion of a veto of the various authorizations and appropriation bills on weapons systems, which today are running to $24.5 billion in cost overruns. We do not hear the administration talking about vetoing any of those bills, though that is what we are today experiencing.

What Congress has provided is a $453 million increase in funds for the education of the young people of this country.

Mr. President, I reject this charge that this is an inflationary measure. We know that in providing quality education for the young people of this country, we are giving them the training for productive employment, and are hopeful of keeping them off the welfare and unemployment rolls. We believe the investment made now will save us untold millions of dollars in future family assistance programs and welfare payments.

Finally, Mr. President, I think it is important to realize that Congress appropriates some $125 a year for every person in South Vietnam; whether it is through Defense programs or AID assistance, or by whatever name we call it, it amounts to $125 for every South Vietnamese.

All we are asking is the provision of less than half of that for every American schoolchild, so that he can receive a decent education.

Mr. President, I feel that this is one of the most important votes we shall have the opportunity to cast. I disclaim the arguments which have been made in the past about the inflationary nature of the bill. There is an extraordinary need and demand for this kind of resource to provide quality education for people enrolled in our school systems.

I hope that the veto will be overturned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the participants at my meeting in Boston this morning, letters and statements which were submitted to me at that meeting, and a statement which I prepared and released in connection with that meeting.

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

EDUCATION AT AUGUST 18, 1970, MEETING IN BOSTON WITH SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Commissioner of Education Neil Sullivan.

Robert C. Graceffa, Michael J. Grealy, Donald Tye, Charles Avery, Coalition for Aid to Private Higher Education.

Daniel Coughlin, William G. Tobin, Title I Boston, Deputy Supt. Boston.

Everet G. Thistle, Asst. Commissioner, State Dept. of Education.

Wm. Philbrick Jr., Director, Bureau of Special Education.

Mrs. Laurence J. Kipp, Vice Chrmn., Board of Education.

Mrs. Mary E. Flynn, Mass. Bureau of Library Extension.

John A. Kariger, Director, Elementary Education, Pittsfield.

Superintendent Donald W. Dunnan, Peabody.

Don Torres, Bureau of Curriculum Innovation, Dept. of Education.

Donald E. Graves, Southeastern Reg. School District (Reg. Voc.).

Wm. A. Dwyer, Supt., Blue Hills Reg. Tech. Sch. District.

Joan M. McFarland, Asst. Dir., Project Lighthouse.

Richard J. Lavin, Director Merrimack Education Center ESEA–III.

James R. Howard, Asst. Director, Educative for Greater Boston, EDCO Title III.

Bryant Robinson, Springfield School Dept.

Thomas J. Donahoe, Springfield.

Harding J. Steward, Springfield.

Asst. Commission of Education Thomas J. Curtin.

Stewart Sargent, Quincy Public Schools.

Supt. Lawrence Creedon, Quincy.

Daniel P. Kulich, Brockton PS.

Blanche Martin, State Dept. of Education.

Fred Maffeo, Mass. Association School Committees.

Betram Holland, Mass. Assoc. of School Principals.

John Sullivan, Mass. Teachers Association.

David Cronin, Mass. Dept. of Education.

John E. Kearney, Mass. Dept. of Education.

George Membrino, Chicopee.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,

Boston, August 18, 1970

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
John F. Kennedy Federal Building,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: The Health, Education and Welfare Appropriation Bill that has been vetoed by President Nixon comes before the Senate for further deliberations on Tuesday, August 18, 1970. A determination to sustain the President's negative position will cause irreparable damage to the educational program in Massachusetts.

Without detailing the specific loss the Commonwealth faces within the $25,000,000 difference between the President's recommended budget and the House-Senate Conference Report, I would like to call to your attention important aspects of the bill. There has been an estimated 22% increase in the number of Aid to Dependent Children. From a 1970 figure of 68,220 the 1971 number is expected to raise to 86,500. The HEW Bill would increase the state's allotment under Title I, E.S.E.A. by 11% over the previous fiscal year. This disproportionate percentage rise will not allow Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act to operate at its present program level. As unfortunate as this situation may be, the President has recommended a 1% decrease in this same program. The conference position would at least enable Title I to absorb some of the cost represented by the added A.F.D.C. population; the President's position spells doom for many aspects of the current program.

In another area, the President has recommended $10,000,000 less than the Conference Report for the education of handicapped children. The Department of Education records indicate that each year for the last three years we have been forced to deny more than 120 worthwhile projects to aid handicapped children in public schools and to deny traineeships or fellowships to more than 100 excellent candidates for further college and university training to teach handicapped children. In addition to inability to fund appropriate projects, the Department has been obliged to cut any approved project by approximately 35% in order to reserve funds to permit greater geographical coverage.

Among the results of these constraints are feelings of hopelessness among local educational agencies regarding any adequate funding, severe restrictions on the original comprehensive planning of individual or groups of local educational associations, and maximum difficulty in hiring administrators and teachers to staff Federally-funded projects.

The increases afforded by the present Federal appropriation act will alleviate these problems substantially.

Sincerely,

NEIL V. SULLIVAN,
Commissioner of Education.

SOUTH EASTON, MASS.,
August 18, 1970.

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: May I thank you for the courtesy extended to me in providing time for myself and my colleagues to appear

before you this morning in an attempt to obtain the Senate approval required to assure passage of the recent education bill currently under presidential veto.

While I am concerned that education continue to advance in all parts of the country I am particularly concerned with vocational education and most specifically with vocational education in Massachusetts.

In recent years vocational education across the nation has made significant strides in providing occupational training opportunities for a great number of our citizens both young and old. These are people who are looking for this kind of training in order that they may take their rightful place in our society.

In Massachusetts as in so many other states we have in the last ten years seen many wonderful changes take place in vocational education and indeed in all elements of education due in large part to the federal aid which has been forthcoming.

I believe that we are within a few years of seeing regional occupational training opportunities extended to practically every community in Massachusetts. I can assure you without question this effort could not have been successful without the help of significant federal funds.

There are many accomplishments to date which are a matter of record and there are many goals yet to attain, far too many to present in this brief delivery.

May I urge you to do all in your power as a Senator from Massachusetts to insure that the recorded progress in education may continue.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD E. GRAVES,
Superintendent Director.

BOSTON SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS URGES SENATE SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION BILL

Dr. William Ohrenberger, Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools, stated emphatically today that school systems throughout the nation need increased financial aid. Dr. Ohrenberger remarked:

"The presidential veto of the Education Bill is a serious blow to the children of not only the Boston Schools, but of schools throughout the country. Congress, through its passage of both this and preceding Education Bills, has truly recognized that education is the only means by which an individual or nation may move ahead. Nothing is more important to the future of our nation than a proper investment in the education of our children.

"Federal funding has been of great benefit to our schools. Without such assistance Boston would have been unable to extend and expand its enrichment program for the disadvantaged or to initiate many worthwhile experimental programs which have a far-reaching effect on the entire school system and will improve greatly the quality of education.

"The continuation of these educational programs and the initiation of others hinges directly on both continued and increasing federal support. The present Education Bill contains Funding for both the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Public Law 874.

"I strongly urge for the sake of all school children in the nation, especially those in urban areas, that the Senate of the United States follow the action of the House of Representatives in voting to override the veto of this vital Education Bill."

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

August 17, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am deeply concerned that federal funds for the strengthening of educational programs in Springfield, are in danger of being cut.

Our federally funded projects during fiscal 1970, are listed on the attached sheet. In order that each of these highly successful, educationally significant, and sound projects be continued, it is imperative that their funding be increased or at least sustained.

It is difficult to single out any of these projects to emphasize the importance of this increased funding. They cannot be implemented without Federal help. Surely our Title VIII bilingual Elementary School program, which is unique in the Commonwealth, and which has been evaluated by an independent team as an excellent program to educate Puerto Rican children, deserves a $21,000 increase.

A city such as ours, needs the Title IV $67,000 to implement a positive program for the in-depth appreciation by our teachers of their changing role in an urban setting, vis-a-vis minority groups. The Teacher Corp has given the city a cadre of employees sensitive to the needs of disadvantaged children, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps furnishes needed jobs for the poor. We cannot disregard the effort which has put into the Career Opportunity Program which, if implemented, will give 50 individuals a chance for a college education, a profession, and a better way of life. I need not enumerate, the importance of the programs made possible by approximately $1,000,000 in ESEA Title I funds to our city.

All this and more will be placed in jeopardy unless the President's veto is overridden and anticipated funds are made available for the coming year. Please help us.

Respectfully,

JOHN E. DEADY,
Superintendent of Schools.

SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS. SPRINGFIELD. MASS.
CURRENT FEDERAL AND STATE PROJECTS

	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Increase
Title I. ESEA	851,000	919,000	70,000
Title II	27,000	27,000	0
Title III	257,761	272,608	15,000
Title IV (civil rights)	None	67,000	67,000
Bilingual title VII	80,000	101,000	21000
Education Professions Development Act (B-2)	29,175	41,140	12,000
Teacher Corps	85,190	90,000	5,000
Career opportunity program	[1] 1,440	67,000	65,500
Neighborhood Youth Corps	[2] 128,060	[2] 141,450	13,000
NDEA. title III	53,853	61,236	8,000
Total	1,513,476	1,787,434	

[1] Planning.
[2] Summer.

MEMORANDUM OF POSITION ON PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF EDUCATIONAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, AUGUST 17, 1970

To: The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy.
From: Dr. William H. Hebert, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Massachusetts Teachers Association.

Massachusetts stands to lose $25 million in federal funds ear-marked for education if the Senate does not override the Presidential veto. President Nixon wants to limit Massachusetts to a total of $52 million, while the proposed legislation calls for an allocation of $77 million. This 25 million dollar difference will have the most profound effect on current and planned educational programs in the Commonwealth. For example:

1. Massachusetts now receives $15 million for Impacted Areas (P.L. 874). This stands to be curtailed sharply and involved in 1969 approximately 200 cities and towns. A partial list of those communities includes Holyoke, Northampton, Pittsfield, Westfield, West Springfield, Chicopee, Granby, South Hadley, Springfield, Ayer, Concord, Fitchburg, Leominster, Waltham, Watertown, Framingham, Worcester, Bedford, Billerica, Burlington, Chelmsford, Lexington, Lowell, Methuen, Tewksbury, Wakefield, Woburn, Gloucester, Haverhill, Lynn, Peabody, Arlington, Belmont, Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Medford, Melrose, Revere, Saugus, Winchester, Winthrop, Brookline, Cambridge, Somerville, Boston, Fall River, Natick, Needham, Braintree, Brockton, Dedham, Quincy, Randolph, Bourne, Falmouth, Hingham, Hull, New Bedford, and Weymouth.

2. Funds allocated for Education for the Handicapped (Title VI A, Elementary and Secondary Education Act) will be reduced substantially. Programs for teachers and materials for the blind, hard-of-hearing and other unfortunate children will have to be eliminated or cut back.

3. The present allocation of $9.7 million for vocational and adult education would be increased to $10.8 if the Senate overrides the veto. This represents a gain of $1.1 million for Massachusetts.

4. The proposed bill calls for $17 million for Higher Education. The President wishes to allocate only $13 million, a potential loss of $4 million to the Commonwealth.

5. Student Aid programs would be reduced significantly if the President's wishes are carried out. For example, NDEA loans will be reduced, educational opportunity grants will be cut, and work study and cooperative educational programs will be curtailed. Further, money essential to permit construction at community colleges will also be pared.

6. Community Education, which involves a public library program, including funds for library materials, salaries and construction, will also be subjected to serious setbacks.

MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL COMMITTEES, INC.,
Boston, Mass., August 18, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: The Massachusetts Association of School Committees respectfully requests that you vote to override the veto of the Office of Education Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 1971.

These funds make it possible for local school committees to improve the quality of education. The cost of these quality programs will need strong financial support from local, state and federal governments in order to achieve their goals. The increased cost of education requires that federal funds must be available to local communities if progress is to be made.

Your favorable action on the veto override will be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HELEN A BOWDITCH,
President.

MERRIMACK VALLEY REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL PLANNING CENTER,
Chelmsford, Mass., August 17, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: The recent veto of the Education Bill by President Nixon prompts me to request your leadership in the Senate for action reversing this veto.

Merrimack Education Center (MEC) has become a vital operating force in a large segment of Massachusetts. As a child of ESEA Title III, we serve approximately 100,000 students in twenty cooperative and contiguous communities in the Merrimack Valley area. It has become a vehicle to be used by students, teachers, administrators, and towns.

Enclosed are two recent newspaper articles describing some of the services provided through our "center". It is important that the momentum that has been estab-

lished through "seed" monies from the Federal Government continue.

Your continuing efforts in behalf of education are very much appreciated.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD J. LAVIN.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 20, 1970]

FARMHOUSE EDUCATIONAL MIDDLEMAN

In a 19th Century Chelmsford farmhouse a group of professionals are taking education into the country—and big business atmosphere out of education.

The Merrimack Valley Education Center can hardly be distinguished from any well-preserved New England homestead. The only outward concession to the center's being a public building is a discreet parking lot, post-card setting of the center.

Headed by Dr. Richard J. Lavin, executive director, the center is a cooperative of 20 surrounding communities hop-scotching from Ashby to North Andover. It was established in 1968 with federal Title III funds which provides for innovative education centers.

According to Dr. Lavin, the center is a middleman between the communities it serves and larger educational resources. It works both ways—with the communities seeking help at the center, and the center itself scouting areas it might help.

Dr. Lavin says the center is a grass roots organization close enough to the local scene to know what's happening, and yet independent of individual school districts. The center, he said, can offer objective evaluation and still be free enough to create new solutions to problems.

The Chelmsford center serves teachers who could otherwise get so tangled in bureaucratic tape over a new program they want to learn about, it would tie them in knots.

The Merrimack Center's staff is small—two full-time professionals, several parttime professionals, doctoral interns, and secretaries. The center also uses consultants on a per diem basis when it's necessary.

Education, as anyone else involved in a constantly changing and experimented-with process, could spend half their working hours, all their free time, and any appropriation given them on "keeping up." Since teachers rarely have the time to read all the extant journals of their profession and taxpayers are more reluctant to spend money on something not tested by the fire of time, experimental and innovative projects are less likely to be tried.

The center, for instance, can serve a Lawrence principal who also hears of a new teaching technique which he feels would be beneficial to his school. The center can detail the information for the principal and collect and collate other data he may need.

The center can also, for example, buy kits outlining various science curricula available to school systems. The kit costs about $75, but since it's only used once, it wouldn't be economically feasible for one system to buy it. The center can—and lend it to whoever in the cooperative wants to use it.

The Title II money runs out next year. After that it will be up to the member communities to keep the Merrimack Center in operation. The members are assessed 25 cents a pupil—so the cost to a community is in proportion to its school population, and the benefits it can receive. If the center is supported by its members, it will know it's serving its school districts well.

The Merrimack Center searches out and evaluates new educational processes and programs, according to Dr. Lavin, but it does not mandate any programs. It assists client towns in developing innovative projects; in applying for funding assistance; in solving problems of curriculum, staffing, pupil and personnel, in providing in-service professional and para-professional training, and in developing cultural and industrial resources.

Among the technological aids at the center is a microfiche (similar to microfilm) library which contains hundreds of pieces of professional educational material. The center also rents computer time which enables guidance counsellors to scan in minutes possible college choices for an interested student.

A New England organization, cognizant of the New England tradition for individuality, the center doesn't press for homogeneous systems. The center will help school districts develop and implement new programs, but the help is so tailormade, said Dr. Lavin, that the schools maintain their own stamps. Nothing the center offers, said Dr. Lavin, is so rigid it can't be shaped to suit the school system.

The main thrust of the center has been in the education of young children, the handicapped, career guidance, and in-service education. During the center's first year and a half of existence, it developed about 10 projects with member districts. In addition, about 15 proposals have been prepared and submitted on behalf of individual districts.

In the fall, according to Dr. Lavin, the center will be working on vocational education, among other things.

[The Christian Science Monitor, July 20, 1970]

OUTSIDE AIDS POOLED: 20 REGIONAL SCHOOLS TAP SERVICE STATION

(By Lorraine Karcz)

CHELMSFORD, MASS.—An old farmhouse napping in a Chelmsford meadow is the unexpected setting for an energetic educational service station.

"I see the Merrimack Educational Center (MEC) as a catalyst for change in the 20 communities surrounding us," said Dr. Richard J. Lavin, the center's director, from his desk overlooking the meadow.

Dr. Lavin, an intense, soft-spoken educator with experience as an industrial consultant, travels about his 20-town area promoting much-needed cooperation among the school districts.

School people from the towns now come to the center to get new ideas to take back to their classrooms and to avail themselves of services and equipment they could not afford alone.

MEC is a child of Title 3 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides for supplementary educational centers. These centers, operating outside local school systems, have the task of developing and disseminating bright new ideas in education.

BROKER FEATURE DESCRIBED

MEC, staffed with a small core of educational professionals, perform a special "broker" feature. "It matches resources from the outside world with the urgent needs of the school systems," saws Dr. Lavin.

Outside the school systems, he explains, universities and industry have developed a wealth of new programs and creative educational techniques which still have to undergo the fire of testing in the schools. MEC gives innovations their test of practicality by bringing them to the attention of teachers who can put them to work.

The center has introduced and made available to teachers of the Merrimack Valley new technological aids. Among them is the microfiche, an instrument for storing information which provides teachers with a wealth of professional material not available to them in local libraries.

Hundreds of these documents are stored at MEC. Individual schools get a catalog of the material stored on the microfiche and a viewer, and the teachers can take out on loan articles and reports in their fields.

VARIETY OFFERED

The microfiche is one example of expensive, modern equipment that the schools in the area can afford when they pool their resources.

Another example of new equipment in the Merrimack Valley introduced by MEC is computer terminals for guidance and math.

Guidance counselors in 14 of the region's 15 high schools now can refer Johnny to a computer when he wants to know of a medium-size rural campus in the Midwest with a good history department and a black-studies program. Johnny uses a manual and a simple keyboard on a terminal that is linked to a computer in Boston to find the school that matches his specific interests and abilities.

While a computer cannot replace personal counseling, its vast store of facts can be a great asset to a busy counselor, teachers find.

The center is doing more than bringing the benefits of modern technology to the area schools. It also sponsors conferences and institutes. Participating educators from the 20 towns gather to hear consultants tell about new teaching methods and new administrative approaches.

PERSONNEL MIX

Dr. Lavin and his crew also organize forums where teachers or school-board members or administrators from one town mix with their counterparts from a neighboring school system, talk, and find that they share common needs.

Such get-togethers did not occur prior to the establishment of MEC. The individual towns were facing on their own a host of difficulties in their educational systems. Industrial buildup along Routes 495 and 128 had brought a population boom and subsequent crowning of classrooms and finance difficulties to all the area's schools.

Local taxpayers were refusing to give any more money than they were already giving for educational innovations.

The Merrimack Center has awakened the towns to the fact that, by jointly financing projects, they can afford to hire consultants and buy equipment without increasing revenues.

Peter Gerefoli, superintendent of schools in North Andover, praises the work of MEC. "A single town can't afford a top-notch consultant," he says. "Many together can."

TAILORMAKING POSSIBLE

An important part of the center's philosophy is that each town participating in MEC activities can opt for the programs it likes and can afford. Towns as small as Ashby and as large as Andover can each afford to participate. Dr. Lavin feels that the MEC thus helps maintain the autonomy and uniqueness so valued by staunchly independent New England school systems.

Title 3 funding lasts three years, and at the end of that time the local communities will have to support the center on their own if they wish to retain it.

It is hard to tell how tightly local purse strings will be held. But educators from the area indicate that the high return on the local investment of such a regional approach is convincing the towns of MEC's value.

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY BY LAWRENCE P. CREEDON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, QUINCY, MASS.

I appreciate the President's concern over inflation. We share his concern. However, the remedy does not lie in curtailing that which is our nation's best investment—Education.

Quincy is a city of ninety thousand people, located in the Eleventh Congressional District of Massachusetts. Quincy maintains a public school system for twenty thousand students, ranging from Kindergarten

through a municipality operated junior college. If the President's veto is sustained, the net result could be to seriously disrupt the educational program of the Quincy Public Schools.

The 1970 budget of the Quincy Public Schools amounted to fifteen million dollars, 85% of that sum going out in salaries, 10% to operate and maintain the physical plant, and 5% for instructional materials. Over the past several years the budget has been increasing at the rate of 15% per year, causing a serious strain on the financial resources of the local taxpayer. In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 77% of the cost of public education is raised at the local level, 18% is contributed by the Commonwealth, and only 5% by the federal government. It is inconceivable that the President would consider reducing the federal contribution.

During the 1969–1970 school year, the Quincy Public Schools received from state and federal sources approximately $3,400,000. Of that amount, $2,000,000 was received from the Commonwealth, while $1,400,000 was received in federal aid through grants or programs financed by the federal government.

Programs within the Quincy Public Schools that would be seriously affected as a result of the Presidential veto include the following:

Adult Basic Education;

Manpower Development and Training Programs;

Neighborhood Youth Corps;

Title I Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged;

Higher Education Work-Study Program;

Libraries under Title II;

Teacher Aid Programs under the Professional Development Act, Public Law 90–35;

Close to twenty programs funded in part under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act;

Several programs under the new comprehensive vocational education bill, Public Law 90–576; and

Breakfast and lunch programs for needy children.

In addition, the Quincy Public Schools would lose approximately $300,000 currently made available through the federally impacted areas law, Public Law 874.

Under the Adult Basic Education program, the Quincy Public Schools have been able to maintain programs in the Norfolk County House of Correction in Dedham, as well as for Quincy residents who are in need of basic skills in reading, mathematics, and language arts. Beginning in the fall of 1970, arrangements were being made to extend the Adult Basic Education program to General Dynamics in Quincy.

In 1966 and 1969, the Quincy Public Schools administered grants amounting to more than $110,000 in order to provide opportunities for unskilled and under-skilled workers to increase their marketability for employment. Many of these programs were carried on in conjunction with General Dynamics and the Quincy City Government.

Since 1965, the Quincy Public Schools have administered a Neighborhood Youth Corps program, caring for the educational and employment needs of 100–150 underprivileged young adults each year.

Under Title I of Public Law 89–10, the Quincy Public Schools have developed and implemented an educational program for about 450 young people in grades 1–3 in five public schools and in three non-public schools. In addition, Title I programs have been developed in guidance and education for the handicapped as well as summer programs for disadvantaged youth. During summer activities every effort has been made to involve parents and community leaders in identifying the needs of the neighborhood school and developing programs for correcting limitations in school organization and administration as well as the educational program. Approximately $200–225,000 per year has been committed to these programs.

Under the Higher Education Act of 1966, the Quincy Public Schools developed and implemented a work-study program, providing work stations for sixty students from Quincy Junior College. The entire program was geared to providing teacher aides for the Quincy Public Schools, and as a result many young people who graduated from Quincy Junior College have gone on to four-year baccalaureate institutions and majored in teacher education.

As a result of the impetus received through Title II monies, the Quincy Public Schools embarked on developing a Department of Library Services that now includes thirty professionally trained librarians and has a local budget for library materials in excess of $90,000. This is in addition to the $14,000 received under Title II.

Under the provisions of the Professional Development Act, Public Law 90–35, the Quincy Public Schools secured a grant in the amount of $29,000 in order to train forty people to serve as full-time teacher aides within the school system.

For more than a decade federal assistance under NDEA, the National Defense Education Act, has served to upgrade educational programs; particularly in mathematics and science. Without this kind of assistance, it is doubtful that the limited resources of the Quincy Public Schools would have allowed for the inclusion of critically needed equipment in these areas. During the last two years the Quincy Public Schools have received over $70,000 from NDEA.

Consistent with the provisions of the new Vocational Education Bill, Public Law 90–576, the Quincy Public Schools submitted proposals in excess of $600,000 in order to develop relevant vocational education programs at the secondary, post secondary, and adult levels. Vocational aducation is a major concern of educators in Quincy in that 70% of our students are not four-year-college-bound and thus are in need of vocational competence by the time they graduate from high school.

In 1965 Quincy embarked on the development of a new vocational-technical school at a cost of five and a half million dollars. In addition, the school system received a grant from the U.S. Office of Education in the amount of $650,000 in order to develop a program of instruction for the new vocational facility. While Quincy has been making every effort to provide relevant vocational opportunities for its students, the fact remains that only 30% of those who could benefit from vocational education are involved in such programs. Public Law 90–576 will allow Quincy to continue its efforts in this area.

Under federally aided food and nutrition programs the Quincy Public Schools received close to $70,000 during the last school year. In 1966 the Quincy Public Schools established the first federally-financed breakfast programs in the Commonwealth.

It is disheartening to be concerned about the possibility of cuts in the amount of federal aid available to local communities when educators across the nation were looking to the federal government for increased assistance. In particular, I anticipated critically needed increases in the areas of comprehensive vocational education, school lunch and nutrition programs, and programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

If the President's veto is sustained Quincy will either be forced to abandon many of the programs that I have cited or redirect its limited funds from development in other critically needed areas to the support of those programs. A loss in federal assistance to the Quincy Public Schools would mean a re-assessment of the school building program, including the replacement of existing elementary schools that are now more than 100 years old and major renovation of existing high school facilities that have not been updated in the past fifty years. In addition, efforts at making educational programs relevant, particularly in the vocational area, and providing learning materials that are responsive to the many and varied ways in which young people learn would have to be curtailed. Programs in inservice teacher education, including the use of para-professionals and community resources, would have to be abandoned.

In the President's veto message he indicated that to have signed the education bill would have contributed to inflation.

Inflation can be most effectively curbed by the prestige and the power of the President being directed toward the major industries of the United States. The continued spiraling of prices in all areas are a direct and an indirect result of their practices. Without a major change by this segment of our economy, the amount of goods and services we will be able to purchase to help educate our students will continue to shrink.

Education is an *investment* that guarantees the continued growth and development of our nation. Continued and increased support for education at the national level is not only imperative to the local communities but also to the nation.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY FOR MEETING WITH MASSACHUSETTS EDUCATORS ON FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EDUCATION

I appreciate the opportunity to meet with school administrators, educators and parents from across the state to discuss federal spending for education. For I feel strongly that the Federal Government has a responsibility to help pay the cost of educating our Nation's youth.

Earlier this year, after extensive hearings and full consideration, Congress appropriated $4.4 billion for the Office of Education for the present fiscal year. Last week the President vetoed the Education Appropriations for the second straight year, indicating that he was upset that Congress chose to spend $453 million more for education than he requested. I am pleased that the House of Representatives last Thursday voted to override the President's veto, and I hope that the Senate will do likewise in the vote expected this afternoon or tomorrow.

Failure to override the President's veto of education funds would be a disaster for Massachusetts and for the Nation. The immediate losers would be school children, parents and educators. The ultimate loser would be the country as a whole.

First, failure to override the veto—and accepting instead the amount requested by the President—would mean $25–30 million less in federal education money for Massachusetts. That money is desperately needed. Expenditures in the state for public elementary and secondary education alone have now risen to over $1 billion annually. School budgets have been pared to a bare-bones minimum, with the result that per pupil expenditure in Massachusetts is less than the national average. Teachers salaries are inadequate, buildings and equipment are getting older, children in many cases have been crowded into half-day sessions. Without adequate federal help, we simply cannot achieve top-quality education in Massachusetts.

Second, failure to override the veto would most likely raise property taxes in Massachusetts. For the money must come from somewhere, unless we are willing to give up on our children's educational needs. Already residents of Massachusetts pay a staggering 74% of school budgets out of local taxes, compared to 52% for the nation as a whole. It would be an unfair and outrageous burden to force property taxes up even higher

because the President vetoed education spending.

Third, failure to override the veto would cause delay and irreparable harm in planning school budgets for the coming academic year. Students will return to classes within the next few weeks. But until administrators know how much federal money their school systems will receive, they cannot set priorities and make realistic plans. Last year, for example, our schools suffered because administrators were kept on the hook until March 5, 1970—less than four months before the end of the school year—before the Education Appropriations bill was finally passed. That is why this year Congress decided to split off education from the general Health, Education, and Welfare bill and consider it separately and early. All this will be undone if we have to scrap the bill passed by Congress and start all over again in September on a new bill.

Fourth, failure to override the veto would deny student assistance to thousands of needy and deserving students in Massachusetts. For the Nation as a whole, Congress passed $243 million for National Defense Student Loans, compared to $176.9 requested by the President. Of that $66.1 million difference, Massachusetts would lose $2.7 million if we took the President's figure. An estimated 4,500 students in Massachusetts would lose assistance—students whose parents are desperately trying to find aid so that their daughter or son can go to college. I sponsored a successful amendment in the Senate to raise the amount for National Defense Student Loans, recognizing that families with college-age children face rising tuition and costs, difficulty in getting bank loans, and a decrease in jobs available for students trying to earn their way through school. We should not cut back on our commitment to student assistance at this time of greatest need.

In general, failure to override the veto would simply reduce the quality of education in Massachusetts and in the Nation. It would turn back the clock on our attempts to achieve equal educational opportunity regardless of the financial resources of a child's family. It would be a step backward at the very time that a sound education is becoming more and more necessary for good employment and advancement in our society.

The President has claimed that the $453 million increase in education appropriations would be responsible for further inflation. Certainly I share the concern of all Americans that prices rose by 6% last year, that interest rates are at the highest level since the Civil War, that unemployment is rising.

It is misleading and absolutely incorrect, however, to single out the Education Appropriations bill as the scapegoat for the President's inability to control inflation.

First, the $453 million is miniscule compared to the economy as a whole. It is only about one-fifth of one percent of the total budget request. It is less than one-twentieth of one percent of the Gross National Product. As one of the President's own economic advisors has pointed out, a shift of this amount simply does not have an appreciable effect on inflation.

Second, education spending is less inflationary than military spending, for example. It trains people for productive employment—which means less people on welfare or unemployment rolls, and an increase in needed goods and services. Especially in light of the present welfare mess, not just in Massachusetts but in the United States generally, education spending is a sound investment in the future.

Third, if anyone deserves the label of "big spender" it should be the Administration, rather than Congress. Last year, for example, Congress appropriated $6.4 billion *less* than the President requested. I am confident that this year again Congress will appropriate several billion dollars *less* than the President has requested. We will make off-setting cuts, so that the increase in education does not contribute to inflation.

Fourth, I say let's cut back federal spending from war programs, not from education programs. Let's stop pouring billions of dollars a year down the drain for cost overruns on military weapons which are not needed in the first place. Let's not blame inflation on education spending, when the President himself has been pushing so hard to spend $1.46 billion this year, and many billions more in the future, on the ABM.

Priorities are badly misplaced indeed when the President vetoes a total of $4.4 billion for education and then asks for more than 15 times as much for military spending. Priorities are badly misplaced when the Administration seeks over half a billion dollars to bail out a railroad and an aircraft company but objects to Congress adding less than that amount for education. Priorities are badly misplaced when the Administration is more concerned about ABM's than ABC's.

I support cutting back far more than $453 million from the subsidies we pay farmers not to work; from the supersonic transport plane which will pollute the environment at the same time that it leaves an earth-shattering boom in its wake; from pork-barrel public works projects; and from the proliferation of costly and unneeded military weapons.

I will fight vigorously and hard to make these cuts and reduce the President's overall budget. But in the meantime, we cannot and we must not shortchange our Nation's youth by cutting the funds which Congress has already deemed necessary for education.

School costs are rising at a rate of over 10% a year. Yet still the Federal Government, on the average, pays less than 7% of public elementary and secondary school budgets—and last year the Federal percentage dropped substantially. Even under the bill vetoed by the President education programs will be funded at less than half of the authorized amounts.

Surely a Nation which spends more than $1400 a year in armaments for each South Vietnamese soldier can afford to spend more than $54 a year for each American school child.

For if we lack the will to invest in education today, our children in Massachusetts and across the Nation will be handicapped tomorrow.

I urge that the Senate override the President's veto, and support the badly needed $4.4 billion for education.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, would the Senator from Delaware be willing to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island, who wishes to make a short statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me from the time under his control.

Mr. President, the President's veto of the education appropriations bill raises not only the question of what should be our national economic priorities but, even more important, who should set those priorities. Should it be Congress or the President? From the founding of our country until now, it has been Congress. But President Nixon apparently believes that this responsibility, this determination, should belong to the President.

A key paragraph in the President's veto message bears out this assertion. It reads as follows:

The appropriation for the Office of Education is $453 million over my budget request.

My request would have produced 28% more spending than in the last fiscal year of the previous Administration.

My budget asked $3.97 billion for the educational purposes covered by this bill—an increase of $972 million in spending over fiscal 1969. In addition, I have committed myself to ask the Congress for an extra $350 million to fully fund the school desegregation program as soon as the Congress provides the authorizing legislation.

The implication of that language is that a $350 million excess would have been acceptable if it were available for expenditure as the President desired. I fail to understand why money spent as the Congress determines is inflationary, while that spent under Presidential direction is not. If $350 million in additional spending is inflationary, it is inflationary regardless of which program absorbs it.

In my opinion, the President, in vetoing this bill, is challenging the right of Congress to set priorities within appropriations bills. The Congress has always maintained its authority granted by the Constitution to appropriate funds by law. I know of no other time in history when a President, by the use of the veto, has challenged the authority of Congress to direct use of funds. Regardless of the subject matter for which this bill appropriates funds, be it education, health, or the national defense, the veto must be overridden as a matter of principle, in order to turn back this challenge of the right of Congress to appropriate funds according to its own priorities.

Finally, there is no more sensible and frugal investment than that of the education of our young people. In fact, there is more than a tenfold return to the Federal Government alone in the form of increased taxes resulting from the increased earning base.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise to indicate my support for President Nixon's veto of this bill. I recognize that it may not be very popular, politically, to support the President of the United States in this particular situation. It is seldom popular to appear to be in opposition to any education bill. Over the years, both in the other body and in this body, I have been a strong supporter of education in general.

I believe President Nixon has taken a very courageous and very statesmanlike position, one which provides the country with the leadership it needs at this very crucial time. His veto is not directed to this one bill alone; it is a veto on principle. I believe he deserves to be supported.

Those who are willing to vote for increases in taxes, those who are willing to have the value of the dollar eroded still further, and those who are willing to have more inflation, of course, can disagree.

Those who believe that President Nixon has not cut the defense budget far enough will say it should be cut still further. But those who think that a $12 billion slash in the defense budget—which has already reordered our priori-

ties significantly and dramatically—those who realize that significant increases have already been made in the educational budget, should support President Nixon in this situation.

The amount in this conference report is $453 million over the budget, nearly a half billion dollars. While it exceeds the President's budget by that amount, it also involves a cut of some $75 million from his request for emergency assistance to help in the desegregation of our school system.

As we have heard from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, some of the conferees apparently have in mind that at a later point they will provide the additional $75 million in a supplemental appropriation bill. So, I suppose, with that admission they are really saying that, although $75 million is not included here, it will be added later, which will bring the total appropriation to a figure which will be at least to $528 million over the budget.

It indicates, of course, a sharp disagreement on the part of the conferees with the President so far as priorities are concerned. This conference report says, in effect, that President Nixon's efforts toward educational reform are not to be implemented, because over half of the increases in this conference report go against President Nixon's efforts toward reform in education.

As already has been admitted, the big increases in the impacted aid program continue and increase—a program that desperately needs reform. It awards more money to the richest county in the United States, Montgomery County, in large amounts, while it does little or nothing for the poorest counties in the United States if they have a few Federal employees.

The money in this conference report actually cuts back on President Nixon's budget request for a dropout prevention program by some $5 million, indicating again that in the areas where President Nixon is seeking reform in education—reform that is desperately needed—as well as in the case of emergency assistance to help in the desegregation of our schools, this conference report is deficient. The conference report cuts back on President Nixon's requests in the areas of reform but, in other areas, it provides for increases far above his budget.

I believe that President Nixon has the support of the people in the fight he is making against inflation, in his fight to hold the line on taxes, and to try to hold the value of the dollar. No bill, not even an education bill, can be exempt or immune from the principles which must be applied if this important fight is to be won.

Every appropriations bill has to stand the test. If President Nixon had not vetoed this bill, which is nearly a half billion dollars over the budget request, his credibility in the fight against inflation would have been impaired. His credibility in this fight is very important; and I say, regretfully, that if the Senate votes to override the President's veto—and I suspect that will happen—surely the credibility of Congress, insofar as its determination to fight inflation is concerned, will be impaired.

Accordingly, I hope that the vote here today will be to sustain President Nixon in the courageous position he has taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of articles and editorials published in newspapers around the country, supporting the President's position.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 13, 1970]

NIXON'S HEW CHIEF DEFENDS FUND BILL VETO—AGREES INFLATION COULD CRIPPLE PROGRAMS

ST. LOUIS, August 12.—Elliot Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, today defended President Nixon's veto of the $4.4 billion education budget as a move necessary to keep inflation from undercutting HEW efforts.

In a press conference at the American Bar Association's annual meeting here, Richardson said the appropriation was $1 billion above department requests.

Nixon yesterday vetoed both the education bill and $18 billion for the Housing and Urban Development Department on the ground that the increases added by Congress would mean "higher prices, taxes, and interest rates."

CITES BUDGET GROWTH

Richardson said his department could operate without the $1 billion. He noted that the HEW budget has been increasing 10 to 15 per cent every year. For the first time in more than 30 years, government spending for defense has been "massively reduced" to 34 per cent of the total budget, he said, while spending for human resources has been increased to 42 per cent of the total.

Richardson said his basic reaction to the vetoes is to urge Congress to pass some kind of education bill quickly, to avoid penalizing schools after the start of the school year next month, he said. Congress must now either override the vetoes, as it did recently with the federal hospital construction bill, or draft new measures to Nixon's liking, he said.

Richardson said that altho his department can always use money, he would not want to see any great increase in educational spending if it might seriously jeopardize national security.

BACKS WELFARE REFORMS

"From my experience in the State Department I recognize that spending for national security is also very important," he said.

Richardson was undersecretary of state until appointed to replace Robert Finch as HEW secretary.

In a speech before a session of the A. B. A., Richardson urged congressional passage of Nixon's family assistance program before the welfare situation becomes worse.

He acknowledged that many northern industrial states will be forced to supplement federal welfare programs even if the federal government takes over all administration of welfare. The change might also result in higher taxes, but most people would be willing to pay them, he said.

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1970]

SIDES WITH FED ASSESSMENT: INFLATION'S STRENGTH IN UNITED STATES UNDERESTIMATED, SAYS OECD

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

The "clearest danger" of current Administration policies to expand the economy lies in a resurgence of inflationary pressures, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development warned yesterday in a report released simultaneously here and in Paris.

In its semi-annual review, the OECD declared that "the strength of the inflationary forces generated over the last two or three years has been consistently underestimated."

The OECD's assessment, written weeks ago, implicitly touches upon an open disagreement between President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers and the Federal Reserve Board over the desirable rate of growth in the nation's money supply. The OECD seemed to side with Fed chairman Arthur Burns, who has claimed that the CEA's proposals for more rapid monetary expansion risk increased price inflation.

Nevertheless, the OECD predicted that the nation's "real" gross national product (GNP) would resume its upward trend in the second half of 1970, reaching a growth rate of 3.75 per cent in the first six months of 1971. During the first half of 1970, "real" GNP (actual GNP adjusted for price increases) declined slightly.

If the Administration's policies work successfully, the OECD said, the unemployment rate, now 4.7 per cent, should "peak" at about 5.5 per cent in early 1971, and the first half of 1971.

But the OECD—composed of the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Canada, and Japan—hedged all its inflation projections.

The current world-wide inflationary cycle ranks as the worst since the Korean War, the OECD said, because previous inflationary periods always left "one or more important countries in which prices remained fairly stable . . . Such islands of stability now hardly exist."

According to the OECD's latest data, reflecting April and May results, five of the seven OECD members are experiencing annual rates of price increases exceeding 6 per cent. Great Britain registered the largest gain (12.4 per cent), followed by Japan (7.2 per cent), the United States (6.7 per cent), France (6.1 per cent), Italy (6 per cent), Canada (3.9 per cent), and Germany (3.1 per cent).

The OECD gave an ambiguous endorsement to experiments with "income policies" aimed at halting the wage-price spiral. Big wage settlements, the OECD said, constitute the clearest threat to price stability. The latest information shows that manufacturing wages of OECD members increased from a minimum of 6 per cent (the United States) to a maximum of 19.7 per cent (Italy) over the past year.

Unlike previous inflationary cycles, the OECD said, the curernt price increases have spread to export products. Last year's export price rise amounted to nearly 4 per cent against an average of ¾ of 1 per cent between 1955 and 67.

The traditional stability of export prices, according to the OECD report, had reflected the competitiveness of international markets. "At any one time, there was one or more major exporter which, because of weak markets at home, acted as a check on other exporters," it said.

However, the combination of rising domestic expenses and strong export demand—OECD trade has expanded 40 per cent more since mid-1967 than it had in the previous five years—reduced pressures to keep prices low, the OECD said.

The universality of price increases contributed to inflation by raising costs for small countries, which import in bulk, and by weakening business' and governments' determination to restrain prices "since they have seen other countries similarly failing to hold the tide," the OECD declared.

[From the National Observer, Aug. 17, 1970]

OVERRIDING THE VETO

Not even the most imaginative economist has been able to devise an alternative way

of reducing the rate of inflation. There is only one way that works, and that is for the Federal Government to scale down or eliminate its budget deficits. To accomplish this, the Government must either raise taxes or cut spending or both. President Nixon long ago declared himself for controlling Federal spending.

It was in the light of this policy that the President decided to veto the education money bill that exceeded the Administration's request by almost half a billion dollars. Last week the House overrode the veto and this week the Senate is expected to take its own vote on the matter.

Throughout the hassle, many critics have attempted to depict Mr. Nixon as indifferent to the nation's school needs. And House Speaker McCormack has called the inflation issue a "scarecrow argument." Neither tactic will wash. Inflation is visible and ubiquitous, the Government continues to spend much more than it takes in, and a $4 billion request for education hardly suggests White House indifference.

The education measure would pump billions into the districts of congressmen, so its political appeal is large—especially in an election year. Too, there are few worthier ways to spend Federal funds than on the welfare of children. And whether to spend $4.4 billion, as Congress wants, or to spend slightly less than $4 billion, as the President prefers, is a question difficult for the average citizen to weigh on its merits.

But if one believes, as we do, that inflation is a paramount threat to the nation's economic health, then there can be no argument that steps should be taken to control it. Those steps involve meeting the nation's needs with careful consideration of the amount that can be spent safely for any given purpose. It is the President's judgment that $4.4 billion is too much to spend on education now.

Congress has replied that it disagrees, and in so replying it has cast doubt on its willingness to make the hard choices necessary if inflation is to be contained. At a time when the country faces yet another sizable Federal deficit, the action on Capitol Hill is regrettable. It is not within the power of the Administration to rein in inflation by itself, and Congress has now gone on record as saying that its help, to put it gently, will be exceedingly erratic.

[From the New York Daily News, Aug. 13, 1970]

TWO VETOES IN ONE DAY, HURRAY

In one of his most dramatic moves since he became President, Richard M. Nixon on Tuesday vetoed two big appropriations bills sent him by Congress.

One was for education—$4.4 billion—and the other called for $18 billion for housing, space and veteran expenditures. They added up, said the President, to $1 billion more than he wanted to spend under these heads.

Passages from his veto statement:

"If I were to sign these bills, that spend more than we can now afford, I would be saying 'Yes' to a higher cost of living, 'Yes' to higher interest rates, 'Yes' to higher taxes . . . a President is not elected to see any one bill in isolation. He must see them as part of a whole, because his constituency is 200 million Americans."

In other words, Mr. Nixon insists on being President of and for all the people, not of and for some of the people.

We think the majority of the people will back him enthusiastically in that instance, as we believe they should.

And if Congress overrides one or both of these votes, as Congress may do, the betting looks good that Congress thereby will improve greatly the prospects for election next Nov. 3 of a Republican-controlled Congress which will cooperate with the economy-minded GOP President, not try to sandbag him every other day or so.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 15, 1970]

VETO SCORE

The House of Representatives acted according to form on President Nixon's two vetoes, overriding his disapproval of a $453 million education item and sustaining him on his rejection of a $541 million housing item. The net effect, if the Senate joins the House next week in overriding the education veto, will be to reduce by half the inflationary impact of the two items as gauged by the White House. If the Democratic leaders in Congress can trim other Nixon administration budget recommendations by comparable amounts, or even more, the inflationary impact on the economy will be neutralized.

But the inflationary aspects of the vetoes cannot be separated from the political aspects, since Mr. Nixon is using the two bills to underscore his criticism of the Democrats in Congress as big spenders, a criticism which is to be used this fall in the Republican campaign for more seats in the House and Senate. Mr. Nixon has made a strong effort to impress this general point upon the American people, and he is on firm ground in declaring that total appropriations cannot be expanded beyond present limits without adding new inflationary pressures. But it should be noted that 77 House Republicans voted to override the President's veto of the education item, whereas 101 voted on his side. On the housing item the President fared better: 22 Republicans voted against the President and 155 for him. Some House Republicans, in short, are ready to qualify as big spenders along with the Democrats.

One more note: the Appropriations committee now has to rework the $18 billion Independent Offices bill which Mr. Nixon vetoed because of the increased housing item. If the President had the so-called item veto, as he should, he could have vetoed the single item without disapproving the entire bill.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 14, 1970]

TALE OF TWO VETOES

President Nixon has won half a victory in his current skirmish with Congress over inflationary spending legislation. The challenge to his veto of the housing and independent agencies bill failed in the House yesterday. That bill, which would have spent $541 million more than the President requested, now must be rewritten more to his liking.

Whether the President scores a complete tactical success in the present confrontation will be decided next week. The House overrode his veto of the Office of Education appropriations bill, a matter of $453 million more than the budget request. The fate of the bill now is up to the Senate.

The President's vetoes of the two appropriations bills were justified as part of the deadly serious fight to slow inflation. For if that fight is lost, attempts to achieve adequate funding levels for domestic programs—such as many of those provided for in the two bills—are doomed to frustration as cost increases nullify the benefits of the larger expenditures.

Fiscal restraint is the keystone of the President's anti-inflation policy, so it was not too surprising for him to register his third and fourth vetoes on bills calling for $1 billion more than his budget requests.

Many of the spending increases sought by the congressmen would be for worthy causes, and the President conceded this point in his veto message. "Taken individually," he said, "there is much that can be said in favor of every spending bill . . ." But from the overall perspective of the Presidency, the ailing national economy needs to be brought back to full health or there'll be need for dozens more social programs to relieve those victimized by economic dislocation.

Mr. Nixon also made the point that his budget already called for substantial increases in programs aiding education and urban areas, so the argument between him and the congressmen is not so much about cutting expenditures as about how much they should be increased.

Whatever the course of the political arguments, the policy of fiscal restraint to control inflation is a vital one, and it already is under too much strain, with the administration estimate of a $1.3 billion deficit for fiscal 1971, and other estimates running to $15 billion. Though the vetoed bills together would have had a spending effect much less than $1 billion this fiscal year, because most of the outlay would have been deferred, the President was thinking about the continuing integrity of his anti-inflation stance, looking beyond next June 30.

While the President's general position is unassailable, one point should be made about the independent agencies bill. It provided a $105 million increase for Veterans Administration medical programs, including the VA hospitals housing the most seriously wounded veterans of the fighting in Southeast Asia. That these young men should get less than the best treatment is just as unthinkable as providing our men in the field with poor rations or inadequate ammunition. Yet there is much evidence that VA hospitals are not meeting the high standards expected of them, and that the spending increase is more than justified.

In the rewriting of this bill, the increase for the veterans' medical program should be preserved. The required anti-inflation economies can be accomplished elsewhere.

The education bill, which may survive its veto, has the potent backing of the education lobby and the advantage of $126 million more than was budgeted for the impacted-area pork barrel. The President complained that Congress neglected his proposals for new education approaches, while fattening old unsatisfactory programs. The bill could stand a through rewriting, in the happy event the Senate upholds the veto the House chose to override.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Michigan in expressing the hope that the Senate will sustain the President's veto.

This bill as it was passed by the Senate provided for $984 million more than the President's budget. It is true that the conferees did a fair job, but the conference report still provides for $453 million over the budget. Perhaps that is as good as they could do, but I do not think it is good enough because this represents an increase of approximately 10 percent in the budget on this one item. I think that at some point we have to stop and draw the line.

The education bill as it is before the Senate calls for $3.97 billion in appropriations. That is $972 million—even at the President's request—more than was expended for the same programs in fiscal 1969, or a 28-percent increase. Certainly that is as much of an increase in education as we can afford at this time.

This is not the only educational spending bill at the Federal level. All together, Federal spending on education will amount to approximately $12 billion this year.

Much has been said about our concern over inflation and the high interest rates.

Certainly high interest rates are a part of the inflationary spiral, but I invite attention to the fact that our Government has spent during the past fiscal year a little more than a billion dollars a month more than it is taking in. Our national debt, on June 30, 1970, was $373.4 billion. Just 1 year ago it was $356.9 billion, or an increase in the national debt in the past 12-month period, the last fiscal year, of $16.5 billion. Even figuring that the Government can finance that deficit at interest charges of 7 percent, which is below the rate they have been paying recently, that means that we will be paying this year about one billion and a quarter million dollars in interest just on the deficit that was created by Congress last year. Next year the deficit is projected at approximately $20 billion if Congress does not take prompt action to curtail expenditures.

I repeat, it will cost us in this current fiscal year about one billion and a quarter dollars just to pay the interest charges on the deficits created in the last fiscal year. I think the time has come when Congress must stop this continuous increasing of expenditures over and beyond our income.

There is no question that if this spending spiral continues we will have a sizable request next year for a tax increase to collect the necessary revenues from the people. It will mean that Congress will have to raise taxes next year substantially, or we will have to borrow money and further increase the debt, which only devalues the American dollar. We must cut back on spending; that is the only answer.

I know that education is a popular program. We all like to support it. The argument has been made that a vote to sustain the President's veto will be a vote against education. The conferees have not used that argument, and I am sure they would agree with me that it is not a valid argument. Such an argument is no more valid than to say that those who oppose the President's veto and who will vote to override the veto are against the taxpayers. Certainly this deficit spending hurts all taxpayers. This Congress must accept its responsibilities in regard to inflationary spending. The President, with all his authority, cannot spend a single dime that is not first approved by Congress.

Much has been said by various Members about our concern for inflation. On this rollcall vote there will be an opportunity to back up such speeches and our concern with a vote where it will really count.

I hope that the President's veto will be sustained.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield such time to the distinguished majority leader as he may need.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the proposal before us has to do with impacted aid areas, where the need is great, as well as assistance to elementary and secondary education and title I, ESEA, which takes care of or attempts to take care of the education of deprived children, audiovisual equipment and teaching materials, guidance and counseling, and supplementary services which is also for bilingual education.

Under the title, "Education for the handicapped," that includes early childhood educational program grants, basic State grants, deaf-blind centers, specific learning disabilities, and special teacher training programs.

Under vocational and adult education, it calls for increased basic grants to States for vocational programs.

In the field of higher education, it covers national defense student loans, community colleges, construction matching grants, land-grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and community services, as well as audiovisual equipment.

Then in the field of community education, there are public libraries, services and construction grants, educational television, equipment grants, college library resources, and Library of Congress cataloging services.

Mr. President, the education bill provides about $450 million more to the educational systems of our country than the President requested. The President requested $3.97 billion. This bill provides $4.4 billion.

The Senate has already saved, through cuts in the military bill now pending before the Senate, three times the amount added for educational programs in the vetoed bill. This is responsible action by the Senate. It puts the needs of the Nation in proper perspective.

Congress will appropriate this year about $135 billion for the Government to operate. This means that for every American man, woman, and child, this Congress will appropriate for Government spending approximately $670. For the educational systems of our country, the administration requested to spend about $19.97 of each taxpayer's $670 for the education of our youth. Congress wanted to do more. It raised the $19.97 to $22 for the education of our youth.

But this was called inflationary. Let me remind the Senate that of each American's $670 to be appropriated this year for Government spending, $375 of each American's $670 goes for Defense Department spending.

The ABM request for spending this year alone will cost each American $7.

The SST request of the administration for just this year is $290 million—or $1.45 for each American.

The increase for education by the Congress in this bill is about $3 for each American.

It is so easy to vote millions for ABM's and SST's and then to reject money for the ABC's. The issue here is not Government spending, but national priorities—not priorities by rhetoric but priorities by action.

Mr. President, I hope that the President's veto will be overridden this afternoon.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I rise to urge the Senate to override the President's veto of H.R. 16916, the Office of Education appropriation bill. In vetoing this bill the President stated that it was inflationary and that he was "saying no to bigger spending and no to higher prices in the interest of all the American people."

The decision we are asked to make on the veto is not limited to being for or against inflation or a balanced budget. The Congress has reduced other, less important Presidential spending requests, adding some of these savings to education funds. The basic question concerns whether we will put first things first in this and future fiscal periods. This, I think, the Congress did when it passed the education bill and the independent offices and Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, approved by overwhelming margins in both the House and the Senate. The vote on the Education bill was 357 to 30 in the House and 88 to 0 in the Senate. We also passed the HUD bill by a vote of 70 to 8, while the House passed the measure by voice vote.

Mr. President, within a week or so, approximately 52 million young people will be returning to school. We will seriously jeopardize the educational opportunities of millions of children if the veto is sustained. Oklahoma's allotment under the facilities construction section of the bill is approximately $600,000. There are at least three new junior college construction programs in Midwest City, Oklahoma City, and Tulsa, Okla., which will be seriously affected if Federal matching funds are not available. Over $8 million in funds for student loans, $21 million for title I, $13 million in impacted aid, and various other educational programs designed to help the disadvantaged and the handicapped in the State of Oklahoma will be in jeopardy. The result will be confusion and delays in educational planning. The Senate will recall that it was not until March 5, 1970, that the Congress approved the 1970 HEW appropriation bill. If the veto of the education appropriation bill is sustained, I am doubtful that we will be able to get another bill through the Congress before the end of this year.

The present bill contains approximately $453 million more than the administration requested. Yet the $4.4 billion appropriation will still not meet the needs of education in America. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it will not meet the needs of America in education.

On August 13, the House voted 289 to 114 to override the Presidential veto. I might add that this was not an exercise in partisan politics, as 77 Republicans joined 212 Democrats to override the measure. By overriding the veto, the Congress is saying that this Government can ill afford the luxury of limited investment in the education of our young people, and that the priorities of this country should give increasing emphasis to the resolution of the many domestic problems which confront us.

Therefore, I will vote to override the President's veto of this important appropriation bill, and I hope that the necessary two-thirds of the Senate will do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have genuinely regretted the action of President Nixon in vetoing the Office of Education appropriations bill which has had the strong approval of both the Senate and the House.

I agree that financial resources must be apportioned very carefully by the Federal Government during the present economic conditions. However, I disagree with the Chief Executive over the extent of the funding limitations and impact which can be absorbed by our educational programs.

The future of too many Americans depends on these educational support funds. Our school systems are unable to meet the requirements of today's society due to lack of money. New ideas cannot be tried; special and progressive programs must be dropped; and America's young people must bear the consequences. Such a stationary position or forced regression in our educational system leaves scars which may never be healed and which may spread with time.

We must continue to have purpose and progress in our programs of education. We must realize that education funds are an investment in our human resources.

I think it is important to stress just what the Chief Executive requested this year for the Office of Education. The President requested $3.9 billion for the Office of Education. Congress approved legislation amounting to $453 million over this budget recommendation from the President. I think this was a vital increase, but I also think it was a modest increase. We approved $232 million over the President's budget request for elementary and secondary education; $10 million for education for the handicapped; and $54 million for vocational education. I was gratified earlier this afternoon to listen to the able Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), as he outlined and emphasized the value of our vocational educational facilities. The Congress also approved a $110 million increase for higher education in the United States. Certainly Members of this body who are familiar with the situation in these rapidly changing and complex times believe these to be wise investments.

Mr. President, the appropriations bill vetoed by the President would provide an additional $6 million to West Virginia. This measure is important to West Virginia because of the funds involved, but I do not advance my case on just the situation in the State of West Virginia. I think of the situation throughout the country. The need for additional funds for education is urgent in almost every area.

I am gratified that the House of Representatives last week voted to override the Preident's veto. I am confident the Senate will also be successful in the endeavor this afternoon in overriding the veto. What we do here will be to reinforce the commitment of Congress to our educational programs, even with the President's disapproval.

I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I plan to vote to sustain the President's veto of the Office of Education appropriation bill, and in so doing affirm my belief in the importance and priority of education in America. President Nixon has given the highest priority to education, and has proved his devotion to this priority by his education budget request for fiscal 1971.

President Nixon asked the Congress for $3.97 billion for the Office of Education, an increase of $972 million or 28 percent over the last year of the last administration and $152 million more than the record level appropriated last year. But the President has not limited his efforts to improve education to one area. Indeed, all Federal moneys for education in general during fiscal year 1971, will reach a record total of nearly $12 billion—a record commitment for this administration or any other.

Mr. President, I am opposed to adding $453 million to the administration's carefully prepared and balanced program. The Federal Government cannot continue to allocate money which is not in the Treasury. It is time that the Congress join the President in exercising restraint and responsibility in coordinating appropriations and budget requests. The American public knows that higher costs of living, higher interest rates, and higher taxes simply cannot be tolerated merely to satisfy the congressional urge to appropriate more and more money, when less and less revenue is coming in.

Also, I have serious reservations that this additional $453 million will provide the best value for our educational dollar. In President Nixon's message to Congress on March 3, he proposed far-reaching educational reforms to eliminate the old approaches that have proven inadequate, and asked for additional research funds to provide continual reassessment. He stated that as new confidence is gained that our education dollars are being wisely invested, the administration will ask for increased funding. Unfortunately, this bill bypasses the forward-looking programs of the President and ask for an additional $453 million to continue the old approaches that have proven inadequate.

Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the President's educational veto because the appropriation of these additional funds are clearly not in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Overriding the Veto," published in the National Observer on Monday, August 17, 1970.

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

OVERRIDING THE VETO

Not even the most imaginative economist has been able to devise an alternative way of reducing the rate of inflation. There is only one way that works, and that is for the Federal Government to scale down or eliminate its budget deficits. To accomplish this, the Government must either raise taxes or cut spending or both. President Nixon long ago declared himself for controlling Federal spending.

It was in the light of this policy that the President decided to veto the education money bill that exceeded the Administration's request by almost half a billion dollars. Last week the House overrode the veto and this week the Senate is expected to take its own vote on the matter.

Throughout the hassle, many critics have attempted to depict Mr. Nixon as indifferent to the nation's school needs. And House Speaker McCormack has called the inflation issue a "scarecrow argument." Neither tactic will wash. Inflation is visible and ubiquitous, the Government continues to spend much more than it takes in, and a $4 billion request for education hardly suggests White House indifference.

The education measure would pump billions into the districts of congressmen, so its political appeal is large—especially in an election year. Too, there are few worthier ways to spend Federal funds than on the welfare of children. And whether to spend $4.4 billion, as Congress wants, or to spend slightly less than $4 billion, as the President prefers, is a question difficult for the average citizen to weigh on its merits.

But if one believes, as we do, that inflation is a paramount threat to the nation's economic health, then there can be no argument that steps should be taken to control it. Those steps involve meeting the nation's needs with careful consideration of the amount that can be spent safely for any given purpose. It is the President's judgment that $4.4 billion is too much to spend on education now.

Congress has replied that it disagrees, and in so replying it has cast doubt on its willingness to make the hard choices necessary if inflation is to be contained. At a time when the country faces yet another sizable Federal deficit, the action on Capitol Hill is regrettable. It is not within the power of the Administration to rein in inflation by itself, and Congress has now gone on record as saying that its help, to put it gently, will be exceedingly erratic.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I will vote to override the veto of the appropriations bills for the Office of Education.

Under our system of government, Congress has a responsibility to help determine national spending priorities. Many of us in Congress have been trying to change those priorities, to redirect more of our effort toward programs in education, health, pollution control, and law enforcement.

My vote today is part of that effort.

In voting to override the veto we will be voting for a level of funding approved earlier this month by a Senate vote of 88 to 0.

When we considered the appropriations bill for education for the last fiscal year I had printed in the RECORD a State-by-State, program-by-program breakdown comparing funding levels under the administration's budget request and under the figures approved by the Congress.

So that Senators may have that information available on this year's appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent that a similar breakdown be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. The information was compiled by the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$34,986,823	$40,184,201	$39,599,049	$45,147,177	$44,397,907	$44,394,217
State administrative expenses	349,908	401,842	395,990	451,472	443,979	443,942
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					631,084	624,835
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,893,354	2,040,343	2,070,020	2,375,089	2,604,987	2,478,544
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,241,181	9,528,000		7,736,000	12,483,000	9,884,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	372,344	328,000		115,000	115,000	115,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	840,259	702,195	1,321,780	1,321,780	1,321,780	1,321,780
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	531,860	531,860	524,625	524,625	596,821	524,625
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,888,098	851,705		428,811	1,883,118	1,143,999
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	35,243	34,770		34,103	34,103	34,103
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	315,250	263,508				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	51,454,320	54,966,424	44,011,464	58,234,057	64,611,779	61,065,045
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	571,028	571,028	623,847	662,940	642,117	642,117
Teacher education and recruitment	488,478					
Research and innovation	150,250					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,209,756	571,028	623,847	662,940	642,117	642,117
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,898,481	6,850,464	6,850,464	7,964,744	7,104,019	7,168,270
State advisory councils		42,566	42,566	42,566	42,566	42,566
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		378,489	378,489	445,393	445,393	445,393
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	29,598	17,228	470,701	377,256	771,608	796,474
Innovation (pt. D)		246,433			302,500	302,500
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		333,881	333,881	389,659	556,851	473,257
Cooperative education (pt. G)		265,122	452,012	349,223	349,223	349,223
Work-study (pt. H)		80,368		104,006	104,006	104,006
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,072,101	1,199,378	1,357,353	1,357,353	1,357,353	1,357,353
Special projects and teacher education	30,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,030,180	9,413,929	9,885,466	11,030,200	11,033,519	11,039,042
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,263,130	[1] 915,698	[1] 1,165,470	[1] 902,524	[1] 1,165,470	[1] 902,524
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,540,009	3,771,234	3,927,713	3,888,436	4,277,280	4,277,280
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,673,248	2,647,480	2,580,144	3,368,532	3,580,485	3,580,485
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	251,574					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	48,471					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	224,435	227,680		155,035	227,680	190,998
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	2,032,026					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	679,637	1,037,770			994,972	994,972
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,436,369	433,104			433,104	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	102,579	102,859	88,802	88,802	88,802	88,802
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	240,351				236,853	114,555
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,076,100					
Subtotal, higher education	17,617,929	9,212,825	7,812,129	8,453,329	11,054,646	10,199,616
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	297,401	268,458	260,039	260,039	260,039	260,039
Personnel development programs	423,950					
Teacher Corps	285,388					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,066,739	268,458	260,039	260,039	260,039	260,039
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	633,492	539,187	539,187	633,492	633,492	633,492
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,892	42,892	42,892	42,892	42,892	42,892
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251
Construction (LSCA II)	397,777	144,077		93,652	168,825	131,239
College library resources (HEA II-A)	313,692					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	54,758					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	175,958	175,958		174,707	174,707	174,707
Subtotal, community education	1,683,329	966,874	646,839	1,009,503	1,084,676	1,047,090
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	561,688					
Total, Office of Education	80,563,941	75,399,538	63,239,784	79,650,068	88,686,776	84,252,949
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	74,607,215	75,399,538	63,239,784	79,650,068	88,686,776	84,252,949

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$1,725,848	$1,874,230	$1,856,995	$2,116,158	$2,078,549	$2,078,364
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					8,185	8,185
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					16,005	16,005
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	547,744	483,700	493,543	518,122	536,705	526,496
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	14,731,443	14,681,000		17,317,000	19,420,000	18,610,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	918,641	1,293,000		100,000	100,000	100,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	66,568	60,232	113,378	113,378	113,378	113,378
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	242,131	242,131	243,649	243,649	277,642	243,649
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	106,156	52,995		26,682	117,173	75,996
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	49,999	50,000				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	18,551,863	19,000,621	2,957,565	20,698,322	22,930,970	22,035,406
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	73,390					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	173,390	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	538,238	403,555	403,555	469,237	418,527	422,312
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		22,295	22,295	26,240	26,240	26,240
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000	220,277	214,262	45,459	46,924
Innovation (pt. D)		203,736			208,247	208,247
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		19,668	19,668	22,956	32,806	27,882
Cooperative education (pt. G)		205,240	221,781	212,006	212,006	212,006
Work-study (pt. H)		7,022		9,088	9,088	9,088
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	131,891	136,550	141,802	141,802	141,802	141,802
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	670,129	1,044,134	1,060,446	1,126,659	1,125,243	1,125,569
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	61,078	[1] 30,246	[1] 38,496	[1] 29,811	[1] 38,496	[1] 29,811
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	164,593	130,963	145,638	144,182	158,599	144,182
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	67,329	80,562	85,224	111,264	118,265	118,265
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	6,941					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	152,468	155,378		150,349	155,378	152,838
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	70,000					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		50,000			50,000	50,000
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	190,628	50,000			50,000	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	28,901	35,400	43,454	43,454	43,454	43,454
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	8,119				9,210	4,384
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	45,800					
Subtotal, higher education	885,857	582,549	362,812	529,060	673,402	592,934
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	112,896	114,450	113,728	113,728	113,728	113,728
Personnel development programs	423,950					
Teacher Corps	1,500					
Subtotal, education professions development	538,346	114,450	113,728	113,728	113,728	113,728
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	136,935	130,406	130,406	139,935	139,935	139,935
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	6,939	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	3,221	25,017	25,017	25,017	25,017	25,017
Construction (LSCA II)	21,765	84,436		80,945	86,150	83,547
College library resources (HEA II-A)	41,398					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	105,733	105,733		105,834	105,834	105,834
Subtotal, community education	356,191	425,301	235,132	431,440	436,645	434,042
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	21,175,776	21,267,055	4,829,683	23,099,209	25,479,988	24,501,679
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	20,464,678	21,267,055	4,829,683	23,099,209	25,479,988	24,501,679

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$9,384,173	$9,614,568	$10,474,927	$10,474,927	$10,474,927	$10,474,927
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	105,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					46,199	46,199
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					104,840	103,802
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,514,678	1,143,854	1,183,395	1,319,269	1,422,818	1,365,872
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,187,169	9,158,000		9,450,000	12,542,000	11,216,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,095,682	175,000		30,000	30,000	30,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	422,604	361,721	680,887	680,887	680,887	680,887
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	368,490	368,490	369,169	369,169	419,533	369,169
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	784,359	366,659		184,603	810,682	507,399
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	16,488	16,610		16,785	16,785	16,785
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	147,487	125,883				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	23,071,130	21,580,785	12,958,378	22,775,640	26,798,671	25,051,040
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	224,757	224,757	245,547	260,934	252,738	252,738
Teacher education and recruitment	547,590					
Research and innovation	47,119					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	819,466	224,757	245,547	260,934	252,738	232,738
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,185,684	2,947,567	2,947,567	3,426,998	3,056,654	3,084,298
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		162,854	162,845	191,640	191,640	191,640
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	58,332	15,000	321,349	279,460	332,000	342,770
Innovation (pt. D)		220,815			245,948	245,948
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		143,660	143,660	167,660	239,597	203,630
Cooperative education (pt. G)		229,193	312,971	266,893	266,893	266,893
Work-study (pt. H)		36,283		46,954	46,954	46,954
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	346,188	379,898	420,118	420,118	420,118	420,118
Special projects and teacher education	200,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,790,204	4,166,338	4,339,587	4,830,791	4,830,872	4,833,249
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,350,664	[1] 639,937	[1] 814,491	[1] 630,731	[1] 814,491	[1] 630,731
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,384,360	1,417,892	1,407,806	1,393,728	1,533,101	1,393,728
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,169,754	2,123,484	1,803,139	2,354,105	2,502,228	2,502,228
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	245,961					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	138,751					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	177,936	180,964		152,007	180,964	166,342
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)						
Language training and area studies	133,600					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	807,119	415,830			388,282	388,282
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,228,671	275,087			275,087	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	58,386	72,487	63,916	63,916	63,916	63,916
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	163,854				173,892	83,552
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	230,933					
Subtotal, higher education	8,139,989	5,175,681	4,139,352	4,644,487	5,981,961	5,278,779
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	181,870	186,777	182,441	182,441	182,441	182,441
Personnel development programs	1,363,104					
Teacher Corps	268,764					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,813,738	186,777	182,441	182,441	182,441	182,441
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	312,656	275,065	275,065	312,656	312,656	312,656
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,153	41,153	41,153	41,153	41,153	41,153
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100
Construction (LSCA II)	215,407	105,542		85,442	115,407	100,424
College library resources (HEA II-A)	202,552					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	134,680	134,680		135,360	135,360	135,360
Subtotal, community education	91,057	621,049	380,827	639,220	669,185	654,202
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	37,605,584	31,955,387	22,246,132	33,333,513	38,715,868	36,262,449
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	34,063,356	31,955,387	22,246,132	33,333,513	38,715,868	36,262,449

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$21,811,725	$24,749,582	$24,389,185	$27,806,296	$27,344,819	$27,342,547
State administrative expenses	218,117	247,496	243,892	278,063	273,448	273,425
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					365,058	361,444
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools						
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,213,497	1,266,286	1,298,231	1,452,631	1,570,324	1,505,599
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,842,356	2,586,000		2,292,000	3,596,000	2,906,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,245,726					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	453,532	380,294	715,848	715,848	715,848	715,848
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	388,193	388,193	384,783	384,783	438,866	384,783
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	886,740	448,166		225,640	990,893	610,488
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	18,499	18,376		18,278	18,278	18,278
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	165,473	139,263				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	1000,00	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	29,743,858	30,323,656	27,131,939	33,273,539	35,413,534	34,218,412
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	297,836	297,836	325,385	345,775	334,914	334,914
Teacher education and recruitment	298,587					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	596,423	297,836	325,385	345,775	334,914	334,914
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,404,568	3,693,674	3,693,674	4,294,428	3,830,344	3,864,985
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		204,175	204,175	240,145	240,145	240,145
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	41,607	15,000	343,129	293,722	416,035	429,443
Innovation (pt. D)		224,551			254,196	254,196
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		180,024	180,024	210,096	300,243	255,170
Cooperative education (pt. G)		234,433	333,248	278,899	278,899	278,899
Work-study (pt. H)		42,330		54,780	54,780	54,780
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	631,826	701,583	788,027	788,027	788,027	788,027
Special projects and teacher education	150,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,228,001	5,326,838	5,573,345	6,191,165	6,193,737	6,196,713
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,656,935	[1] 519,808	[1] 661,595	[1] 512,330	[1] 661,595	[1] 512,330
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,505,616	2,265,627	2,283,489	2,260,605	2,486,665	2,260,605
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,830,256	1,788,966	1,464,653	1,912,192	2,032,510	2,030,510
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	64,487					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	42,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	189,394	192,476		152,753	192,476	172,418
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	648,560					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		557,980			532,626	532,626
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,248,903	240,408			240,408	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	74,074	77,911	67,408	67,408	67,408	67,408
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	136,490				132,614	63,741
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	230,933					
Subtotal, higher education	9,677,658	5,693,176	4,527,095	4,955,288	6,396,302	5,689,638
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	187,861	191,233	186,674	186,674	186,674	186,674
Personnel development programs	665,111					
Teacher Corps	268,545					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,121,517	191,233	186,674	186,674	186,674	186,674
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	391,716	340,150	340,150	391,716	391,716	391,716
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,581	41,581	41,581	41,581	41,581	41,581
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,138	25,138	25,138	25,138	25,138	25,138
Construction (LSCA II)	346,970	105,542		87,465	128,570	108,018
College library resources (HEA II-A)	196,374					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,316	142,316		142,062	142,062	142,062
Subtotal, community education	1,183,604	694,236	446,378	727,471	768,576	748,024
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	20,067					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	20,067					
Civil rights education	441,183					
Total, Office of Education	47,012,311	42,526,975	38,190,816	45,679,912	49,293,737	47,374,375
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	43,349,974	42,526,975	38,190,816	45,679,912	49,293,737	47,374,375

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$80,232,375	$96,957,350	$95,547,164	$108,934,051	$107,126,163	$107,117,260
State administrative expenses	802,900	969,574	955,472	1,089,341	1,071,262	1,071,173
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					1,042,072	1,042,072
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					1,244,122	1,231,803
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	14,180,196	9,681,939	10,050,004	11,648,665	12,862,072	12,194,651
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	76,264,658	74,734,000		61,839,000	97,757,000	78,858,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	10,880,448	460,000		739,000	739,000	739,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	4,786,011	4,081,360	7,682,559	7,682,559	7,682,559	7,682,559
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	1,908,448	1,908,448	1,910,647	1,910,647	2,167,114	1,910,647
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	5,335,635	2,580,066		1,298,994	5,704,519	3,535,998
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	174,462	175,073		175,210	175,210	175,210
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	1,560,552	1,326,826				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	196,125,685	192,974,636	116,245,846	195,417,467	237,671,093	215,658,373
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	2,397,629	2,397,629	2,619,406	2,783,546	2,696,116	2,696,116
Teacher education and recruitment	1,920,604					
Research and innovation	2,210,700					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	6,528,933	2,397,629	2,619,406	2,783,546	2,696,116	2,696,116
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	18,005,856	23,903,359	23,903,359	27,789,454	24,786,338	25,010,506
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		1,320,663	1,320,663	1,554,000	1,554,000	1,554,000
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	1,468,244	60,113	1,499,053	1,050,626	2,692,182	2,778,945
Innovation (pt. D)		422,827			691,883	691,883
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		1,165,014	1,165,014	1,359,542	1,942,885	1,651,219
Cooperative education (pt. G)		512,513	1,409,368	916,098	916,098	916,098
Work-study (pt. H)		390,527		505,388	505,388	505,388
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,908,201	2,137,446	2,430,216	2,430,216	2,430,216	2,430,216
Special projects and teacher education	224,914					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	21,607,215	30,005,665	31,820,876	35,698,527	35,612,193	35,631,458
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	11,127,949	[1] 6,548,209	[1] 8,334,349	[1] 6,454,006	[1] 8,334,349	[1] 6,454,006
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	13,636,446	12,567,739	13,004,762	12,874,714	14,162,185	12,874,714
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	17,825,858	18,936,036	18,450,766	24,008,575	25,604,260	25,604,260
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	2,567,470					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	406,087					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	519,125	523,740		174,223	523,740	347,252
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	322,300					
Language training and area studies	2,275,532					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	6,699,777	3,453,412			3,205,727	3,205,727
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	15,422,360	3,110,233			3,110,233	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,700,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	534,541	399,679	300,490	300,490	300,490	300,490
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	1,577,046				1,642,020	794,436
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	7,096,900					
Subtotal, higher education	82,761,391	45,589,048	40,140,367	43,942,008	56,933,004	49,630,885
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	977,178	1,079,123	1,030,190	1,030,190	1,030,190	1,030,190
Personnel development programs	6,201,146					
Teacher Corps	2,546,153					
Subtotal, education professions development	9,724,477	1,079,123	1,030,190	1,030,190	1,030,190	1,030,190
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	2,666,778	2,213,055	2,213,055	2,666,778	2,666,778	2,666,778
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	53,915	53,915	53,915	53,915	53,915	53,915
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	26,210	26,210	26,210	26,210	26,210	26,210
Construction (LSCA II)	1,313,062	388,295		145,682	507,365	326,523
College library resources (HEA II-A)	2,161,076					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	703,007					
Educational broadcasting facilities	168,766					
University community service programs (HEA I)	506,766	506,766		506,816	506,816	506,816
Subtotal, community education	7,639,089	3,227,750	2,332,689	3,438,910	3,800,593	3,619,751
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	4,171,896					
Research and development centers	3,242,638					
Subtotal, research and development	7,414,534					
Civil rights education	487,177					
Total, Office of Education	332,288,501	275,273,851	194,189,374	282,310,648	337,743,189	308,266,773
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	291,305,089	275,273,851	194,189,374	282,310,648	337,743,189	308,266,773

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$8,914,233	$9,283,738	$10,069,703	$10,448,857	$10,272,957	$10,272,091
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					281,882	281,882
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					54,067	53,532
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,767,120	1,307,980	1,360,849	1,525,351	1,650,756	1,581,788
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	12,924,352	12,883,000		10,090,000	16,980,000	13,330,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	2,655,971					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	541,044	462,359	870,323	870,323	870,323	870,323
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	430,472	410,474	411,038	411,038	466,100	411,038
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	802,055	383,233		192,948	847,328	531,257
Loans to nonprofit private schools	3,900					
State administration	19,340	19,673		19,914	19,914	19,914
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	259,627	149,094				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	28,468,114	25,149,551	12,961,913	23,808,431	31,643,337	27,601,825
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	285,258	285,258	311,644	331,173	320,771	320,771
Teacher education and recruitment	696,367					
Research and innovation	498,738					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,480,363	285,258	311,644	331,173	320,771	320,771
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,518,883	3,293,775	3,293,775	3,829,433	3,415,598	3,446,489
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		181,980	181,980	214,143	214,143	214,143
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	76,218	15,000	350,908	298,815	370,987	382,943
Innovation (pt. D)		225,885			257,141	257,141
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		160,534	160,534	187,346	267,733	227,541
Cooperative education (pt. G)		236,304	340,489	283,187	283,187	283,187
Work-study (pt. H)		45,451		58,819	58,819	58,819
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	255,893	275,835	301,102	301,102	301,102	301,102
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,850,994	4,465,832	4,659,856	5,203,913	5,199,778	5,202,433
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,061,131	[1] 880,449	[1] 1,120,607	[1] 867,783	[1] 1,120,607	[1] 867,783
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,823,059	1,697,619	1,775,107	1,757,356	1,933,091	1,757,356
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,814,663	2,753,794	2,480,825	3,238,865	3,442,659	3,442,659
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	363,089					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	71,586					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	188,629	191,707		152,703	191,707	172,012
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	150,000					
Language training and area studies	175,765					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	940,502	483,869			493,581	493,581
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,917,682	351,983			351,983	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	173,128	83,988	77,966	77,966	77,966	77,966
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	212,102				207,790	101,014
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,558,200					
Subtotal, higher education	12,699,536	6,493,409	5,504,505	6,144,673	7,869,384	6,962,371
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	231,798	210,921	205,377	205,377	205,377	205,377
Personnel development programs	1,597,409					
Teacher Corps	63,615					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,892,822	210,921	205,377	205,377	205,377	205,377
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	386,437	335,804	335,804	386,437	386,437	386,437
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,553	41,553	41,553	41,553	41,553	41,553
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,135	25,135	25,135	25,135	25,135	25,135
Construction (LSCA II)	232,843	114,404		87,330	127,691	107,511
College library resources (HEA II-A)	354,370					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	102,866					
Educational broadcasting facilities	338,685					
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,295	142,295		143,844	143,844	143,844
Subtotal, community education	1,663,692	698,700	422,001	723,808	764,169	743,989
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	346,000					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	346,000					
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	49,401,521	37,303,671	24,085,296	36,417,375	46,052,816	41,036,766
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	42,672,719	37,303,671	24,085,296	36,417,375	46,052,816	41,036,766

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$8,699,833	$11,405,817	$11,237,792	$12,833,308	$12,617,835	$12,616,774
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					130,694	129,400
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools	2,331,546	1,687,122	1,749,460	1,976,658	2,149,925	2,054,631
Supplementary services (ESEA III)						
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,265,208	3,255,000		2,868,000	4,397,000	3,648,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)						
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	717,392	610,790	1,149,723	1,149,723	1,149,723	1,149,723
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	449,925	449,925	450,905	450,905	516,499	450,905
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	724,973	336,161		169,248	743,250	464,283
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	26,250	26,375		26,600	26,600	26,600
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	234,802	199,884				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	16,599,929	18,221,074	14,837,880	19,724,442	21,981,326	20,790,316
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	369,463	369,463	403,638	428,931	415,459	415,459
Teacher education and recruitment	534,275					
Research and innovation	170,485					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,074,223	369,463	403,638	428,931	415,459	415,459
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,727,244	3,402,846	3,402,846	3,955,904	3,528,401	3,560,314
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		188,007	188,007	221,216	221,216	221,216
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	95,930	15,000	391,358	325,302	383,240	395,590
Innovation (pt. D)		232,824			272,457	272,457
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		165,851	165,851	193,534	276,576	235,055
Cooperative education (pt. G)		246,035	378,146	305,485	305,485	305,485
Work-study (pt. H)		56,570		73,208	73,208	73,208
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	457,836	503,143	561,073	561,073	561,073	561,073
Special projects and teacher education	225,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,506,010	4,841,341	5,118,349	5,666,790	5,652,724	5,655,466
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,668,912	[1] 801,634	[1] 1,020,294	[1] 790,102	[1] 1,020,294	[1] 790,102
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,597,398	1,593,508	1,679,997	1,663,197	1,829,518	1,663,197
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,360,435	2,348,049	2,258,749	2,948,932	3,134,483	3,134,483
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	1,796,129					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	70,500					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	257,121	210,285		153,907	210,285	181,817
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)						
Language training and area studies	644,664					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	707,988	452,481			436,967	436,967
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,461,717	385,934			385,934	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	91,915	96,574	85,465	85,465	85,465	85,465
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	163,167				172,663	83,405
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,583,600					
Subtotal, higher education	13,453,546	5,938,465	5,094,505	5,691,603	7,325,609	6,425,436
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	270,462	246,529	239,206	239,206	239,206	239,206
Personnel development programs	523,202					
Teacher Corps	171,534					
Subtotal, education professions development	965,198	246,529	239,206	239,206	239,206	239,206
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	514,029	440,842	440,842	514,029	514,029	514,029
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,244	42,244	42,244	42,244	42,244	42,244
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,195	25,195	25,195	25,195	25,195	25,195
Construction (LSCA II)	270,118	129,729		90,559	148,935	119,765
College library resources (HEA II-A)	418,350					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	162,263	162,263		162,087	162,087	162,087
Subtotal, community education	1,471,708	838,782	547,790	873,659	931,999	902,829
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	37,070,614	30,456,654	26,241,368	32,624,631	36,546,523	34,428,712
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	30,769,708	30,456,654	26,241,368	32,624,631	36,546,523	34,428,712

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$2,520,995	$2,602,240	$2,837,447	$2,837,447	$2,837,447	$2,837,447
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					41,200	41,200
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					22,497	22,497
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	714,568	597,711	610,744	654,232	687,250	669,101
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,000,165	2,109,000		1,987,000	2,453,000	2,197,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		801,000		5,158,000	5,158,000	5,158,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	134,057	117,339	220,873	220,873	220,873	220,873
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	261,718	261,718	263,311	263,311	300,329	263,311
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	164,547	82,557		41,565	182,532	114,705
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	50,000				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	6,009,383	6,884,898	4,182,375	11,425,761	12,166,461	11,787,467
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	116,735					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	216,735	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	653,244	653,224	653,224	759,433	677,363	683,489
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		36,090	36,090	42,468	42,468	42,468
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	34,638	15,000	236,560	223,940	73,572	75,943
Innovation (pt. D)		206,271			213,843	213,843
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		31,837	31,837	37,153	53,094	45,124
Cooperative education (pt. G)		208,795	234,036	220,154	220,154	220,154
Work-study (pt. H)		10,924		14,137	14,137	14,137
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	155,845	162,892	171,929	171,929	171,929	171,929
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	843,727	1,356,101	1,394,744	1,500,282	1,497,629	1,498,155
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	234,892	[1] 140,312	[1] 178,585	[1] 138,294	[1] 178,585	[1] 138,294
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	206,977	310,950	349,089	345,598	380,159	345,598
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	358,429	358,899	396,355	515,160	548,637	548,637
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	28,837					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	85,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	157,678	160,612		150,688	160,612	155,601
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	117,925					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	75,582	84,324			90,042	90,042
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	403,675	72,306			72,306	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	53,749	49,416	47,681	47,681	47,681	47,681
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	26,175				31,536	15,623
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	148,400					
Subtotal, higher education	2,147,319	1,226,819	1,021,710	1,248,421	1,559,558	1,391,476
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	125,971	128,150	126,743	126,743	126,743	126,743
Personnel development programs						
Teacher Corps	6,744					
Subtotal, education professions development	132,715	128,150	126,743	126,743	126,743	126,743
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	172,884	160,000	160,000	172,884	172,884	172,884
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,395	40,395	40,395	40,395	40,395	40,395
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,034	25,034	25,034	25,034	25,034	25,034
Construction (LSCA II)	133,812	88,754		81,865	92,135	87,000
College library resources (HEA II-A)	51,466					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	111,098	111,098		111,306	111,306	111,306
Subtotal, community education	574,198	464,790	264,938	470,993	481,263	476,128
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	137,618					
Total, Office of Education	10,061,695	10,160,758	7,090,510	14,972,200	16,031,654	15,479,969
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	9,142,795	10,160,758	7,090,510	14,972,200	16,031,654	15,479,969

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$5,655,271	$6,110,433	$6,344,360	$6,875,664	$6,759,065	$6,758,491
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					88,483	88,015
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,088,238	705,509	719,782	780,861	827,308	801,772
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	5,436,944	5,418,000		3,720,000	7,050,000	5,224,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	544,264					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	167,514	139,372	262,348	262,348	262,348	262,348
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	273,711	273,711	272,313	272,313	312,497	272,313
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	254,359	83,393		41,986	184,382	116,292
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	79,191	51,609				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	13,662,825	13,045,360	7,848,803	12,216,505	15,747,416	13,786,564
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,397	100,397	109,684	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	534,221					
Research and innovation	1,787,758					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,422,376	100,397	109,684	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	774,982	826,189	826,189	960,380	856,594	864,342
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		45,648	45,648	53,705	53,705	53,705
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	700,697	15,000	245,895	230,052	93,040	96,038
Innovation (pt. D)		207,872			217,378	217,378
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		40,267	40,267	46,986	67,145	57,065
Cooperative education (pt. G)		211,041	242,726	225,299	225,299	225,299
Work-study (pt. H)		13,655		17,671	17,671	17,671
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	216,690	231,310	250,179	250,179	250,179	250,179
Special projects and teacher education	525,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,217,369	1,622,050	1,681,972	1,815,340	1,812,079	1,812,745
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,046,615	[1] 458,426	[1] 583,470	[1] 451,832	[1] 583,470	[1] 451,832
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,079,303	748,751	733,608	726,272	798,898	726,272
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,624,999	1,592,830	1,291,700	1,686,391	1,792,501	1,792,501
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	3,603,390					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	149,635					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	165,197	168,166		151,177	168,166	159,588
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	82,557					
Language training and area studies	345,215					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		74,111			76,857	76,857
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	889,985	153,929			153,929	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	400,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	65,934	67,409	63,528	63,528	63,528	63,528
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	79,610				101,523	49,469
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,136,919					
Subtotal, higher education	10,719,359	3,313,622	2,722,306	3,129,200	3,788,872	3,370,047
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	132,452	133,436	131,765	131,765	131,765	131,765
Personnel development programs	636,278					
Teacher Corps	334,283					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,103,013	133,436	131,765	131,765	131,765	131,765
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	224,762	202,708	202,708	224,762	224,762	224,762
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)		40,676	40,676	40,676	40,676	40,676
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)		39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)		25,059	25,059	25,059	25,059	25,059
Construction (LSCA II)	138,580	94,985		83,193	100,773	91,983
College library resources (HEA II-A)	172,298					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	49,920					
Educational broadcasting facilities	227,328					
University community service programs (HEA I)	117,437	117,437		117,012	117,012	117,012
Subtotal, community education	930,325	520,374	307,952	530,211	547,791	539,001
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	390,000					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	390,000					
Civil rights education	152,065					
Total, Office of Education	31,597,332	18,735,239	12,802,482	18,023,021	22,227,923	19,840,122
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	20,990,855	18,735,239	12,802,482	18,023,021	22,227,923	19,840,122

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$32,030,278	$33,005,253	$35,965,703	$35,965,703	$35,965,703	$35,965,703
State administrative expenses	320,928	330,053	359,657	359,657	359,657	359,657
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					293,167	290,264
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	4,389,257	3,182,146	3,355,263	3,863,409	4,251,151	4,037,886
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	17,547,731	17,676,000		14,335,000	22,863,000	18,206,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	2,694,363	17,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,358,173	1,178,032	2,217,472	2,217,472	2,217,472	2,217,472
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	709,479	709,479	718,370	718,370	822,202	718,370
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	2,268,779	1,059,430		533,395	2,342,396	1,475,713
Loans to nonprofit private schools	1,200					
State administration	53,121	54,190		55,120	55,120	55,120
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	475,164	410,691				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	61,848,473	57,722,274	42,716,465	58,148,126	69,269,868	63,426,185
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	736,246	736,246	804,347	854,750	827,903	827,903
Teacher education and recruitment	839,519					
Research and innovation	324,352					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,900,118	736,246	804,347	854,750	827,903	827,903
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	7,331,487	9,767,350	9,767,350	11,355,250	10,128,125	10,219,726
State advisory councils		60,690	60,690	60,690	60,690	60,690
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		539,646	539,646	634,989	634,989	639,989
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	83,400	24,563	599,050	461,300	1,100,073	1,135,525
Innovation (pt. D)		268,449			351,100	351,100
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		476,047	476,047	555,532	793,897	674,717
Cooperative education (pt. G)		295,999	571,500	419,975	419,975	419,975
Work-study (pt. H)		118,602		153,485	153,485	153,485
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,040,045	1,159,832	1,312,124	1,312,124	1,312,124	1,312,124
Special projects and teacher education	79,950					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	8,534,882	12,711,178	13,326,407	14,953,345	14,954,458	14,962,331
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,249,260	[1] 1,664,938	[1] 2,119,080	[1] 1,640,987	[1] 2,119,080	[1] 1,640,987
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,993,543	4,139,255	4,628,227	4,581,945	5,040,139	4,581,945
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	4,509,571	4,468,163	4,691,266	6,124,727	6,510,103	6,510,103
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	180,238					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	264,313	267,743		157,632	267,743	212,142
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	851,904					
Language training and area studies	235,182					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,312,667	1,193,372			1,293,421	1,293,421
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,661,823	766,372			766,372	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	250,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	168,491	132,528	112,265	112,265	112,265	112,265
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	398,154				417,052	199,228
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,115,413					
Subtotal, higher education	22,290,559	12,682,371	11,600,838	12,667,556	16,576,175	14,600,091
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	410,952	382,611	368,487	368,487	368,487	368,487
Personnel development programs	1,512,124					
Teacher Corps	685,906					
Subtotal, education professions development	2,608,982	382,611	368,487	368,487	368,487	358,487
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	908,640	765,698	765,698	908,640	908,640	908,640
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,384	44,384	44,384	44,384	44,384	44,384
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,381	25,381	25,381	25,381	25,381	25,381
Construction (LSCA II)	398,742	177,125		100,692	214,637	157,665
College library resources (HEA II-A)	553,565					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	110,327					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	227,490	227,490		231,724	231,724	231,724
Subtotal, community education	2,308,038	1,279,587	874,972	1,350,330	1,464,275	1,407,303
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	518,550					
Total, Office of Education	100,009,602	85,514,267	69,661,894	88,312,972	103,461,166	95,592,300
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	91,304,417	85,514,267	69,661,894	88,312,972	103,461,166	95,592,300

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$34,745,771	$39,816,759	$39,236,958	$44,734,354	$43,991,936	$43,988,280
State administrative expenses	347,488	398,168	392,370	447,344	439,919	439,883
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					535,357	530,050
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,623,910	2,519,142	2,625,777	3,016,236	3,314,130	3,150,285
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	16,133,291	16,803,000		13,749,000	20,956,000	17,009,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	2,309,974	1,598,000		630,637	630,637	630,637
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,089,383	923,415	1,738,192	1,738,192	1,738,192	1,738,192
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	628,796	628,796	625,028	625,028	709,664	625,028
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	2,226,363	999,405		503,174	2,209,681	1,372,931
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	44,018	43,958		44,096	44,096	44,096
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	393,735	333,140				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	61,542,729	64,163,783	44,718,325	65,588,061	74,669,612	69,628,382
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	682,477	682,477	745,572	792,292	767,406	767,406
Teacher education and recruitment	729,543					
Research and innovation	134,110					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,546,130	682,477	745,572	792,292	767,406	767,406
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	7,278,364	8,907,572	8,907,572	10,356,448	9,237,260	9,320,803
State advisory councils		55,348	55,348	55,348	55,348	55,348
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		492,145	492,145	579,137	579,137	579,137
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	95,576	22,401	543,043	424,626	1,003,311	1,035,645
Innovation (pt. D)		258,842			329,893	329,893
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		434,142	434,14	506,669	724,006	615,370
Cooperative education (pt. G)		282,526	519,360	389,101	389,101	389,101
Work-study (pt. H)		103,581		134,047	134,047	134,647
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,352,356	1,5156,10	1,719,026	1,719,026	1,719,026	1,719,026
Special projects and teacher education	700,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	9,426,296	12,072,167	12,670,636	14,164,402	14,171,189	14,178,970
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,670,339	[1] 1,040,494	[1] 1,324,307	[1] 1,025,525	[1] 1,324,307	[1] 1,025,525
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,700,025	4,209,230	4,431,514	4,387,199	4,825,919	4,387,199
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,242,368	3,182,532	2,931,781	3,827,615	4,068,453	4,068,453
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	538,465					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	240,444	243,763		156,077	243,763	199,486
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	2,550,985					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,044,455	1,063,460			1,095,526	1,095,526
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,587,633	522,714			522,714	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	77,383	120,015	101,923	101,923	101,923	101,923
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	274,568				257,816	123,745
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,536,809					
Subtotal, higher education	18,752,974	10,432,208	8,839,525	9,548,339	12,490,421	11,051,857
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	311,043	321,528	310,457	310,457	310,457	310,457
Personnel development programs	750,849					
Teacher Corps	397,473					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,459,365	321,528	310,457	310,457	310,457	310,457
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	743,951	630,121	630,121	743,951	743,951	743,951
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,491	43,491	43,491	43,491	43,491	43,491
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304
Construction (LSCA II)	357,471	157,345		96,478	187,217	141,847
College library resources (HEA II-A)	427,931					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	218,930					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	196,164	196,164		197,128	197,128	197,128
Subtotal, community education	2,052,751	1,091,934	738,425	1,145,861	1,236,600	1,191,230
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	670,000					
Research and development centers	789,680					
Subtotal, research and development	1,459,680					
Civil rights education	481,623					
Total, Office of Education	96,721,548	88,764,097	68,022,940	91,549,412	103,645,685	97,128,302
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	86,281,082	88,764,097	68,022,940	91,549,412	103,645,685	97,128,302

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$2,215,107	$2,756,538	$2,707,189	$3,107,503	$3,053,441	$3,053,175
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					57,633	57,633
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					32,379	32,379
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	556,489	716,722	736,307	800,052	848,535	821,878
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,520,455	9,490,000		9,264,000	12,354,000	10,685,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,728,671					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	193,833	163,537	307,834	307,834	307,834	307,834
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	281,390	281,390	280,891	280,891	320,757	280,891
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	299,306	148,958		74,997	329,347	206,976
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	66,059	58,436				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	15,024,643	13,878,914	4,282,221	14,098,610	17,567,259	15,709,099
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	113,023	113,023	123,477	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment						
Research and innovation	131,534					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	244,557	113,023	123,477	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,032,530	1,281,603	1,281,603	1,490,134	1,329,098	1,341,119
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		70,809	70,809	83,328	83,328	83,328
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	25,334	15,000	259,896	239,220	144,361	149,013
Innovation (pt. D)		210,274			222,680	222,680
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		62,464	62,464	72,902	104,182	88,542
Cooperative education (pt. G)		214,409	255,761	233,108	233,108	233,103
Work-study (pt. H)		18,922		24,487	24,487	24,487
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	235,281	251,540	273,315	273,315	273,315	273,315
Special projects and teacher education	120,986					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,414,131	2,156,089	2,234,916	2,447,562	2,445,627	2,446,660
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	275,170	[1] 240,466	[1] 306,057	[1] 237,007	[1] 306,057	[1] 237,007
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	563,188	509,439	554,236	548,694	603,563	548,694
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	319,050	664,557	877,556	884,590	940,250	940,250
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	82,795					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	66,286					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	162,092	165,047		150,975	165,047	157,941
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	185,300					
Language training and area studies	167,132					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	327,314	169,240			171,585	171,585
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	547,034	108,157			108,157	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	600,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	30,490	53,635	49,359	49,359	49,359	49,359
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	58,366				53,070	25,839
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	453,739					
Subtotal, higher education	3,887,956	1,960,541	1,837,208	1,920,625	2,447,088	2,180,675
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	137,551	139,233	137,272	137,272	137,272	137,272
Personnel development programs	104,613					
Teacher Corps	282,716					
Subtotal, education professions development	524,880	139,233	137,272	137,272	137,272	137,272
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	203,338	185,071	185,071	203,338	203,338	203,338
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049
Construction (LSCA II)	71,358	92,412		82,644	97,206	89,925
College library resources (HEA II-A)	112,262					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	49,920					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,728	115,728		116,439	116,439	116,439
Subtotal, community education	657,724	498,329	290,189	507,539	522,101	514,820
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	21,753,891	18,746,129	8,905,283	19,311,518	23,319,347	21,188,526
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	19,338,242	18,746,129	8,905,283	19,311,518	23,319,347	21,188,526

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$2,947,216	$3,032,174	$3,305,670	$3,305,670	$3,305,670	$3,305,670
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					76,220	76,220
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools						
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	857,190	689,438	702,900	761,255	805,624	781,230
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,707,913	2,699,000		2,297,000	3,573,000	2,910,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	80,850					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	180,728	153,059	288,111	288,111	288,111	288,111
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	283,917	283,917	283,357	283,357	322,446	283,357
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	358,140	163,334		82,234	361,131	222,979
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	64,750	54,340				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	7,644,037	7,338,595	4,830,038	7,280,960	8,995,535	8,130,900
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	116,982	116,982	127,803	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	134,140					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	251,122	116,982	127,803	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,242,196	1,348,046	1,348,046	1,567,331	1,397,954	1,410,598
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		74,479	74,479	87,644	87,644	87,644
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	44,465	15,000	256,007	236,674	151,840	156,733
Innovation (pt. D)		209,607			221,207	221,207
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		65,703	65,703	76,679	109,580	93,129
Cooperative education (pt. G)		213,474	252,140	230,874	230,874	230,874
Work-study (pt. H)		16,581		21,548	21,458	21,458
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	146,680	153,041	160,663	160,663	160,663	160,663
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,433,341	2,126,999	2,188,106	2,412,391	2,412,288	2,413,374
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	558,213	[1] 258,188	[1] 328,614	[1] 254,474	[1] 328,614	254,474
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	639,633	581,865	613,231	607,099	667,808	607,099
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	806,240	783,258	727,493	949,785	1,009,547	1,009,547
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	74,845					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	162,907	165,865		151,028	165,865	158,373
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	400,064	206,857			210,209	210,209
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	546,443	112,507			112,507	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	800,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,308	57,748	52,914	52,914	52,914	52,914
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	65,137				63,655	31,226
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	154,800					
Subtotal, higher education	4,437,590	2,216,288	1,772,252	2,065,300	2,661,119	2,373,842
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	152,799	136,719	134,884	134,884	134,884	134,884
Personnel development programs	488,709					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	641,508	136,719	134,884	134,884	134,884	134,884
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	208,959	189,699	189,699	208,959	208,959	208,959
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,591	40,591	40,591	40,591	40,591	40,591
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,051	25,051	25,051	25,051	25,051	25,051
Construction (LSCA II)	131,159	93,087		82,788	98,141	90,465
College library resources (HEA II-A)	73,906					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities	344,605					
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,079	115,079		115,039	115,039	115,039
Subtotal, community education	968,859	503,016	294,850	511,937	527,290	519,614
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	15,376,457	12,438,599	9,347,933	12,605,472	14,931,116	$13,772,614
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	13,160,315	12,438,599	9,347,933	12,605,472	14,931,116	13,772,614

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$44,413,015	$53,256,753	$52,482,435	$59,835,625	$58,842,582	$58,837,691
State administrative expenses	444,130	532,567	524,824	598,356	588,426	588,377
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					544,878	539,483
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	8,235,338	5,650,541	5,861,685	6,774,193	7,470,638	7,087,572
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	12,924,988	12,830,000		10,596,000	10,596,000	13,788,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	907,187					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,681,475	2,271,614	4,275,978	4,275,978	4,275,978	4,275,978
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	1,056,099	1,056,099	1,057,552	1,057,552	1,217,264	1,057,552
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	3,085,357	1,445,776		727,910	3,196,605	1,984,149
Loans to nonprofit private schools	2,460					
State administration	99,990	100,742		100,958	100,958	100,958
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	894,406	763,492				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	74,744,445	78,007,584	64,302,474	84,066,572	86,933,329	88,359,761
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,626,605	1,728,534	1,674,241	1,674,241
Teacher education and recruitment	1,499,900					
Research and innovation	918,573					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,907,358	1,488,885	1,626,605	1,728,534	1,674,241	1,674,241
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	10,661,193	12,769,779	12,769,779	14,845,440	13,241,143	13,360,897
State advisory councils		79,345	79,345	79,345	79,345	79,345
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		705,533	705,533	830,164	830,164	830,164
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	397,728	32,114	934,315	680,833	1,438,195	1,484,544
Innovation (pt. D)		325,957			478,047	478,047
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		622,382	622,382	726,283	1,037,913	882,100
Cooperative education (pt. G)		376,654	833,315	604,788	604,788	604,788
Work-study (pt. H)		215,941		279,453	279,453	279,453
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,460,494	1,633,780	1,854,177	1,854,177	1,854,177	1,854,177
Special projects and teacher education	500,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	13,019,415	16,761,485	17,798,846	19,900,483	19,843,225	19,853,515
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,957,766	[1] 3,016,661	[1] 3,839,510	[1] 2,973,263	[1] 3,839,510	2,973,263
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	6,674,449	6,624,079	6,974,245	6,904,502	7,594,953	6,904,502
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	9,003,578	9,290,708	8,499,990	11,097,244	11,795,497	11,795,497
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	1,224,052					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	146,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	385,726	389,721		165,537	389,721	276,519
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	380,000					
Language training and area studies	1,311,609					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	3,311,412	1,706,263			1,693,326	1,693,326
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	7,145,802	1,433,544			1,433,544	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,150,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	268,425	227,574	185,852	185,852	185,852	185,852
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	627,907				665,986	323,725
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	4,050,300					
Subtotal, higher education	42,637,026	22,738,550	19,549,597	21,376,398	27,648,389	24,202,684
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	701,085	644,963	617,727	617,727	617,727	617,727
Personnel development programs	2,187,500					
Teacher Corps	1,238,523					
Subtotal, education professions development	4,127,108	644,963	617,727	617,727	617,727	617,727
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,746,355	1,455,333	1,455,333	1,746,355	1,746,355	1,746,355
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,925
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,776	25,776	25,776	25,776	25,776	25,776
Construction (LSCA II)	1,653,747	277,743		122,129	354,115	238,122
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,001,350					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	503,663					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	333,347	333,347		332,436	332,436	332,436
Subtotal, community education	5,352,672	2,180,633	1,569,543	2,315,130	2,547,116	2,431,123
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	240,489					
Research and development centers	1,707,213					
Subtotal, research and development	1,947,702					
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	145,785,726	121,822,100	105,464,792	130,004,844	139,264,027	137,139,051
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	127,098,647	121,822,100	105,464,792	130,004,844	139,264,027	137,139,051

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$15,015,004	$17,081,476	$16,832,741	$19,191,136	$18,872,637	$18,871,068
State administrative expenses	150,191	170,314	168,327	191,911	188,726	188,711
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					237,382	237,382
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					71,160	70,455
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,974,139	2,766,361	2,868,526	3,298,148	3,625,941	3,445,650
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,159,363	4,146,000		3,202,000	5,468,000	4,269,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	157,850					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,286,642	1,090,524	2,052,751	2,052,751	2,052,751	2,052,751
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	630,850	664,602	662,709	662,709	753,065	662,709
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,950,699	889,093		447,635	1,965,782	1,217,833
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	48,185	48,281		48,292	48,292	48,292
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	431,016	365,908				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	27,803,939	27,323,059	22,685,054	29,194,582	33,383,736	31,163,851
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	745,215	745,215	814,147	865,164	837,989	837,989
Teacher education and recruitment	615,356					
Research and innovation	825,309					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,185,880	745,215	814,147	865,164	837,989	837,989
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,364,257	7,431,298	7,431,298	8,639,563	7,705,912	7,775,608
State advisory councils		46,175	46,175	46,175	46,175	46,175
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		410,579	410,579	483,127	483,127	483,127
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	172,804	18,688	562,490	437,360	836,983	863,956
Innovation (pt. D)		262,178			337,256	337,256
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		362,189	362,189	422,673	604,030	513,354
Cooperative education (pt. G)		287,204	537,464	399,821	399,821	399,821
Work-study (pt. H)		105,922		137,076	137,076	137,076
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	568,749	630,936	707,229	707,229	707,229	707,229
Special projects and teacher education	120,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,225,810	9,555,169	10,057,424	11,273,024	11,257,609	11,263,602
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,980,453	[1] 1,585,291	[1] 2,017,708	[1] 1,562,485	[1] 2,017,708	1,562,485
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,626,683	3,548,133	3,600,674	3,564,667	3,921,134	3,564,667
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	5,348,259	5,231,415	4,466,846	5,831,734	6,198,675	6,198,675
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	483,347					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	48,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	257,471	260,870		157,186	260,870	208,515
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	286,887					
Language training and area studies	780,439					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,044,962	1,050,631			1,049,243	1,049,243
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,483,714	717,108			717,108	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	170,805	129,751	115,084	115,084	115,084	115,084
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	360,578				360,293	175,020
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,725,327					
Subtotal, higher education	22,646,925	12,573,199	10,250,312	11,281,156	14,690,115	12,923,689
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	349,257	361,618	348,543	348,543	348,543	348,543
Personnel development programs	1,077,531					
Teacher Corps	303,628					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,730,416	361,618	348,543	348,543	348,543	348,543
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	861,433	726,836	726,836	861,433	861,433	861,433
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,128	44,128	44,128	44,128	44,128	44,128
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,359	25,359	25,359	25,359	25,359	25,359
Construction (LSCA II)	206,881	171,455		99,484	206,777	153,131
College library resources (HEA II-A)	527,165					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	574,301					
Educational broadcasting facilities	468,770					
University community service programs (HEA I)	207,111	207,111		207,436	207,436	207,436
Subtotal, community education	2,954,657	1,214,398	835,832	1,277,349	1,384,642	1,330,996
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	65,184					
Total, Office of Education	64,612,811	51,772,658	44,991,312	54,239,818	61,902,634	57,868,670
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	55,479,989	51,772,658	44,991,312	54,239,818	61,902,634	57,868,670

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IOWA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$14,591,865	$15,057,157	$15,939,698	$16,916,803	$16,636,049	$16,634,666
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,571	159,397	169,168	166,360	166,347
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					436,436	436,436
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					73,585	72,857
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,292,488	1,648,450	1,687,138	1,904,281	2,069,872	1,978,800
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,653,905	2,596,000		1,782,000	3,380,000	2,504,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	670,028					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	722,942	612,734	1,153,382	1,153,382	1,153,382	1,153,380
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	461,077	461,077	460,360	460,360	523,765	460,360
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,119,359	486,312		244,845	1,075,234	659,104
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	26,323	26,194		25,924	25,924	25,924
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	235,455	198,519				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	22,923,442	21,337,014	19,499,975	22,756,763	25,640,607	24,191,874
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	432,885	432,885	472,926	502,561	486,776	486,766
Teacher education and recruitment	391,785					
Research and innovation	356,003					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,180,673	432,885	472,926	502,561	486,776	486,766
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,228,808	4,198,015	4,198,015	4,880,671	4,353,233	4,392,605
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		231,941	231,941	272,930	272,930	272,930
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	24,615	15,000	403,804	333,451	472,829	488,067
Innovation (pt. D)		234,958			277,170	277,170
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		204,606	204,606	238,776	341,230	290,005
Cooperative education (pt. G)		249,029	389,733	312,346	312,346	312,346
Work-study (pt. H)		59,496		76,995	76,995	76,995
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	284,335	309,838	339,991	339,991	339,991	339,991
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,537,758	5,533,951	5,799,158	6,486,228	6,477,792	6,481,177
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,185,784	[1] 1,073,409	[1] 1,366,200	[1] 1,057,967	[1] 1,366,200	1,057,967
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,146,018	2,567,000	2,628,434	2,602,150	2,862,365	2,602,156
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,611,023	3,656,333	3,024,524	3,948,696	4,197,154	4,197,154
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	285,147					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	212,383	215,572		154,250	215,572	184,607
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	795,105					
Language training and area studies	65,312					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,383,909	712,803			736,107	736,107
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,136,021	437,700			437,700	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	675,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	99,713	109,775	94,665	94,665	94,665	94,665
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	244,835				234,618	114,571
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,313,075					
Subtotal, higher education	16,244,325	8,822,593	7,163,823	7,907,728	10,194,381	9,037,127
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	180,053	246,996	239,649	239,649	239,649	239,649
Personnel development programs	535,761					
Teacher Corps	569,241					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,085,055	246,996	239,649	239,649	239,649	239,649
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	550,334	199,402	199,402	550,334	550,334	550,334
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,441	42,441	42,441	42,441	42,441	42,441
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,212	25,212	25,212	25,212	25,212	25,212
Construction (LSCA II)	506,923	159,521		91,524	154,980	123,252
College library resources (HEA II-A)	422,878					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	40,024					
Educational broadcasting facilities	316,617					
University community service programs (HEA I)	159,710	159,710		158,862	158,862	158,862
Subtotal, community education	2,103,648	625,795	306,564	907,882	971,338	939,610
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	48,074,901	36,999,233	33,482,095	38,800,811	44,010,543	41,376,203
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	42,223,118	36,999,233	33,482,095	38,800,811	44,010,543	41,376,203

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$9,784,956	$10,497,614	$10,742,914	$11,812,655	$11,614,121	$11,613,143
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants					129,762	129,762
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					48,127	47,651
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,942,094	1,422,144	1,457,201	1,637,248	1,774,519	1,699,025
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,664,572	8,642,000		7,543,000	11,496,000	9,483,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	573,750	63,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	556,782	465,110	875,502	875,502	875,502	875,502
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	414,425	414,425	410,248	410,248	467,956	410,248
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	893,721	415,179		209,031	917,959	563,945
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	21,680	21,727		21,550	21,550	21,550
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	291,036	164,659				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	23,293,016	22,355,858	13,735,865	22,759,234	27,595,496	25,093,826
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	338,673	338,673	370,000	393,185	380,835	380,835
Teacher education and recruitment	780,110					
Research and innovation	299,868					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,418,651	338,673	370,000	393,185	380,835	380,835
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,180,467	3,598,952	3,598,952	4,184,173	3,732,002	3,765,756
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		198,841	198,841	233,980	233,980	233,980
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	49,833	15,000	364,910	307,984	405,354	418,417
Innovation (pt. D)		228,287			262,443	262,443
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		175,408	175,408	204,702	292,534	248,620
Cooperative education (pt. G)		239,672	353,525	290,906	290,906	290,906
Work-study (pt. H)		48,767		63,110	63,110	63,110
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	260,619	282,224	308,408	308,408	308,408	308,408
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,490,919	4,818,219	5,031,112	5,624,331	5,619,805	5,622,708
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,070,461	[1] 872,547	[1] 1,110,550	[1] 859,994	[1] 1,110,550	859,994
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,015,111	1,948,114	1,931,768	1,912,450	2,103,696	1,912,450
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,240,036	3,198,452	2,458,559	3,209,795	3,411,760	3,411,760
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	98,308					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	39,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	198,680	201,805		153,358	201,805	177,342
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	743,747					
Language training and area studies	218,743					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,051,377	531,076			562,089	562,089
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,723,010	350,022			350,022	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	150,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,473	99,770	87,151	87,151	87,151	87,151
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	203,085					96,786
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,393,500					
Subtotal, higher education	14,303,531	7,251,786	5,638,028	6,272,748	7,877,073	7,157,572
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	207,864	211,581	206,004	206,004	206,004	206,004
Personnel development programs	336,778					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	564,642	211,581	206,004	206,004	206,004	206,004
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	455,789	392,897	392,897	455,789	455,789	455,789
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,929
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168
Construction (LSCA II)	201,413	122,734		89,104	139,238	114,171
College library resources (HEA II-A)	414,277					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	146,541					
Educational broadcasting facilities	268,809					
University community service programs (HEA I)	149,218	149,218		148,596	148,596	148,596
Subtotal, community education	1,742,653	771,455	499,503	800,095	850,229	825,162
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	44,793,412	35,747,572	25,480,512	36,055,597	42,529,442	39,286,107
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	39,600,646	35,747,572	25,480,512	36,055,597	42,529,442	39,286,107

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$30,207,987	$34,326,959	$35,452,207	$40,419,331	$39,748,525	$39,746,222
State administrative expenses	302,084	343,269	354,522	404,193	397,485	397,452
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					503,821	498,833
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,622,860	1,849,465	1,901,271	2,153,182	2,359,545	2,248,048
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,407,184	9,477,000		8,139,000	10,626,000	9,262,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	230,278	127,000		48,500	48,500	48,500
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	759,127	641,127	1,206,827	1,206,827	1,206,827	1,206,827
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	477,508	477,508	475,514	475,514	544,203	475,514
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,581,651	697,959		351,404	1,543,185	948,977
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	30,673	30,230		30,014	30,014	30,014
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	274,372	229,102				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	44,893,724	48,299,619	39,490,341	53,327,965	57,108,105	54,960,387
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	509,972	509,972	557,144	592,056	573,460	573,460
Teacher education and recruitment	387,755					
Research and innovation	343,102					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,240,829	509,972	557,144	592,056	573,460	573,460
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,602,669	6,212,161	6,212,161	7,222,590	6,442,067	6,500,330
State advisory councils		38,600	38,600	38,600	38,600	38,600
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		343,223	343,223	403,891	403,891	403,891
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	43,070	15,623	441,919	358,410	699,709	722,259
Innovation (pt. D)		241,497			291,602	291,602
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		302,771	302,771	353,349	504,964	429,159
Cooperative education (pt. G)		258,198	425,218	333,357	333,357	333,357
Work-study (pt. H)		72,761		94,161	94,161	94,161
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	910,457	1,019,688	1,151,842	1,151,842	1,151,842	1,151,842
Special projects and teacher education	477,989					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,034,185	8,504,522	8,915,734	9,956,200	9,960,193	9,965,201
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,828,376	[1] 870,849	[1] 1,108,388	[1] 858,320	[1] 1,108,388	[1] 858,320
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,124,716	3,312,872	3,224,149	3,191,908	3,511,098	3,191,908
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,014,967	2,932,428	2,453,774	3,203,548	3,405,119	3,405,119
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	148,217					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	117,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	219,025	222,244		154,683	222,244	188,129
Permanent		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	864,600					
Language training and area studies	13,415					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,338,963	927,912			759,894	759,894
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,034,025	402,793			402,793	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	84,070	103,380	85,668	85,668	85,668	85,668
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	239,537				222,369	106,780
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	668,600					
Subtotal, higher education	15,689,511	8,822,478	6,921,979	7,544,127	9,767,573	8,645,818
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	247,063	253,807	246,120	246,120	246,120	246,120
Personnel development programs	452,063					
Teacher Corps	671,384					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,370,510	253,807	246,120	246,120	246,120	246,120
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	596,161	508,456	508,456	596,161	596,161	596,161
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	4,235	42,690	42,690	42,690	42,690	42,690
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,234	25,234	25,234	25,234	25,234	25,234
Construction (LSCA II)	158,205	139,594		92,696	162,610	127,653
College library resources (HEA II-A)	309,262					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	183,946					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	168,818	159,710		168,386	168,386	168,386
Subtotal, community education	1,485,370	915,193	615,889	964,676	1,034,590	999,633
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	5,912					
Total, Office of Education	71,720,041	67,305,591	56,747,207	72,631,144	78,690,041	75,390,619
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	66,848,259	67,305,591	56,747,207	72,631,144	78,690,041	75,390,619

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$30,428,619	$34,326,959	$33,827,100	$38,566,534	$37,926,477	$37,923,326
State administrative expenses	304,314	343,270	338,271	385,665	379,265	379,233
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					1,130,256	1,130,256
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					468,034	463,400
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,074,668	2,150,754	2,228,360	2,554,704	2,803,651	2,666,731
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,447,717	666,000		2,671,000	4,483,000	3,491,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	351,676	813,574				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	954,621		1,531,433	1,531,433	1,531,433	1,531,433
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	535,430	535,430	536,860	536,860	611,269	536,860
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,806,533	912,117		459,227	2,016,688	1,246,845
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	37,949	37,976		37,908	37,908	37,908
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	339,449	287,811				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	41,280,976	40,173,891	38,562,024	46,843,331	51,487,981	49,506,992
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	570,824	570,824	623,624	662,703	641,887	641,887
Teacher education and recruitment	346,923					
Research and innovation	8,270					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	926,017	570,824	623,624	662,703	641,887	641,887
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,587,332	7,152,052	7,152,052	8,315,482	7,416,855	7,483,934
State advisory councils		44,440	44,440	44,440	44,440	44,440
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		395,150	395,150	465,005	465,005	465,005
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	5,430	17,986	485,481	386,934	805,586	831,548
Innovation (pt. D)		248,969			308,097	308,097
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		348,579	348,579	406,818	581,373	494,097
Cooperative education (pt. G)		268,678	465,771	357,370	357,370	357,370
Work-study (pt. H)		84,660		109,560	109,560	109,560
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,266,373	1,414,980	1,603,937	1,603,937	1,603,937	1,603,937
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,859,135	9,975,494	10,495,410	11,689,546	11,692,223	11,697,988
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,533,113	1,028,548	[1] 1,309,103	[1] 1,013,751	[1] 1,309,103	[1] 1,013,751
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,081,348	3,778,457	3,810,300	3,772,197	4,149,416	3,772,197
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,345,928	3,523,681	2,898,121	3,783,670	4,021,743	4,021,743
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	182,628					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	56,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	224,205	227,449		155,020	227,449	190,876
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,089,051					
Language training and area studies	203,255					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	306,071	939,932			904,989	904,989
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	5,111,837	479,452			479,452	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	250,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	160,233	101,494	84,399	84,399	84,399	84,399
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	272,955				265,319	127,929
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,330,908					
Subtotal, higher education	18,197,532	10,129,013	8,151,923	8,859,037	11,491,870	10,165,884
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	322,474	295,177	285,423	285,423	285,423	285,423
Personnel development programs	611,791					
Teacher Corps	168,072					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,102,337	295,177	285,423	285,423	285,423	285,423
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	631,904	537,881	537,881	631,904	631,904	631,904
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,883	42,883	42,883	42,883	42,883	42,883
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251	25,251
Construction (LSCA II)	229,744	143,887		93,611	168,561	131,086
College library resources (HEA II-A)	308,819					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	182,226					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	178,251	178,251		178,695	178,695	178,695
Subtotal, community education	1,638,587	967,662	645,524	1,011,853	1,086,803	1,049,328
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	281,793					
Total, Office of Education	70,286,377	62,112,061	58,763,928	69,351,893	76,686,187	73,347,502
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	64,993,686	62,112,061	58,763,928	69,351,893	76,686,187	73,347,502

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$3,351,971	$3,884,709	$3,818,868	$4,374,936	$4,299,840	$4,299,840
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					23,559	23,559
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					4,333	4,333
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	964,066	804,617	818,387	895,373	953,965	921,749
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,594,464	2,586,000		2,533,000	3,451,000	3,001,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		22,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	253,111	213,526	401,930	401,930	401,930	401,930
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	303,881	303,881	303,030	303,030	345,285	303,030
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	436,944	194,993		98,174	431,129	265,625
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	82,737	69,359				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	8,150,507	8,342,418	5,592,215	8,869,776	10,174,374	9,484,399
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	153,967	153,967	168,209	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	155,543					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	309,510	153,967	168,209	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,539,144	1,714,714	1,714,714	1,993,561	1,778,124	1,794,206
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		94,738	94,738	111,481	111,481	111,481
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000	270,009	245,842	193,132	199,356
Innovation (pt. D)		212,009			226,509	226,509
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		83,572	83,572	97,530	139,379	118,455
Cooperative education (pt. G)		216,842	265,176	238,592	238,592	238,592
Work-study (pt. H)		20,677		26,759	26,759	26,759
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	192,097	204,502	219,519	219,519	219,519	219,519
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,731,241	2,593,122	2,678,796	2,964,352	2,964,563	2,965,945
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	666,632	248,553	[1] 316,350	[1] 244,977	[1] 316,350	244,977
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	797,691	744,348	786,502	778,637	856,501	778,637
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	780,846	758,059	700,343	914,340	971,872	971,872
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	147,253					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search						
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	170,056	173,048		151,494	173,048	162,164
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	120,300					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	548,214	283,459			289,229	289,229
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	620,484	129,423			129,423	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	85,786	65,833	58,654	58,654	58,654	58,654
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	53,126				61,581	25,614
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	181,619					
Subtotal, higher education	4,222,007	2,452,723	1,911,849	2,198,102	2,906,658	2,581,147
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	149,034	151,225	148,665	148,665	148,665	148,665
Personnel development programs	60,991					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	210,025	151,225	148,665	148,665	148,665	148,665
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	258,291	230,310	230,310	258,291	258,291	258,291
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,858	40,858	40,858	40,858	40,858	40,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,075	25,075	25,075	25,075	25,075	25,075
Construction (LSCA II)	106,355	99,012		84,051	106,355	95,202
College library resources (HEA II-A)	143,115					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities	72,216					
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,158	121,158		120,745	120,745	120,745
Subtotal, community education	806,577	555,922	335,752	568,529	590,833	579,680
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	15,429,867	14,249,377	10,835,486	14,949,424	16,985,093	15,959,836
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	14,495,704	14,249,377	10,835,486	14,949,424	16,985,093	15,959,836

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$14,445,834	$18,207,980	$17,942,957	$20,456,903	$20,117,396	$20,115,725
State administrative expenses	150,000	182,079	179,430	204,569	201,174	201,157
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					233,380	233,380
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					213,300	211,188
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,887,002	2,088,229	2,157,621	2,472,552	2,712,786	2,580,658
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	25,867,892	25,785,000		18,640,000	33,565,000	25,393,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	494,236	23,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	936,620	805,571	1,516,369	1,516,369	1,516,369	1,516,369
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	529,969	529,969	534,643	534,643	609,122	534,643
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,312,943	607,549		305,885	1,343,290	832,052
Loans to nonprofit private schools	12,890					
State administration	34,987	35,310		35,312	35,212	35,312
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	312,960	267,604				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	46,985,333	48,632,291	22,431,020	44,266,233	60,647,129	51,753,484
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	493,874	493,874	539,556	573,367	555,357	555,357
Teacher education and recruitment	376,451					
Research and innovation	426,695					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,297,020	493,874	539,556	573,367	555,357	555,357
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,084,864	5,241,683	5,241,683	6,094,001	5,435,441	5,484,600
State advisory councils		32,570	32,570	32,570	32,570	32,570
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		289,602	289,602	340,780	340,780	340,780
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	123,787	15,000	462,144	371,653	590,374	609,400
Innovation (pt. D)		244,966			299,260	299,260
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		255,472	255,472	298,137	426,059	362,099
Cooperative education (pt. G)		263,064	444,046	344,506	344,506	344,506
Work-study (pt. H)		78,808		101,986	101,986	101,986
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	615,676	682,321	765,998	765,998	765,998	765,998
Special projects and teacher education	53,331					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,882,658	7,103,486	7,491,515	8,349,631	8,336,974	8,341,199
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,670,392	[1] 941,773	[1] 1,198,658	[1] 928,225	[1] 1,198,658	[1] 928,225
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,547,538	2,293,450	2,418,293	2,394,110	2,633,521	2,394,110
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,346,063	2,785,347	2,653,616	3,464,454	3,682,442	3,682,442
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	234,680					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search						
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	220,505	223,731		154,779	223,731	188,914
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	706,694					
Language training and area studies	13,131					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,345,896	693,653			688,924	688,924
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,241,212	480,057			480,057	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	69,208	107,349	89,153	89,153	89,153	89,153
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	213,395				222,503	92,076
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,624,327					
Subtotal, higher education	12,584,035	7,575,360	6,409,720	7,080,721	9,268,989	8,113,844
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	318,527	293,258	283,599	283,599	283,599	283,599
Personnel development programs	622,171					
Teacher Corps	156,293					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,096,991	293,258	283,599	283,599	283,599	283,599
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	606,374	516,863	516,863	606,374	606,374	606,374
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,745	42,745	42,745	42,745	42,745	42,745
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,239	25,239	25,239	25,239	25,239	25,239
Construction (LSCA II)	393,560	140,820		92,958	164,310	128,634
College library resources (HEA II-A)	398,449					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	102,510					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	178,121	178,121		178,822	178,822	178,822
Subtotal, community education	1,786,507	943,297	624,356	985,647	1,056,999	1,021,323
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers	613,880					
Subtotal, research and development	613,880					
Civil rights education	225,529					
Total, Office of Education	69,471,953	65,041,566	37,779,766	61,539,198	80,149,047	70,068,806
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	64,111,111	65,041,566	37,779,766	61,539,198	80,149,047	70,068,806

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$16,794,736	$21,630,141	$21,315,302	$24,301,739	$23,898,423	$23,896,437
State administrative expenses	167,965	216,301	213,153	243,017	238,984	238,964
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					279,886	277,116
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	4,108,964	2,867,743	2,958,214	3,402,304	3,741,143	3,554,778
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	13,710,871	13,994,000		12,120,000	18,300,000	15,097,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	116,046	465,000		250,000	250,000	250,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,296,227	1,103,113	2,076,448	2,076,448	2,076,448	2,076,448
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	626,114	626,114	628,412	628,412	723,158	628,412
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,557,326	722,123		363,570	1,596,611	987,713
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	48,222	48,101		48,043	48,043	48,043
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	431,343	364,543				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	38,857,814	42,137,179	27,291,529	43,533,533	51,252,696	47,154,911
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	750,780	750,780	820,226	871,624	844,247	844,247
Teacher education and recruitment	1,258,348					
Research and innovation	813,925					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,823,053	750,780	820,226	871,624	844,247	844,247
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,562,570	6,866,845	6,866,845	7,982,984	7,120,290	7,184,686
State advisory councils		42,667	42,667	42,667	42,667	42,677
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		379,393	379,393	446,412	446,412	446,412
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	437,153	17,269	553,934	431,757	773,375	798,299
Innovation (pt. D)		260,710			334,016	334,016
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		334,679	334,679	390,551	558,126	474,341
Cooperative education (pt. G)		285,146	529,498	395,104	395,104	395,104
Work-study (pt. H)		104,947		135,814	135,814	135,814
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	750,102	835,242	940,892	940,892	940,892	940,892
Special projects and teacher education	273,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,027,825	9,126,898	9,647,908	10,766,818	10,746,696	10,752,231
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	5,488,242	[1] 2,222,744	[1] 2,829,038	[1] 2,190,768	[1] 2,829,038	[1] 2,190,768
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	6,495,739	3,949,122	4,047,533	4,007,058	4,407,762	4,007,058
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	7,070,873	6,942,565	6,262,986	8,716,710	8,691,191	8,691,191
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	1,206,506					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	127,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	268,977	272,428		157,936	272,428	214,615
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000					
Language training and area studies	898,381					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,157,438	1,114,870			1,076,049	1,076,904
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	4,330,783	881,731			881,731	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,800,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	208,175	173,339	131,834	131,834	131,834	131,834
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	507,779				499,755	206,285
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	3,984,143					
Subtotal, higher education	34,644,036	15,606,799	13,321,391	14,714,296	18,839,833	16,567,845
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	301,000	364,638	351,412	351,412	351,412	351,412
Personnel development programs	2,099,039					
Teacher Corps	829,390					
Subtotal, education professions development	3,229,429	364,638	351,412	351,412	351,412	351,412
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	940,815	792,186	792,186	940,815	940,815	940,815
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,558	44,558	44,558	44,558	44,558	44,558
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,396	25,396	25,396	25,396	25,396	25,396
Construction (LSCA II)	633,065	180,990		101,516	219,994	160,755
College library resources (HEA II-A)	919,725					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	293,465					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	216,889	216,889		215,348	215,348	215,348
Subtotal, community education	3,113,422	1,299,528	901,649	1,367,142	1,485,620	1,426,381
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	959,655					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	959,655					
Civil rights education	91,670					
Total, Office of Education	90,746,904	69,285,822	52,334,115	71,604,188	83,420,504	77,097,027
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	74,629,878	69,285,822	52,334,115	71,604,188	83,420,504	77,097,027

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$32,395,258	$42,339,633	$41,724,218	$47,570,100	$46,780,618	$46,776,730
State administrative expenses	324,175	423,398	417,242	475,701	467,806	467,767
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					102,509	102,509
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					396,683	392,756
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	6,790,000	4,691,787	4,850,885	5,600,320	6,172,271	5,857,683
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,550,314	4,536,000		4,508,000	6,151,000	5,398,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	194,618	3,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,326,201	2,000,378	3,765,418	3,765,418	3,765,418	3,765,418
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	990,466	990,466	1,002,131	1,002,131	1,134,950	1,002,131
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	3,421,788	1,553,289		782,040	3,434,317	2,116,053
Loans to nonprofit private schools	5,900					
State administration	86,061	86,366		85,916	85,916	85,916
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	769,811	654,538				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	51,854,592	57,379,055	51,859,894	63,889,626	68,591,488	66,064,963
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,268,699	1,268,699	1,386,051	1,472,906	1,426,642	1,426,642
Teacher education and recruitment	1,576,186					
Research and innovation	841,068					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,685,953	1,268,699	1,386,051	1,472,906	1,426,642	1,146,642
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	9,582,011	12,038,767	12,038,767	13,996,341	12,483,801	12,596,706
State advisory councils		74,803	74,803	74,803	74,803	74,803
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		665,143	665,143	782,682	782,682	782,682
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	449,550	30,275 }	838,636	618,182 {	1,355,935	1,399,634
Innovation (pt. D)		309,545 }		{	441,818	441,818
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		586,753	586,753	684,741	978,548	831,649
Cooperative education (pt. G)		353,636 }	794,545	{ 552,045	552,045	552,045
Work-study (pt. H)		186,486 }		{ 241,334	241,334	241,334
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	991,837	1,106,931	1,251,622	1,251,622	1,251,622	1,251,622
Special projects and teacher education	500,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	11,523,398	15,352,339	16,250,269	18,201,750	18,162,588	18,172,293
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,080,085	[1] 2,690,991	[1] 3,425,007	[1] 2,652,278	[1] 3,425,007	[1] 2,652,278
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	5,006,293	5,922,710	6,144,144	6,082,702	6,690,974	6,082,702
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	8,650,342	8,534,862	7,582,356	9,899,217	10,522,089	10,522,089
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	435,727					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	85,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	332,282	336,028		162,057	336,028	248,182
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	90,000					
Language training and area studies	1,159,039					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	3,315,772	1,701,935			1,726,844	1,726,844
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	6,385,324	1,247,835			1,247,835	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	178,974	197,259	162,392	162,392	162,392	162,392
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	612,301				621,551	259,245
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,691,606					
Subtotal, higher education	35,372,745	20,681,620	17,363,899	19,008,646	24,872,720	21,703,732
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	550,647	579,893	555,910	555,910	555,910	555,910
Personnel development programs	2,279,616					
Teacher Corps	349,241					
Subtotal, education professions development	3,679,504	579,893	555,910	555,910	555,910	555,910
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,377,606	1,151,767	1,151,767	1,377,606	1,377,606	1,377,606
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	46,926	46,926	46,926	46,926	46,926	46,926
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,602	25,602	25,602	25,602	25,602	25,602
Construction (LSCA II)	925,674	233,453		112,693	292,719	202,706
College library resources (HEA II-A)	802,205					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	522,737					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	283,198	283,198		283,968	283,968	283,968
Subtotal, community education	4,023,457	1,780,455	1,263,804	1,886,304	2,060,330	1,976,317
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	384,500					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	384,500					
Civil rights education	163,569					
Total, Office of Education	110,687,718	97,042,061	88,679,827	105,015,142	115,585,678	109,899,857
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	97,394,923	97,042,061	88,679,827	105,015,142	115,585,678	109,899,857

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$18,633,931	$20,127,632	$20,462,284	$22,613,655	$22,238,355	$22,236,507
State administrative expenses	186,630	201,276	204,623	226,137	222,384	222,384
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					675,607	675,607
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					179,259	179,259
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,976,699	2,097,802	2,171,620	2,488,811	2,730,770	2,597,693
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,331,658	3,368,000		2,698,000	4,438,000	3,517,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)						
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	996,022	853,429	1,606,455	1,606,455	1,606,455	1,606,455
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	544,185	544,185	548,158	548,158	622,014	548,158
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,563,031	719,373		362,185	1,590,532	987,778
Loans to nonprofit private schools	11,500					
State administration	35,901	36,211		36,308	36,308	36,308
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	321,136	274,431				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	28,650,693	28,322,339	225,093,140	30,679,709	34,439,684	32,707,149
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	552,633	552,633	603,750	641,583	621,431	621,431
Teacher education and recruitment	702,609					
Research and innovation	634,739					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	4,889,981	552,633	603,750	641,583	621,431	621,431
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,084,132	5,683,713	5,683,713	6,608,050	5,893,940	5,947,246
State advisory councils		35,316	35,316	35,316	35,316	35,316
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		314,026	314,026	369,525	369,525	369,525
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	472,021	15,000	471,479	377,765	640,174	660,805
Innovation (pt. D)		246,567			302,795	302,795
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		277,015	277,015	323,285	461,999	392,643
Cooperative education (pt. G)		265,309	452,736	349,651	349,651	349,651
Work-study (pt. H)		78,808		101,986	101,986	101,986
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	360,302	393,947	436,186	436,186	436,186	436,186
Special projects and teacher education	200,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,116,455	7,309,701	7,670,471	8,601,764	8,591,572	8,596,153
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,093,988	[1] 1,340,828	[1] 1,706,563	[1] 1,321,539	[1] 1,706,563	[1] 1,321,539
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,074,487	3,107,129	3,205,052	3,173,001	3,490,301	3,173,001
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	4,516,471	4,467,393	3,778,026	4,932,439	5,242,794	5,242,794
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	416,615					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	99,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	227,918	231,178		155,262	231,178	192,844
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	292,135					
Language training and area studies	260,387					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,824,346	951,515			983,409	983,409
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,864,880	594,127			594,127	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,000,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	180,432	122,169	101,943	101,943	101,943	101,943
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	318,722				311,262	128,943
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	994,100					
Subtotal, higher education	20,213,181	10,864,339	8,841,584	9,734,184	12,711,577	11,194,473
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	331,551	304,739	294,507	294,507	294,507	294,507
Personnel development programs	1,166,053					
Teacher Corps	443,834					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,941,438	304,739	294,507	294,507	294,507	294,507
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	657,518	558,967	558,967	657,518	657,518	657,518
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,022	43,022	43,022	43,022	43,022	43,022
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,263	25,263	25,263	25,263	25,263	25,263
Construction (LSCA II)	177,371	146,963		94,266	172,826	133,546
College library resources (HEA II-A)	469,205					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	280,541					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	177,277	177,277		177,698	177,698	177,698
Subtotal, community education	1,869,706	991,001	666,761	1,037,276	1,115,836	1,076,556
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	800,000					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	800,000					
Civil rights education	78,967					
Total, Office of Education	61,560,421	48,344,752	43,170,213	50,989,923	57,774,607	54,490,269
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	53,695,378	48,344,752	43,170,213	50,989,923	57,774,607	54,490,269

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$32,395,258	$41,909,589	$41,299,313	$47,085,660	$46,304,219	$46,300,371
State administrative expenses	366,015	419,096	412,993	470,857	463,042	463,042
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					659,974	653,440
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,101,942	1,502,449	1,537,506	1,730,507	1,877,670	1,796,735
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,593,395	2,585,000		2,276,000	3,365,000	2,773,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	117,158					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	589,397	491,458	925,097	925,097	925,097	925,097
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	437,838	437,838	432,249	432,249	490,640	432,249
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,312,466	596,634		300,390	1,319,157	808,793
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	24,641	24,357		24,110	24,110	24,110
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	220,413	184,592				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	40,158,523	48,251,013	44,707,158	53,344,870	55,528,909	54,275,837
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	399,693	399,693	436,664	464,027	449,452	449,452
Teacher education and recruitment	229,137					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	628,830	399,693	436,664	464,027	449,452	449,452
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,405,983	4,712,410	4,712,410	5,479,202	4,887,082	4,931,282
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		260,361	260,361	306,400	306,400	306,400
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	45,826	15,000	389,802	324,283	530,814	547,920
Innovation (pt. D)		232,557			271,868	271,868
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		229,675	229,675	368,059	383,076	325,568
Cooperative education (pt. G)		245,661	376,698	304,627	304,627	304,627
Work-study (pt. H)		56,375		72,956	72,946	72,956
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	831,474	936,895	1,057,152	1,057,152	1,057,152	1,057,152
Special projects and teacher education	320,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,603,283	6,720,002	7,057,166	7,843,747	7,845,043	7,848,841
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,470,096	[1]696,224	[1]886,131	[1]636,208	[1]886,131	686,208
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,159,065	3,188,960	3,301,930	3,268,911	3,595,802	3,268,911
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,304,564	2,256,810	1,961,736	2,561,164	2,722,316	2,722,316
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	28,300					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search						
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	98,669	201,794		153,357	201,794	177,336
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,929,260					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,197,927	640,999			653,093	653,093
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,540,792	304,004			304,004	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,151	93,741	81,084	81,084	81,084	81,084
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	280,563				178,785	73,950
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	572,726					
Subtotal, higher education	13,020,113	7,432,532	6,280,881	6,800,024	8,673,009	7,712,898
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	214,182	217,901	212,009	212,009	212,009	212,009
Personnel development programs	145,925					
Teacher Corps	468,815					
Subtotal, education professions development	828,922	217,901	212,009	212,009	212,009	212,009
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	455,712	392,834	392,834	455,712	455,712	455,712
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,928	41,928	41,928	41,928	41,928	41,928
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168	25,168
Construction (LSCA II)	139,226	122,724		89,102	139,226	114,164
College library resources (HEA II-A)	298,915					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	139,973					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	150,559	150,559		149,826	149,826	149,826
Subtotal, community education	1,490,990	772,722	499,439	801,245	851,369	826,307
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	289,604					
Total, Office of Education	62,920,265	63,782,863	59,193,317	69,466,622	73,559,791	71,326,344
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis[2]	58,018,047	63,793,863	59,193,317	69,466,622	73,559,791	71,326,344

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$22,898,224	$26,049,684	$25,670,355	$29,266,967	$28,781,248	$28,778,856
State administrative expenses	228,982	260,497	256,704	292,670	287,812	287,789
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					272,909	270,207
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools						
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,556,732	2,481,771	2,561,513	2,941,605	3,231,584	3,072,094
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,398,571	8,371,000		6,555,000	11,102,000	8,729,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,485,317			50,000	50,000	50,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,670,831	994,943	1,872,834	1,872,834	1,872,834	1,872,834
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	596,859	596,859	607,581	607,581	692,582	607,581
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,655,991	772,977		389,174	1,709,051	1,054,691
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	41,641	41,652		41,500	41,500	41,500
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	372,479	315,664				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	40,905,627	39,985,047	31,068,987	42,117,331	48,141,520	44,864,552
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	641,800	641,800	701,166	745,103	721,700	721,700
Teacher education and recruitment	724,146					
Research and innovation	9,600					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,375,546	641,800	701,166	745,103	721,700	721,700
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,083,056	7,028,458	7,028,458	8,171,046	7,288,027	7,353,941
State advisory councils		43,672	43,672	43,672	43,672	43,672
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		388,323	388,323	456,929	456,929	456,929
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	20,573	17,675	510,373	403,233	791,594	817,105
Innovation (pt. D)		253,258			317,522	317,522
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		342,557	342,557	399,752	571,275	485,515
Cooperative education (pt. G)		274,666	488,945	371,092	371,092	371,092
Work-study (pt. H)		91,487		118,395	118,395	118,395
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	742,562	824,641	928,768	928,768	928,768	928,768
Special projects and teacher education	127,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,973,191	9,264,737	9,731,096	10,892,887	10,887,274	10,892,939
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,586,582	[1] 1,414,063	[1] 1,799,774	[1] 1,393,720	[1] 1,799,774	[1] 1,393,720
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,295,787	3,733,029	3,677,540	3,640,765	4,004,840	3,640,765
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	4,823,178	4,814,078	3,984,379	5,201,845	5,529,152	5,529,152
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	130,362					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	123,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	249,360	252,721		156,658	252,721	204,214
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,127,530					
Language training and area studies	239,679					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,972,556	1,017,094			945,265	945,265
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,987,407	618,833			618,833	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	700,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	143,722	134,033	109,742	109,742	109,742	109,742
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	343,879				339,124	163,734
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,396,200					
Subtotal, higher education	22,169,242	12,033,851	9,621,435	10,552,730	13,649,451	12,036,592
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	346,701	338,688	326,759	326,759	326,759	326,759
Personnel development programs	470,198					
Teacher Corps	524,256					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,341,155	338,688	326,759	326,759	326,759	326,759
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	805,469	680,765	680,765	805,469	805,649	805,469
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,824	43,824	43,824	43,824	43,824	43,824
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,333	25,333	25,333	25,333	25,333	25,333
Construction (LSCA II)	512,392	164,733		98,052	197,459	147,756
College library resources (HEA II-A)	522,912					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	61,748					
Educational broadcasting facilities	340,000					
University community service programs (HEA I)	198,738	198,738		197,785	197,785	197,785
Subtotal, community education	2,549,925	1,152,902	789,421	1,209,972	1,309,379	1,259,676
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	2,683,838					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	2,683,838					
Civil rights education	60,067					
Total, Office of Education	78,058,591	63,417,025	52,238,874	65,844,782	75,036,083	70,102,218
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	67,474,176	63,417,025	52,238,874	65,844,782	75,036,083	70,102,218

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$3,460,422	$3,576,190	$3,897,883	$3,897,883	$3,897,883	$3,897,883
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					213,479	213,479
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					9,274	9,274
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	888,162	686,277	696,082	753,338	796,867	772,936
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,204,578	4,191,000		4,469,000	5,696,000	5,171,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	844,364			400,000	400,000	400,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	185,736	155,462	292,635	292,635	292,635	292,635
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	282,290	282,290	281,090	281,090	320,026	281,090
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	333,751	152,595		76,827	337,387	207,298
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	96,194	53,521				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	10,458,830	9,360,668	5,417,690	10,434,106	12,226,884	11,508,928
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	112,296	112,296	122,683	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	143,729					
Research and innovation	32,075					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	288,100	112,296	122,683	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,155,069	1,233,991	1,233,991	1,434,704	1,279,662	1,291,234
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		68,178	68,178	80,231	80,231	80,231
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	32,571	15,000	254,451	235,655	138,991	143,471
Innovation (pt. D)		209,340			220,618	220,618
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		60,144	60,144	70,190	100,306	85,248
Cooperative education (pt. G)		213,099	250,692	230,016	230,016	230,016
Work-study (pt. H)		15,801		20,448	20,448	20,448
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	156,723	164,109	173,321	173,321	173,321	173,321
Special projects and teacher education	138,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,482,363	2,010,730	2,071,845	2,275,633	2,274,661	2,275,655
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	729,768	[1] 260,776	[1] 331,908	[1] 257,025	[1] 331,908	[1] 257,025
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,529,733	597,086	634,395	628,051	690,857	628,051
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	877,702	848,766	734,784	959,305	1,019,666	1,019,666
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	71,730					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,394					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	163,086	166,045		151,040	166,045	158,468
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	21,300					
Language training and area studies	12,951					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	234,428	189,170			209,638	209,638
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	662,620	109,909			109,909	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	68,765	57,831	53,806	53,806	53,806	53,806
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	59,639				60,521	25,153
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	253,200					
Subtotal, higher education	5,785,316	2,279,583	1,804,893	2,099,227	2,692,350	2,401,807
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	135,982	137,296	135,432	135,432	135,432	135,432
Personnel development programs	270,762					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	406,744	137,296	135,432	135,432	135,432	135,432
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	210,196	190,717	190,717	210,196	210,196	210,196
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,597	40,597	40,597	40,597	40,597	40,597
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,507
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052
Construction (LSCA II)	88,347	93,236		82,820	98,347	90,594
College library resources (HEA II-A)	108,233					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	33,737					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	115,187	115,187		114,763	114,763	114,763
Subtotal, community education	660,858	504,298	295,875	512,937	528,464	520,711
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	19,082,211	14,404,871	9,848,418	15,657,335	18,057,791	17,042,533
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	17,886,461	14,404,871	9,848,418	15,657,335	18,057,791	17,042,533

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$5,668,814	$7,491,253	$7,376,510	$8,431,031	$8,288,619	$8,287,918
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					53,780	53,198
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,353,663	1,024,798	1,051,683	1,166,306	1,253,633	1,205,611
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	4,624,472	4,610,000		4,389,000	5,263,000	5,390,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	457,928					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	374,367	313,078	589,323	589,323	589,323	589,323
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	340,817	340,817	338,719	338,719	386,565	338,719
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	576,770	258,291		130,042	571,080	354,630
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,673	13,656		13,691	13,691	13,691
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	183,554	103,492				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	13,744,058	14,405,385	9,606,235	15,308,112	17,669,641	16,483,090
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	217,458	217,458	237,573	252,460	244,530	244,530
Teacher education and recruitment	176,671					
Research and innovation	274,385					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	668,514	217,458	237,573	252,460	244,530	244,530
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,199,575	2,227,091	2,227,091	2,589,253	2,309,441	2,330,328
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		123,046	123,046	144,792	144,792	144,792
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	82,022	15,000	254,451	268,254	250,841	258,925
Innovation (pt. D)		217,880			239,468	153,851
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		108,546	108,546	126,673	181,026	181,026
Cooperative education (pt. G)		225,076	250,692	257,459	257,459	257,459
Work-study (pt. H)		30,821		39,886	39,886	39,886
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	207,912	221,891	239,406	239,406	239,406	239,406
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,489,509	3,200,419	3,234,300	3,696,791	3,693,387	3,636,741
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,362,622	[1] 575,316	[1] 732,014	[1] 566,862	[1] 732,014	[1] 566,862
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,232,909	1,309,717	1,362,875	1,349,246	1,484,171	1,349,246
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,786,869	1,813,595	1,620,549	2,115,724	2,248,848	2,248,848
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	64,019					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	60,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	180,520	183,560		152,075	183,560	167,712
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	280,000					
Language training and area studies	34,980					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	726,890	359,064			356,265	356,265
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,136,397	232,407			232,407	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	75,908	74,549	67,335	67,335	67,335	67,335
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	125,481				131,608	58,841
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	511,900					
Subtotal, higher education	7,928,495	4,598,028	3,832,773	4,301,242	5,486,208	4,865,109
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	172,525	175,108	171,354	171,354	171,354	171,354
Personnel development programs	848,726					
Teacher Corps	541,734					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,562,985	175,108	171,354	171,354	171,354	171,354
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	330,484	289,742	289,742	330,484	330,484	330,484
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,249	41,249	41,249	41,249	41,249	41,249
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,109	25,109	25,109	25,109	25,109	25,109
Construction (LSCA II)	256,938	107,683		85,898	118,375	102,137
College library resources (HEA II-A)	204,610					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	131,132	131,132		130,820	130,820	130,820
Subtotal, community education	1,029,031	634,424	395,609	653,069	685,546	669,308
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	27,422,592	23,230,922	17,477,844	24,383,028	27,950,666	26,070,132
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	24,000,036	23,230,822	17,477,844	24,383,028	27,950,666	26,070,132

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$886,124	$932,847	$1,006,741	$1,058,509	$1,038,452	$1,038,354
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					4,123	4,123
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					704	704
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	646,767	551,066	564,708	600,769	628,118	613,086
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,554,294	3,543,000		3,066,000	4,641,000	3,799,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	221,351	14,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	113,689	100,155	188,527	188,527	188,527	188,527
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	257,521	259,550	260,934	260,934	296,963	260,934
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	113,732	61,619		31,023	136,239	86,937
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	50,000				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	6,006,811	5,775,570	2,270,910	5,469,095	7,197,459	6,254,998
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	90,967					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	190,967	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	596,052	529,448	529,448	615,506	548,990	553,955
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		29,252	29,252	34,420	34,420	34,420
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	140,627	15,000	227,226	217,827	59,629	61,551
Innovation (pt. D)		204,670			210,309	210,309
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		25,804	25,804	30,113	43,032	36,572
Cooperative education (pt. G)		206,550	225,346	215,008	215,008	215,008
Work-study (pt. H)		8,388		10,855	10,855	10,855
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	121,076	123,829	173,321	173,321	173,321	173,321
Special projects and teacher education	160,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,017,755	1,174,009	1,241,465	1,328,118	1,326,632	1,327,059
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	141,788	[1] 93,823	[1] 119,414	[1] 92,473	[1] 119,414	92,473
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	343,532	193,116	221,473	219,258	241,185	219,258
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	222,484	219,899	264,362	345,141	366,857	366,857
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	31,014					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	44,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	158,867	156,784		150,440	156,784	153,580
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)						
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		61,219			64,573	64,573
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	334,962	51,403			51,403	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	48,460	38,960	43,968	43,968	43,968	43,968
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	14,561				19,527	9,483
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	117,800					
Subtotal, higher education	1,497,468	865,204	699,217	901,280	1,113,771	1,000,192
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	3,661	124,027	122,827	122,827	122,827	122,827
Personnel development programs	46,706					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	50,367	124,027	122,827	122,827	122,827	122,827
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	146,589	138,353	138,353	146,589	146,589	146,589
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,253	40,253	40,253	40,253	40,253	40,253
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	20,753	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	5,299	25,022	25,022	25,022	25,022	25,022
Construction (LSCA II)	62,523	85,596		81,192	80,000	89,520
College library resources (HEA II-A)	57,175					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	109,324	109,324		109,524	109,524	109,524
Subtotal, community education	441,916	438,057	243,187	442,089	440,897	450,417
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	62,931					
Total, Office of Education	9,268,215	8,476,867	4,677,556	8,463,409	10,401,526	9,355,493
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	8,643,061	8,476,867	4,677,556	8,463,409	10,401,526	9,355,493

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$1,431,723	$1,627,712	$1,594,736	$1,839,186	$1,806,173	$1,806,011
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools						
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	815,216	665,545	682,108	737,109	778,917	755,932
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,065,756	2,059,000		1,785,000	2,765,000	2,277,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	−9,245	6,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	168,878	146,053	274,924	274,924	274,924	274,924
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	269,677	269,677	271,088	271,088	310,107	271,088
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	257,968	118,824		59,825	262,720	165,189
Loans to nonprofit private schools	2,970					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	55,921	50,000				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	5,222,197	5,206,144	3,072,856	5,230,465	6,461,174	5,813,477
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	101,537	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	73,850					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	173,850	100,000	101,537	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	975,353	1,058,551	1,058,551	1,230,632	1,097,643	1,107,570
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		58,485	58,485	68,817	68,817	68,817
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	26,550	15,000	246,673	230,561	119,221	123,063
Innovation (pt. D)		208,006			217,672	217,672
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		51,592	51,592	60,206	86,039	73,124
Cooperative education (pt. G)		211,228	243,450	225,728	225,728	225,728
Work-study (pt. H)		13,850		17,923	17,923	17,923
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	153,033	160,283	168,945	168,945	168,945	168,945
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,154,936	1,808,063	1,858,764	2,033,880	2,033,056	2,033,910
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	656,280	[1] 259,748	[1] 330,599	[1] 256,011	[1] 330,599	256,011
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	766,819	484,432	514,123	508,982	559,879	508,982
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	804,338	785,378	731,887	955,522	1,015,645	1,015,645
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	35,014					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search						
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	161,480	164,432		150,935	164,432	157,617
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	215,000					
Language training and area studies	50,731					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		168,618			169,813	169,813
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	835,235	105,932			105,932	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	44,491	61,000	57,148	57,148	57,148	57,148
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	61,584				59,689	28,784
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	366,300					
Subtotal, higher education	4,047,272	2,079,540	1,683,757	1,978,598	2,513,137	2,244,000
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	147,716	135,038	133,287	133,287	133,287	133,287
Personnel development programs	281,745					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	429,461	135,038	133,287	133,287	133,287	133,287
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	199,116	181,596	181,596	199,116	199,116	199,116
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,537	40,537	40,537	40,537	40,537	40,537
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,047	25,047	25,047	25,047	25,047	25,047
Construction (LSCA II)	152,018	91,905		82,536	96,503	89,320
College library resources (HEA II-A)	117,971					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	114,625	114,625		114,912	114,912	114,912
Subtotal, community education	688,913	493,219	286,689	501,657	515,624	508,441
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	11,716,629	9,822,004	7,136,890	10,077,887	11,856,278	10,933,115
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	10,514,434	9,822,004	7,136,890	10,077,887	11,856,278	10,933,115

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$24,487,811	$33,310,467	$32,825,491	$37,424,592	$36,803,488	$36,800,430
State administrative expenses	245,001	333,105	328,255	374,246	368,035	368,004
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					342,743	339,349
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools	5,233,177	3,626,822	3,775,106	4,350,987	4,790,439	4,548,731
Supplementary services (ESEA III)						
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	10,321,861	10,287,000		8,589,000	15,684,000	12,536,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	773,195	27,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,652,599	1,406,778	2,648,053	2,648,053	2,648,053	2,648,053
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	738,898	738,898	742,620	742,620	856,573	742,620
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,796,586	863,566		434,782	1,909,341	1,188,248
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	2,432	61,901		62,196	62,196	62,196
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	552,014	469,127				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	45,804,574	51,224,664	40,419,525	54,726,476	63,564,868	59,333,631
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	866,823	866,823	947,003	1,006,346	974,736	974,736
Teacher education and recruitment	503,629					
Research and innovation	9,336					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,379,788	866,823	947,003	1,006,346	974,736	974,736
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,448,818	8,543,798	8,543,798	9,932,416	8,859,051	8,939,174
State advisory councils		53,087	53,087	53,087	53,087	53,087
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		472,044	472,044	555,425	555,425	555,425
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	338,844	21,486	657,391	499,502	962,232	993,242
Innovation (pt. D)		278,456			373,190	373,190
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		416,411	416,411	485,923	694,421	590,174
Cooperative education (pt. G)		310,034	625,813	452,135	452,135	452,135
Work-study (pt. H)		136,743		176,962	176,962	176,962
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,057,036	1,177,851	1,332,732	1,332,732	1,332,732	1,332,732
Special projects and teacher education	417,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	8,261,698	11,409,910	12,101,276	13,488,182	13,459,235	13,466,121
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,636,170	[1] 1,065,148	[1] 1,355,687	[1] 1,049,825	[1] 1,355,687	[1] 1,049,825
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,751,188	3,272,107	3,419,849	3,385,651	3,724,215	3,385,651
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,281,169	3,330,813	3,001,249	3,918,309	4,164,854	4,164,854
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	2,023,322					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	139,875					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	290,710	294,262		159,350	294,262	226,138
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000					
Language training and area studies	423,131					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,260,985	1,162,358			1,188,662	1,188,662
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,452,283	725,600			725,600	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,600,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	175,863	129,991	104,828	104,828	104,828	104,828
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	265,201				262,020	126,991
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,875,400					
Subtotal, higher education	21,265,297	10,030,279	7,931,613	8,667,963	11,870,128	10,296,949
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	420,452	437,488	420,621	420,621	420,621	420,621
Personnel development programs	705,047					
Teacher Corps	264,859					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,390,358	437,488	420,621	420,621	420,621	420,621
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,090,767	915,632	915,632	1,090,767	1,090,767	1,090,767
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	45,371	45,371	45,371	45,371	45,371	45,371
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,467	25,467	25,467	25,477	25,467	25,467
Construction (LSCA II)	545,193	199,000		105,353	244,961	175,157
College library resources (HEA II-A)	487,854					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	248,366					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	249,254	249,254		249,966	249,966	249,966
Subtotal, community education	2,731,781	1,474,233	1,025,979	1,556,433	1,696,041	1,626,237
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	92,322					
Total, Office of Education	80,925,818	75,443,397	62,846,017	79,866,021	91,985,629	86,118,295
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	71,830,476	75,443,397	62,846,017	79,866,021	91,985,629	86,118,295

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$9,794,395	$9,888,110	$10,761,354	$10,761,354	$10,761,354	$10,761,354
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					488,844	488,844
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					91,418	90,512
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,112,240	860,486	873,831	959,763	1,025,184	989,211
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	10,219,522	10,187,000		10,115,000	13,687,000	11,992,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	229,219					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	288,109	241,076	453,791	453,791	453,791	453,791
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	319,982	319,982	317,977	317,977	360,421	317,977
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	525,835	273,046		137,471	603,704	370,233
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	100,396	84,923				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	22,753,031	22,117,956	12,656,953	23,008,689	27,735,049	25,727,255
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	175,883	175,883	192,152	204,192	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	291,082					
Research and innovation	485,629					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	952,594	175,883	192,152	204,192	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,590,156	1,947,460	1,947,460	2,264,327	2,019,629	2,037,894
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		107,597	107,597	126,621	126,621	126,621
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	50,000	15,000	281,677	253,482	219,363	226,433
Innovation (pt. D)		214,010			230,927	230,927
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		94,917	94,917	110,778	158,310	134,544
Cooperative education (pt. G)		219,649	276,068	245,024	245,024	245,024
Work-study (pt. H)		23,993		31,050	31,050	31,050
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	289,178	314,160	344,873	344,873	344,873	344,873
Special projects and teacher education	933,162					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,862,496	2,967,800	3,083,680	3,407,223	3,406,865	3,408,434
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	954,594	[1] 332,197	[1] 422,810	[1] 327,418	[1] 422,810	[1] 327,418
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,288,791	972,393	1,047,147	1,036,676	1,140,343	1,036,676
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,040,703	1,007,149	936,027	1,222,038	1,298,931	1,298,931
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	59,250					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	113,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	169,625	172,614		151,466	172,614	161,935
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	159,660					
Language training and area studies	99,838					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		307,654			338,305	338,305
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,361,848	156,457			156,457	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	300,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	80,506	62,013	57,006	57,006	57,006	57,006
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	73,684				85,535	41,531
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	568,300					
Subtotal, higher education	6,319,799	3,060,477	2,512,990	2,844,604	3,722,001	3,311,802
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	142,814	157,834	154,944	154,944	154,944	154,944
Personnel development programs	183,920					
Teacher Corps	456,756					
Subtotal, education professions development	783,490	157,834	154,944	154,944	154,944	154,944
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	255,312	227,858	227,858	255,312	255,312	255,312
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,842	40,842	40,842	40,842	40,842	40,842
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,073	25,073	25,073	25,073	25,073	25,073
Construction (LSCA II)	132,985	98,654		83,974	105,859	94,917
College library resources (HEA II-A)	196,710					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	8,380					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,677	121,677		121,084	121,084	121,084
Subtotal, community education	820,488	553,613	333,282	565,794	587,679	576,737
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	862,244					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	862,244					
Civil rights education	367,646					
Total, Office of Education	35,721,788	29,033,563	18,933,951	30,185,446	35,806,538	33,379,172
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	30,562,527	29,033,563	18,933,951	30,185,446	35,806,538	33,379,172

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$120,339,680	$178,348,472	$175,753,809	$200,378,257	$197,052,746	$197,036,370
State administrative expenses	1,204,063	1,783,485	1,757,538	2,003,783	1,970,527	1,970,364
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					1,130,256	1,130,256
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					2,070,481	2,049,980
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	13,221,927	8,869,461	9,235,315	10,692,091	11,804,049	11,192,431
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	16,738,842	16,997,000		14,386,000	22,113,000	17,993,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	98,325	1,688,000		3,481,301	3,481,301	3,481,301
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	4,090,893	3,465,109	6,522,557	6,522,557	6,522,557	6,522,557
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	1,474,535	1,474,815	1,477,979	1,477,979	1,722,759	1,477,979
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	4,198,623	1,928,151		970,773	4,263,134	2,657,948
Loans to nonprofit private schools	151,200					
State administration	156,767	153,851		154,869	154,869	154,869
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	1,402,273	1,165,991				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	163,127,128	215,974,335	194,847,198	240,167,610	252,385,679	245,767,055
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	2,331,331	2,331,331	2,546,976	2,706,577	2,621,564	2,621,564
Teacher education and recruitment	2,533,652					
Research and innovation	2,538,892					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	7,403,875	2,331,331	2,546,976	2,706,577	2,621,564	2,621,564
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	17,023,218	20,730,525	20,730,525	24,099,228	21,494,901	21,689,304
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		1,145,363	1,145,363	1,347,641	1,347,641	1,347,641
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	872,939	52,134	1,348,923	952,320	2,344,682	2,409,923
Innovation (pt. D)		397,076			635,037	635,037
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		1,010,377	1,010,377	1,179,005	1,684,886	1,431,949
Cooperative education (pt. G)		476,396	1,269,603	833,339	833,339	833,339
Work-study (pt. H)		339,615		439,501	439,501	439,501
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	2,946,251	3,299,893	3,759,700	3,759,700	3,759,700	3,759,700
Special projects and teacher education	536,318					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	21,378,726	27,544,582	29,357,694	32,703,937	32,632,890	32,639,597
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	12,047,255	[1] 5,023,882	[1] 6,394,237	[1] 4,951,609	[1] 6,394,237	[1] 4,951,609
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	9,537,189	10,320,156	11,411,374	11,297,260	12,426,987	11,297,260
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	14,717,179	14,852,696	14,155,701	18,481,112	19,643,969	19,643,969
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	9,779,625					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	312,236					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	544,335	549,067		175,865	549,067	360,619
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	135,000					
Language training and area studies	2,857,698					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	5,210,882	2,623,120			2,938,723	2,938,723
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	9,896,878	2,360,852			2,360,852	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,700,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	497,178	347,369	275,587	275,587	275,587	275,587
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	1,170,283				1,153,771	472,879
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	8,008,950					
Subtotal, higher education	76,864,688	36,127,142	32,286,899	35,231,433	45,793,193	39,990,646
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	392,515	931,283	889,739	889,739	889,739	889,739
Personnel development programs	4,832,101					
Teacher Corps	1,174,556					
Subtotal, education professions development	6,399,172	931,283	889,739	889,739	889,739	889,739
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	2,340,719	2,356,249	2,356,249	2,840,719	2,840,719	2,840,719
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	54,858	54,858	54,858	54,858	54,858	54,858
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292	26,292
Construction (LSCA II)	2,521,607	409,187		150,133	536,326	343,229
College library resources (HEA II-A)	2,018,364					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	656,562					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	493,850	493,850		485,753	485,753	485,753
Subtotal, community education	8,651,761	3,379,945	2,476,908	3,597,264	3,983,457	3,790,360
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	3,644,494					
Research and development centers	495,973					
Subtotal, research and development	4,140,467					
Civil rights education	213,880					
Total, Office of Education	288,179,697	286,288,618	262,405,414	315,296,560	338,306,522	325,698,961
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	245,571,113	285,288,618	262,405,414	315,296,560	338,306,522	325,698,961

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$49,388,344	$57,588,036	$56,749,453	$64,700,485	$63,626,704	$63,621,417
State administrative expenses	493,970	575 880	567,495	647,005	636,267	636,214
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					763,767	756,205
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	4,019,265	2,787,844	2,890,573	3,323,753	3,654,260	3,472,478
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	11,886,349	11,995,000		10,562,000	13,939,000	12,093,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,391,665	60,000		758,714	768,714	758,714
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,186,993	993,278	1,869,699	1,869,699	1,869,699	1,869,699
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	1,110,464	669,081	659,015	659,015	750,148	659,015
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	2,543,076	1,130,562		569,208	2,499,669	1,542,773
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	48,734	48,642		48,470	48,470	48,470
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	435,921	368,639				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	72,504,781	76,316,962	62,836,235	83,238,349	88,646,698	85,557,985
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	805,195	805,195	879,674	934,798	905,436	905,436
Teacher education and recruitment	456,656					
Research and innovation	135,931					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,397,782	805,195	879,674	934,798	905,436	905,436
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	8,971,685	10,190,085	10,109,085	11,847,550	10,567,223	10,662,796
State advisory councils		63,317	63,317	63,317	63,317	63,317
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		563,004	563,004	662,519	662,519	662,519
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	457,975	25,626	590,494	455,697	1,147,766	1,184,755
Innovation (pt. D)		266,982			347,860	347,860
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		496,651	496,651	579,617	828,316	703,970
Cooperative education (pt. G)		293,941	563,534	415,258	425,258	415,258
Work-study (pt. H)		118,212		152,980	152,980	152,980
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,495,891	1,677,851	1,904,580	1,904,580	1,904,580	1,904,580
Special projects and teacher education	415,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	11,340,551	13,695,669	14,371,665	16,081,518	16,089,819	16,098,035
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,329,263	[1] 1,437,343	[1] 1,829,403	[1] 1,416,665	[1] 1,829,403	[1] 1,416,665
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	4,815,571	5,388,943	5,517,832	5,462,654	6,008,921	5,462,654
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	4,519,639	4,465,664	4,049,973	5,287,482	5,620,177	5,620,177
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	164,526					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	254,954	258,341		157,022	258,341	207,180
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	2,854,457					
Language training and area studies	127,573					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,664,358	1,368,374			1,270,865	1,270,865
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,212,504	649,949			649,949	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	400,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	217,104	139,376	126,689	126,689	126,689	126,689
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	364,447				359,358	172,419
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,291,206					
Subtotal, higher education	26,315,602	13,757,990	11,573,897	12,500,512	16,173,703	14,326,649
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	337,952	338,289	326,380	326,380	326,380	326,380
Personnel development programs	809,378					
Teacher Corps	665,659					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,812,989	338,289	326,380	326,380	326,380	326,380
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	844,066	712,539	712,539	844,066	844,066	844,066
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	44,033	44,033	44,033	44,033	44,033	44,033
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,351	25,351	25,351	25,351	25,351	25,351
Construction (LSCA II)	388,584	169,369		99,040	203,886	151,463
College library resources (HEA II-A)	678,984					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	301,099					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	207,608	207,608		208,836	208,836	208,836
Subtotal, community education	2,529,234	1,198,409	821,432	1,260,835	1,365,681	1,313,258
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	820,000					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	820,000					
Civil rights education	731,116					
Total, Office of Education	117,452,055	106,112,514	90,809,283	114,342,392	123,507,717	118,527,743
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	110,006,832	106,112,514	90,809,283	114,342,392	123,507,717	118,527,743

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$4,033,993	$4,703,614	$4,718,350	$5,294,981	$5,204,615	$5,204,170
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					216,115	216,115
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					34,149	34,149
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	815,806	653,528	659,387	710,722	749,732	728,287
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,664,431	2,651,000		3,242,000	3,768,000	3,667,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		1,000		400,000	400,000	400,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	162,589	136,301	256,567	256,567	256,567	256,567
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	273,216	273,216	272,292	272,292	310,381	272,292
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	329,954	146,026		73,520	322,863	196,253
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	88,341	50,000				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	8,531,663	8,878,018	6,156,596	10,513,415	11,527,755	11,238,166
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	109,151	109,151	119,247	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	177,879					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	287,030	109,151	119,247	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,313,021	1,207,190	1,207,190	1,403,584	1,251,903	1,263,226
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		66,697	66,697	78,490	78,490	78,490
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	45,834	15,000	249,784	232,599	135,976	140,358
Innovation (pt. D)		208,539			218,851	218,851
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		58,837	58,837	68,667	98,130	83,400
Cooperative education (pt. G)		211,977	246,347	227,443	227,443	227,443
Work-study (pt. H)		14,630		18,933	18,933	18,933
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	168,753	177,469	188,601	188,601	188,601	188,601
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,527,608	1,991,407	2,048,524	2,249,385	2,249,395	2,250,370
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	893,715	[1] 283,305	[1] 360,581	[1] 279,229	[1] 360,581	[1] 279,229
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	753,069	700,121	718,959	711,769	782,947	711,769
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	946,751	926,540	798,263	1,042,179	1,107,755	1,107,755
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	175,900					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	48,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	162,084	165,039		160,975	165,039	157,937
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	405,000					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	77,204	200,784			202,370	202,370
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	919,319	109,575			109,575	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	253,165					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	72,802	58,948	54,101	54,101	54,101	54,101
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	71,130				68,041	32,912
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	269,200					
Subtotal, higher education	5,097,339	2,494,312	1,981,904	2,288,253	2,900,409	2,596,073
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	131,498	132,699	131,065	131,065	131,065	131,065
Personnel development programs						
Teacher Corps	29,604					
Subtotal, education professions development	161,102	132,699	131,065	131,065	131,065	131,065
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	203,285	185,027	185,027	203,285	203,285	203,285
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049
Construction (LSCA II)	256,991	92,405		82,643	97,197	89,920
College library resources (HEA II-A)	133,911					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	113,911	113,911		113,236	113,236	113,236
Subtotal, community education	813,216	496,461	290,145	504,282	518,836	511,559
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	16,417,958	14,102,048	10,727,481	15,886,400	17,591,566	16,927,233
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	14,854,169	14,102,048	10,727,481	15,886,400	17,591,566	16,927,233

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$33,370,827	$40,363,720	$39,755,953	$45,348,867	$44,596,250	$44,592,545
State administrative expenses	333,804	403,637	397,760	453,489	445,963	445,925
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					408,849	404,801
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	8,124,232	5,570,394	5,784,416	6,684,458	7,371,387	6,993,555
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	10,796,237	10,686,000		7,675,000	14,032,000	10,617,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	601,890					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,661,889	2,234,209	4,205,569	4,205,569	4,205,569	4,205,569
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	669,081	1,110,464	1,098,447	1,098,447	1,254,063	1,098,447
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	4,089,849	1,870,951		941,974	4,136,666	2,560,178
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	101,489	101,499		101,420	101,420	101,420
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	905,668	769,226				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	61,654,966	63,210,100	51,342,145	66,609,224	76,652,167	71,119,440
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,519,923	1,519,923	1,660,513	1,764,567	1,709,142	1,709,142
Teacher education and recruitment	902,441					
Research and innovation	110,492					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	2,532,856	1,519,923	1,660,513	1,764,567	1,709,142	1,709,142
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	12,376,685	15,503,686	15,503,686	18,024,291	16,076,464	16,221,862
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		856,581	856,581	1,007,925	1,007,925	1,007,925
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	2,239,722	38,989	959,985	697,641	1,746,155	1,802,429
Innovation (pt. D)		330,360			487,767	478,767
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		755,628	755,628	881,801	1,260,161	1,070,983
Cooperative education (pt. G)		382,829	907,517	618,938	618,938	618,938
Work-study (pt. H)		222,768		288,289	288,289	288,289
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,208,203	1,351,381	1,531,199	1,531,199	1,531,199	1,531,199
Special projects and teacher education	100,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	15,924,610	19,535,425	20,607,799	23,143,287	23,110,101	23,122,595
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,825,477	[1] 2,875,956	[1] 3,660,424	[1] 2,834,582	[1] 3,660,424	[1] 2,834,582
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	4,369,310	6,842,259	7,071,655	7,000,938	7,701,032	7,000,938
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	9,263,289	9,149,205	8,103,528	10,579,639	11,245,324	11,245,324
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	353,134					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	139,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	376,856	380,809		164,960	380,809	271,816
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	928,455					
Language training and area studies	228,989					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	5,062,019	2,208,535			2,215,139	2,215,139
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	7,474,954	1,394,980			1,394,980	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,200,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	130,405	216,768	161,361	161,361	161,361	161,361
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	681,179				665,433	321,162
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,814,700					
Subtotal, higher education	39,897,767	23,118,512	19,046,968	20,791,480	27,474,502	24,100,322
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	615,679	635,989	609,202	609,202	609,202	609,202
Personnel development programs	1,529,997					
Teacher Corps	729,250					
Subtotal, education professions development	2,874,926	635,989	609,202	609,202	609,202	609,202
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,685,152	1,404,949	1,404,949	1,685,152	1,685,152	1,685,152
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,593	48,593	48,593	48,593	48,593	48,593
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,059
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,747	25,747	25,747	25,747	25,747	25,747
Construction (LSCA II)	1,080,285	270,392		120,563	343,925	232,244
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,016,270					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	302,349					
Educational broadcasting facilities	131,687					
University community service programs (HEA I)	324,216	324,216		325,054	325,054	325,054
Subtotal, community education	4,653,808	2,113,406	1,518,798	2,244,618	2,467,980	2,356,299
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	156,630					
Total, Office of Education	127,695,563	110,133,355	94,785,425	115,162,378	132,023,094	123,017,000
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	116,370,990	110,133,355	94,785,425	115,162,378	132,023,094	123,017,000

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$16,791,317	$18,736,899	$18,464,057	$21,051,013	$20,701,647	$20,699,926
State administrative expenses	167,913	187,368	184,641	210,510	207,016	206,999
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					241,975	239,579
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,108,726	1,496,021	1,543,476	1,737,442	1,885,340	1,804,001
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	12,601,770	12,559,000		10,113,000	16,448,000	13,044,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	194,246	11,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	596,823	507,271	954,862	954,862	954,862	954,862
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	441,825	441,825	440,485	440,485	501,147	440,485
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,034,408	466,563		234,902	1,031,570	640,709
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	22,411	22,483		22,546	22,546	22,546
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	200,465	170,393				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	34,159,904	34,698,823	21,687,521	34,864,760	42,094,103	38,153,107
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	366,917	366,917	400,857	425,976	412,596	412,596
Teacher education and recruitment	380,135					
Research and innovation	100,000					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	847,052	366,917	400,857	425,976	412,596	412,596
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,795,552	4,541,401	4,541,401	5,279,822	4,709,249	4,751,840
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		250,912	250,912	295,249	295,249	295,249
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	253,116	15,000	377,356	316,133	511,498	527,982
Innovation (pt. D)		230,422			267,155	267,155
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		221,341	221,341	258,304	369,136	313,722
Cooperative education (pt. G)		242,666	365,111	297,767	297,767	297,767
Work-study (pt. H)		52,864		68,412	68,412	68,412
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	482,882	531,447	593,444	593,444	593,444	593,444
Special projects and teacher education	145,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,676,550	6,117,121	6,380,633	7,140,199	7,142,978	7,146,639
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,349,126	[1] 949,548	[1] 1,208,554	[1] 935,888	[1] 1,208,554	[1] 935,888
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,264,220	2,396,494	2,418,706	2,394,519	2,633,971	2,394,519
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,259,838	3,217,015	2,675,524	3,493,056	3,712,844	3,712,844
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	81,295					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	91,808					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	202,223	205,364		153,588	205,364	179,220
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	906,400					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,278,671	652,830			649,879	649,879
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,937,759	385,280			385,280	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	163,842	97,138	85,038	85,038	85,038	85,038
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	243,359				237,320	114,174
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	777,463					
Subtotal, higher education	13,606,004	7,953,669	6,437,822	7,112,089	9,168,250	8,121,562
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	140,917	221,695	215,613	215,613	215,613	215,613
Personnel development programs	552,463					
Teacher Corps	134,527					
Subtotal, education professions development	827,907	221,695	215,613	215,613	215,613	215,613
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	480,232	413,019	413,019	480,232	480,232	480,232
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,061	42,061	42,061	42,061	42,061	42,061
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,179	25,179	25,179	25,179	25,179	25,179
Construction (LSCA II)	485,060	125,669		89,730	146,308	116,519
College library resources (HEA II-A)	395,613					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	181,146					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	153,588	153,588		153,920	153,920	153,920
Subtotal, community education	1,802,388	799,025	519,768	830,631	887,209	857,420
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	55,919,805	50,157,250	35,642,214	50,589,268	59,920,749	54,906,937
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	51,930,596	50,157,250	35,642,214	50,589,268	59,920,749	54,906,937

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$8,093,651	$8,256,688	$8,998,583	$9,032,085	$8,998,583	$8,998,583
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					167,630	167,630
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					32,994	32,668
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,123,019	1,267,496	1,300,528	1,455,299	1,573,274	1,508,393
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,282,405	3,301,000		2,767,000	4,294,000	3,467,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)						
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	485,416	426,653	803,112	803,112	803,112	803,112
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	392,527	392,527	398,278	398,278	452,608	398,278
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	745,867	338,665		170,509	748,788	459,537
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	18,609	18,340		18,172	18,172	18,172
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	166,454	138,990				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	15,057,948	14,390,359	11,750,501	14,894,455	17,339,161	16,103,373
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	279,058	279,058	304,870	323,975	313,799	313,799
Teacher education and recruitment	994,455					
Research and innovation	613,213					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,886,726	279,058	304,870	323,975	313,799	313,799
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	2,577,575	3,138,872	3,138,872	3,649,238	3,254,877	3,284,314
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		173,422	173,422	204,067	204,067	204,067
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	253,116	15,000	345,463	295,250	353,530	364,924
Innovation (pt. D)		224,951			255,079	255,079
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		152,985	152,985	178,531	255,134	216,834
Cooperative education (pt. G)		234,994	335,420	280,186	280,186	280,186
Work-study (pt. H)		42,525		55,032	55,032	55,032
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	225,639	241,935	262,331	262,331	262,331	262,331
Special projects and teacher education	43,472					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,099,802	4,255,752	4,439,561	4,955,703	4,951,304	4,953,835
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,901,186	[1] 834,098	[1] 1,061,613	[1] 822,099	[1] 1,061,613	[1] 822,099
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,422,079	1,536,246	1,634,421	1,618,077	1,779,884	1,618,077
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,639,560	2,486,567	2,350,223	3,068,356	3,261,421	3,261,421
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	348,206					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	68,260					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	188,978	192,058		152,726	192,058	172,197
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	5,0000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	106,950					
Language training and area studies	120,593					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	978,887	502,615			512,143	512,143
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,651,456	342,465			342,465	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	500,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	86,876	89,263	78,838	78,838	78,838	78,838
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	198,461				195,573	94,680
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,321,922					
Subtotal, higher education	13,483,774	6,033,312	5,175,095	5,790,096	7,473,995	6,609,455
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	203,938	202,355	197,239	197,239	197,239	197,239
Personnel development programs	1,309,266					
Teacher Corps	386,867					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,900,071	202,355	197,239	197,239	197,239	197,239
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	375,683	337,786	337,786	388,844	388,844	388,844
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,566	41,566	41,566	41,566	41,566	41,566
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,136	25,136	25,136	25,136	25,136	25,136
Construction (LSCA II)	387,922	114,693		87,391	128,092	107,742
College library resources (HEA II-A)	323,389					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	228,958					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	142,684	142,684		142,508	142,508	142,508
Subtotal, community education	1,564,847	701,374	443,997	724,954	765,655	745,305
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	1,763,473					
Research and development centers	518,759					
Subtotal, research and development	2,282,232					
Civil rights education	207,597					
Total, Office of Education	39,482,997	25,862,210	22,311,263	26,886,422	31,041,153	28,923,006
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	30,428,796	25,862,210	22,311,263	26,886,422	31,041,153	28,923,006

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$46,085,501	$56,549,804	$55,726,371	$63,534,060	$62,479,639	$62,474,446
State administrative expenses	460,885	565,498	557,264	635,341	624,796	624,744
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					21,405	21,405
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					551,393	545,934
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	8,692,138	5,928,233	6,129,230	7,084,901	7,814,299	7,413,108
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	9,290,582	8,759,000		6,037,000	11,401,000	8,460,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)						
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,767,349	2,338,965	4,402,757	4,402,757	4,402,757	4,402,757
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	1,071,500	1,071,500	1,070,926	1,070,926	1,239,960	1,070,926
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	3,992,360	1,796,266		904,372	3,971,538	2,447,213
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	104,487	103,732		103,199	103,199	103,199
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	934,630	786,156				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	73,399,432	77,999,154	67,986,548	83,872,556	92,709,986	87,663,732
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,672,090	1,672,090	1,826,756	1,941,227	1,880,253	1,880,253
Teacher education and recruitment	1,387,240					
Research and innovation	592,755					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,652,085	1,672,090	1,826,756	1,941,227	1,880,253	1,880,253
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	14,044,897	17,080,756	17,080,756	19,856,954	17,711,078	17,871,260
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		943,714	943,714	1,110,411	1,110,411	1,110,411
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	753,769	42,956	993,434	719,544	1,923,700	1,985,695
Innovation (pt. D)		336,098			500,432	500,432
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		832,492	832,492	971,461	1,388,290	1,179,879
Cooperative education (pt. G)		390,876	938,656	637,377	637,377	637,377
Work-study (pt. H)		233,107		301,668	301,668	301,688
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,758,365	1,967,553	2,235,911	2,235,911	2,235,911	2,235,911
Special projects and teacher education	445,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	17,002,031	21,920,755	23,118,166	25,926,529	25,902,070	25,915,856
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,920,537	[1] 3,022,911	[1] 3,847,465	[1] 2,979,424	[1] 3,847,464	[1] 2,979,424
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	5,302,145	7,898,003	8,141,348	8,059,934	8,865,927	8,059,934
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	9,314,508	9,471,840	8,517,601	11,120,236	11,819,936	11,819,936
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	1,819,562					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	90,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	415,033	419,164		167,446	419,164	248,182
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	636,445					
Language training and area studies	927,017					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	5,381,842	2,754,310			2,697,489	2,697,489
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	7,313,779	1,517,897			1,517,897	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,648,829					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	443,361	256,687	200,561	200,561	200,561	200,561
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	738,408				721,473	348,488
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	3,701,000					
Subtotal, higher education	44,702,466	25,390,812	20,756,975	22,577,601	30,139,912	26,624,014
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	719,912	661,121	633,078	633,078	633,078	633,078
Personnel development programs	2,324,878					
Teacher Corps	1,208,432					
Subtotal, education professions development	4,253,222	661,121	633,078	633,078	633,078	633,078
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,948,566	1,621,800	1,621,800	1,948,566	1,948,566	1,948,566
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	50,021	50,021	50,021	50,021	50,021	50,021
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,872	25,872	25,872	25,872	25,872	25,872
Construction (LSCA II)	1,274,143	302,031		127,303	387,784	257,543
College library resources (HEA II-A)	1,322,250					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	245,608					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	350,978	350,978		349,235	349,235	349,235
Subtotal, community education	5,256,947	2,390,211	1,737,202	2,540,506	2,800,987	2,670,746
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	2,700,000					
Research and development centers	1,454,332					
Subtotal, research and development	4,154,332					
Civil rights education	30,538					
Total, Office of Education	152,451,053	130,034,143	116,058,725	137,491,497	154,066,286	145,167,679
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	131,178,759	130,034,143	116,058,725	137,491,497	154,066,286	145,167,679

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$3,427,736	$4,261,172	$4,189,876	$4,797,926	$4,715,809	$4,715,405
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					46,320	46,320
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	950,666	751,529	766,512	835,130	887,333	858,630
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,458,728	3,443,000		3,065,000	4,532,000	3,761,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	125,400					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	210,946	179,825	338,494	338,494	338,494	338,494
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	280,536	280,536	281,321	281,321	322,752	281,321
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	281,708	125,274		63,072	276,980	170,886
Loans to nonprofit private schools	43,800					
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	69,988	58,982				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	9,007,841	9,363,651	5,826,203	9,644,276	11,383,021	10,435,389
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	127,696	127,696	139,507	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	160,366					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	283,062	127,696	139,507	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,125,087	1,294,166	1,294,166	1,504,552	1,341,961	1,354,098
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		71,503	71,503	84,135	84,135	84,135
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	124,574	15,000	259,896	239,220	145,758	150,455
Innovation (pt. D)		210,274			222,680	222,680
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		63,076	63,076	73,606	105,190	89,399
Cooperative education (pt. G)		214,409	255,761	233,018	233,018	233,018
Work-study (pt. H)		18,141		23,477	23,477	23,477
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	228,181	244,389	265,137	265,137	265,137	265,137
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,477,842	2,162,026	2,240,607	2,454,213	2,452,424	2,453,467
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	820,489	[1] 317,502	[1] 404,106	[1] 312,934	[1] 404,106	[1] 312,934
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	548,835	669,589	665,251	658,598	724,458	658,598
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,074,064	1,068,572	894,619	1,167,979	1,241,470	1,241,470
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	351,741					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	42,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	167,458	170,438		151,235	170,438	160,787
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	37,000					
Language training and area studies	46,837					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	366,701	189,606			180,445	180,445
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	643,900	134,700			134,700	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	600,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	64,566	61,106	56,117	56,117	56,117	56,117
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	75,611				78,250	37,708
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	931,289					
Subtotal, higher education	5,820,491	2,661,513	2,070,093	2,396,863	3,039,984	2,698,059
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	140,866	143,140	140,984	140,984	140,984	140,984
Personnel development programs						
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	140,866	143,140	140,984	140,984	140,984	140,984
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	240,363	215,551	215,551	240,363	240,363	240,363
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,761	40,761	40,761	40,761	40,761	40,761
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,066	25,066	25,066	25,066	25,066	25,066
Construction (LSCA II)	122,211	96,859		83,592	103,370	93,481
College library resources (HEA II-A)	130,256					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	119,427	119,427		119,260	119,260	119,260
Subtotal, community education	717,593	537,173	320,887	548,551	568,329	558,440
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	75,073					
Total, Office of Education	17,527,768	14,995,199	10,738,281	15,384,887	17,784,742	16,486,339
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	15,077,595	14,995,199	10,738,281	15,384,887	17,784,742	16,486,339

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$29,997,874	$34,304,985	$33,805,445	$38,541,845	$37,902,198	$37,899,049
State administrative expenses	300,015	343,050	338,054	385,418	379,022	378,990
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					54,484	54,484
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					536,594	531,281
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,876,411	1,634,142	1,680,942	1,897,085	2,061,914	1,971,261
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	8,148,582	8,485,000		7,414,000	10,767,000	8,937,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,090,261	559,000		251,030	251,030	251,030
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	647,442	542,285	1,020,771	1,020,771	1,020,771	1,020,771
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	462,194	462,194	456,998	456,998	519,515	456,998
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,435,659	658,416		331,495	1,455,756	894,682
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	26,798	26,879		26,671	26,671	26,671
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	239,707	203,707				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	45,224,943	47,319,658	37,402,210	50,425,313	55,074,955	52,522,217
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	448,822	448,822	490,338	521,064	504,698	504,698
Teacher education and recruitment	183,963					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	632,785	448,822	490,338	521,064	504,698	504,698
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	4,705,545	5,581,203	5,581,203	6,489,335	5,788,053	5,840,401
State advisory councils		34,679	34,679	34,679	34,679	34,679
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		308,362	308,362	362,886	362,886	362,866
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	41,942	15,000	417,805	342,620	628,673	648,933
Innovation (pt. D)		237,360			282,471	282,471
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		272,021	272,021	317,476	453,698	385,590
Cooperative education (pt. G)		252,397	402,678	320,064	320,064	320,064
Work-study (pt. H)		66,128		85,578	85,578	85,578
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	938,021	1,056,859	1,194,355	1,194,355	1,194,355	1,194,355
Special projects and teacher education	120,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	5,805,508	7,824,009	8,211,193	9,146,993	9,150,457	9,154,937
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,318,847	[1] 556,431	[1] 708,208	[1] 548,426	[1] 708,208	[1] 548,426
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,318,936	2,923,329	3,024,746	2,994,499	3,293,948	2,994,499
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,755,247	1,785,215	1,567,846	2,046,917	2,175,711	2,175,711
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	58,412					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	29,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	203,508	206,656		153,672	206,656	179,902
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,322,163					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,352,252	758,609			750,494	750,494
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,552,012	294,365			294,365	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	89,260	88,808	81,417	81,417	81,417	81,417
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	145,939				142,229	58,748
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	535,600					
Subtotal, higher education	9,731,176	6,663,413	5,432,217	5,874,931	7,703,028	6,839,197
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	225,427	230,095	223,593	223,593	223,593	223,593
Personnel development programs	204,116					
Teacher Corps	389,168					
Subtotal, education professions development	818,711	230,095	223,593	223,593	223,593	223,593
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	489,102	420,321	420,321	489,102	489,102	489,102
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,109	42,109	42,109	42,109	42,109	42,109
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,183	25,183	25,183	25,183	25,183	25,183
Construction (LSCA II)	191,554	126,735		89,957	144,785	117,371
College library resources (HEA II-A)	330,491					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	68,841					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	156,011	156,011		156,614	156,614	156,614
Subtotal, community education	1,342,800	809,868	527,122	842,474	897,302	869,888
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	363,946					
Total, Office of Education	63,919,869	63,295,865	52,286,673	67,034,368	73,554,033	70,114,530
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	60,168,230	63,295,865	52,286,673	67,034,368	73,554,033	70,114,530

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$5,384,852	$6,138,638	$6,039,975	$6,907,237	$6,790,114	$6,789,538
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					71,500	71,500
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					65,130	64,882
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	209,789	670,038	679,400	733,964	775,438	752,638
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,425,076	3,410,000		3,665,000	4,667,000	4,261,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	192,626	24,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	181,001	150,552	283,393	283,393	283,393	283,393
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	280,643	280,643	279,034	279,034	317,606	279,034
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	351,316	151,605		76,329	335,198	206,010
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	92,268	50,790				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	10,280,904	11,139,599	7,531,802	12,208,290	13,568,712	12,971,328
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	113,577	113,577	124,083	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	156,012					
Research and innovation	7,853					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	277,442	113,577	124,083	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,314,560	1,228,372	1,228,372	1,428,191	1,273,851	1,285,372
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		67,867	67,867	79,865	79,865	79,865
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	105,000	15,000	252,118	234,127	138,360	142,819
Innovation (pt. D)		208,940			219,734	219,734
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		59,870	59,870	69,871	99,851	84,862
Cooperative education (pt. G)		212,538	248,520	228,730	228,730	228,730
Work-study (pt. H)		15,215		19,690	19,690	19,690
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	157,733	165,279	174,659	174,659	174,659	174,659
Special projects and teacher education	50,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,627,293	2,004,149	2,062,474	2,266,201	2,265,808	2,266,799
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	931,287	[1] 279,677	[1] 355,964	[1] 275,654	[1] 355,964	[1] 275,654
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	835,548	764,132	665,251	804,128	884,540	804,128
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	929,478	905,666	788,041	1,028,835	1,093,570	1,093,570
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	68,059					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	42,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	163,222	166,182		151,049	166,182	158,540
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	109,300					
Language training and area studies	6,477					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		219,374			239,042	239,042
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	978,247	113,427			113,427	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	81,037	61,447	56,097	56,097	56,097	56,097
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	70,545				68,340	32,790
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	222,400					
Subtotal, higher education	4,487,600	2,559,905	1,915,353	2,365,763	3,027,162	2,709,821
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	152,859	136,118	134,313	134,313	134,313	134,313
Personnel development programs	184,482					
Teacher Corps	33,037					
Subtotal, education professions development	370,378	136,118	134,313	134,313	134,313	134,313
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	211,135	191,490	191,490	211,135	211,135	211,135
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,602	40,602	40,602	40,602	40,602	40,602
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052	25,052
Construction (LSCA II)	264,000	93,348		82,844	98,504	90,674
College library resources (HEA II-A)	122,741					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	36,290					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	114,690	114,690		114,106	114,106	114,108
Subtotal, community education	854,019	504,691	296,653	513,248	528,908	521,080
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	17,897,636	16,458,039	12,064,678	17,687,815	19,724,903	18,803,341
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	16,788,440	16,458,039	12,064,678	17,687,815	19,724,903	18,803,341

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$32,040,454	$36,662,972	$36,129,096	$41,191,057	$40,507,444	$40,504,077
State administrative expenses	320,413	366,630	361,291	411,911	405,074	405,041
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					525,807	520,620
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools	3,110,281	2,179,882	2,240,639	2,568,848	2,819,295	2,681,550
Supplementary services (ESEA III)						
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	6,763,256	6,741,000		4,789,000	8,776,000	6,592,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	53,590					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	887,491	748,560	1,409,054	1,409,054	1,409,054	1,409,054
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	548,312	548,312	543,785	543,785	621,042	543,785
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,880,219	837,746		421,783	1,852,253	1,134,525
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	36,486	36,499		36,095	36,095	36,095
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	326,367	276,616				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	45,966,869	48,498,217	40,783,865	51,471,533	57,052,064	53,936,728
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	592,555	592,555	647,365	687,932	666,324	666,324
Teacher education and recruitment	755,063					
Research and innovation	377,353					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,724,971	592,555	647,365	687,932	666,324	666,324
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,544,967	7,399,834	7,399,834	8,603,098	7,673,389	7,742,788
State advisory councils		45,979	45,979	45,979	45,979	45,979
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		408,841	408,841	481,089	481,089	481,089
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		18,609	483,925	385,915	833,450	860,310
Innovation (pt. D)		248,702			307,507	307,507
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		360,657	360,657	420,889	601,482	511,188
Cooperative education (pt. G)		268,304	464,323	356,512	356,512	356,512
Work-study (pt. H)		84,660		109,560	109,560	109,560
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,111,779	1,243,389	1,407,690	1,407,690	1,407,690	1,407,690
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,656,746	10,078,975	10,571,249	11,810,732	11,816,658	11,822,623
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	3,802,933	[1] 1,127,246	[1] 1,434,723	[1] 1,111,030	[1] 1,434,723	[1] 1,111,030
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,740,853	3,977,080	4,018,617	3,978,431	4,376,275	3,978,431
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,915,617	3,853,342	3,176,221	4,146,745	4,407,664	4,407,664
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	203,720					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	95,774					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	231,544	234,822		155,498	234,822	194,767
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,690,064					
Language training and area studies	103,774					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,972,230	493,293			960,522	960,522
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,385,730	580,969			580,969	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	200,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	139,223	116,041	100,888	100,888	100,888	100,888
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	293,417				288,968	139,471
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,784,787					
Subtotal, higher education	20,609,666	10,432,793	8,780,449	9,542,592	12,434,831	10,942,773
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	271,931	279,580	270,606	270,606	270,606	270,606
Personnel development programs	808,592					
Teacher Corps	892,463					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,972,986	279,580	270,606	270,606	270,606	270,606
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	682,542	579,567	579,567	682,542	682,542	682,542
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,158	43,158	43,158	43,158	43,158	43,158
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,275	25,275	25,275	25,275	25,275	25,275
Construction (LSCA II)	225,972	149,969		94,907	176,992	135,949
College library resources (HEA II-A)	408,431					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	280,418					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	183,638	183,638		183,828	183,828	183,828
Subtotal, community education	1,888,943	1,021,116	687,509	1,069,219	1,151,304	1,110,261
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	376,697					
Total, Office of Education	80,196,878	70,903,236	61,741,043	74,852,614	83,391,787	78,739,315
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	71,926,325	70,903,236	61,741,043	74,852,614	83,391,787	78,739,315

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$73,314,190	$74,853,133	$81,555,130	$82,194,584	$81,555,130	$88,555,130
State administrative expenses	734,549	748,531	815,551	821,946	815,551	815,551
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					881,811	873,080
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	8,478,686	5,817,974	6,063,103	7,008,106	7,729,359	7,332,648
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	30,311,176	30,111,000		23,737,000	39,629,000	31,182,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	4,876,004	309,000		150,218	150,218	150,218
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,723,308	2,328,984	4,383,968	4,383,968	4,383,968	4,383,968
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	1,214,477	1,214,477	1,216,664	1,216,664	1,377,024	1,216,664
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	4,554,006	2,326,392		1,171,277	5,143,645	3,198,198
Loans to nonprofit private schools	4,800					
State administration	106,791	107,263		107,680	107,680	107,680
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	955,233	812,916				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	127,273,220	118,729,670	94,134,416	120,891,443	141,873,386	137,915,137
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	1,598,917	1,598,917	1,746,815	1,856,276	1,797,971	1,797,971
Teacher education and recruitment	1,448,263					
Research and innovation	529,938					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,577,118	1,598,917	1,746,815	1,856,276	1,797,971	1,797,971
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	15,296,068	19,648,794	19,648,794	22,844,332	20,375,619	20,559,899
State advisory councils		93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203	93,203
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		1,085,598	1,085,598	1,277,466	1,277,466	1,277,466
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	425,455	49,414	1,009,769	730,241	2,213,110	2,284,433
Innovation (pt. D)		338,900			506,617	506,617
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		957,654	957,654	1,117,612	1,597,152	1,357,386
Cooperative education (pt. G)		394,806	953,864	646,382	646,382	646,382
Work-study (pt. H)		240,910		311,766	311,766	311,766
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	2,505,509	2,823,537	3,214,895	3,214,895	3,214,895	3,214,895
Special projects and teacher education	283,905					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	18,510,937	25,632,816	26,963,777	30,235,897	30,236,210	30,252,047
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	7,466,566	[1] 3,254,435	[1] 4,142,141	[1] 3,207,617	[1] 4,142,141	[1] 3,207,617
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	8,341,028	9,160,666	9,466,983	9,372,313	10,309,545	9,372,313
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	7,524,662	10,372,986	9,169,962	11,971,932	12,725,222	12,725,222
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	1,107,488					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	189,200					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	373,876	377,795		164,765	377,795	270,226
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,850,462					
Language training and area studies	425,414					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	4,437,818	2,284,545			2,278,572	2,278,572
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	7,246,734	1,488,272			1,488,272	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	2,800,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	252,014	229,549	184,718	184,718	184,718	184,718
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	818,531				815,324	390,794
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	2,487,200					
Subtotal, higher education	45,370,993	27,218,248	23,013,804	24,951,345	32,371,589	28,479,462
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	627,577	658,726	630,803	630,803	630,803	630,803
Personnel development programs	1,632,485					
Teacher Corps	1,121,647					
Subtotal, education professions development	3,381,709	658,726	630,803	630,803	630,803	630,803
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	1,664,458	1,387,913	1,387,913	1,664,458	1,664,458	1,664,458
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	48,481	48,481	48,481	48,481	48,481	48,481
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,737	25,737	25,737	25,737	25,737	25,737
Construction (LSCA II)	1,622,353	267,906		120,033	340,480	230,256
College library resources (HEA II-A)	971,864					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	374,104					
Educational broadcasting facilities	200,000					
University community service programs (HEA I)	332,502	332,502		333,603	333,603	333,603
Subtotal, community education	5,279,008	2,102,048	1,501,640	2,231,821	2,452,268	2,342,044
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	1,709,715					
Research and development centers	820,000					
Subtotal, research and development	2,529,715					
Civil rights education	809,808					
Total, Office of Education	206,732,508	175,940,425	147,991,255	180,797,585	209,362,227	201,417,464
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	187,152,484	175,940,425	147,991,255	180,797,585	209,362,227	201,417,464

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF UTAH

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$3,013,832	$3,507,573	$3,447,224	$3,951,222	$3,883,158	$3,882,823
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					238,702	238,702
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					26,004	26,004
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,088,519	866,965	886,432	974,396	1,041,369	1,004,543
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	7,069,317	7,047,000		5,280,000	9,202,000	7,073,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	1,235,518	773,000		50,000	50,000	50,000
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	296,752	250,725	471,954	471,954	471,954	471,954
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	329,967	329,967	328,529	328,529	371,408	328,529
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	562,511	266,267		134,058	588,715	363,334
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	100,396	85,470				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	13,860,145	13,390,300	5,384,139	11,453,492	16,136,643	13,702,222
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	165,614	165,614	180,933	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	443,578					
Research and innovation	3,537					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	612,729	165,614	180,933	200,000	200,000	
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	1,478,438	1,926,493	1,926,493	2,239,910	1,997,851	2,015,921
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		106,439	106,439	125,257	125,257	125,257
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000	281,677	253,482	216,998	223,991
Innovation (pt. D)		214,010			230,927	230,927
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		93,895	93,895	109,583	156,603	133,093
Cooperative education (pt. G)		219,649	276,038	245,024	245,024	245,024
Work-study (pt. H)		23,993		31,050	31,050	31,050
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	146,169	152,742	160,321	160,321	160,321	160,321
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,624,607	2,783,289	2,875,931	3,195,695	3,195,099	3,196,652
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,253,811	[1] 629,481	[1] 801,184	[1] 620,426	[1] 801,184	[1] 620,426
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,102,791	1,081,711	1,027,389	1,017,115	1,118,827	1,017,115
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,047,412	2,268,497	1,773,678	2,315,643	2,461,346	2,461,346
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	178,722					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	50,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	168,195	171,178		151,373	171,178	161,177
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	117,600					
Language training and area studies	94,501					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		313,134			305,928	305,928
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	1,830,753	224,368			224,368	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	54,045	67,778	63,154	63,154	63,154	63,154
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	189,561				156,304	75,961
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	986,775					
Subtotal, higher education	7,124,166	4,806,147	3,715,405	4,217,711	5,352,289	4,755,107
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	178,237	160,149	157,143	157,143	157,143	157,143
Personnel development programs	513,069					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	691,306	160,149	157,143	157,143	157,143	157,143
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	345,448	219,738	219,738	245,448	245,448	245,448
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,788	40,788	40,788	40,788	40,788	40,788
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,069	25,069	25,069	25,069	25,069	25,069
Construction (LSCA II)	243,914	97,470		83,722	104,217	93,969
College library resources (HEA II-A)	227,431					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	16,303					
Educational broadcasting facilities	59,310					
University community service programs (HEA I)	121,786	121,786		121,869	121,869	121,869
Subtotal, community education	1,019,558	544,360	325,104	556,405	576,900	566,652
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	24,932,511	21,849,859	12,638,655	19,780,446	25,668,074	22,577,776
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	22,052,124	21,849,859	12,638,655	19,780,446	25,668,074	22,577,776

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VERMONT

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$1,632,466	$2,018,201	$1,979,533	$2,277,896	$2,237,603	$2,237,404
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					50,580	50,580
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					415	415
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	637,800	543,728	554,362	588,753	614,828	600,498
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	136,062	136,000		91,000	176,000	130,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)						
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	104,377	94,392	177,680	177,680	177,680	177,680
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	251,499	251,499	254,064	254,064	289,858	254,064
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	187,862	82,130		41,350	181,590	114,034
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	50,000				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	3,163,399	3,439,283	3,215,639	3,694,076	3,991,887	3,828,008
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	72,260					
Research and innovation	43,867					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	216,127	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	−738,026	718,373	718,373	835,183	744,927	751,664
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		39,691	39,691	46,704	46,704	46,704
Research and special project activities (pt. C)		15,000	230,337	219,865	80,911	83,518
Innovation (pt. D)		205,204			211,487	211,487
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		35,012	35,012	40,858	58,392	49,626
Cooperative education (pt. G)		207,298	228,243	216,723	216,723	216,723
Work-study (pt. H)		8,973		11,612	11,612	11,612
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	131,267	135,709	140,840	140,840	140,840	140,840
Special projects and teacher education	30,680					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	899,973	1,396,328	1,423,564	1,542,853	1,542,664	1,543,242
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	572,834	[1] 190,591	[1] 242,578	[1] 187,849	[1] 242,578	[1] 187,849
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	419,455	377,681	418,789	414,601	456,061	414,601
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	589,299	597,750	537,025	701,119	745,234	745,234
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	84,397					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	15,700					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	156,343	159,271		150,601	159,271	154,893
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)						
Language training and area studies	72,165					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	208,229	112,256			133,742	133,742
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	351,138	76,355			76,355	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	800,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	58,174	56,723	50,642	50,642	50,642	59,642
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	43,846				43,533	20,882
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	148,400					
Subtotal, higher education	3,569,980	1,620,627	1,299,034	1,554,812	1,957,416	1,766,843
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	120,221	122,645	121,513	121,513	121,513	121,513
Personnel development programs	144,578					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	264,799	122,645	121,513	121,513	121,513	121,513
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	153,671	152,416	152,416	163,671	163,671	163,671
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,345	40,345	40,345	40,345	40,345	40,345
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,030	25,030	25,030	25,030	25,030	25,030
Construction (LSCA II)	22,344	87,648		81,629	90,601	86,115
College library resources (HEA II-A)	112,087					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	24,510					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	108,892	108,892		109,100	109,100	109,100
Subtotal, community education	536,388	453,840	257,300	459,284	468,256	463,770
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	8,650,666	7,132,723	6,417,050	7,572,538	8,281,736	7,923,376
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	7,058,176	7,132,723	6,417,050	7,572,538	8,281,736	7,923,376

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$26,959,114	$31,452,550	$30,994,548	$35,337,120	$34,750,658	$34,747,771
State administrative expenses	270,474	314,526	309,945	353,371	347,507	347,478
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants						
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					356,762	353,230
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,568,334	2,498,188	2,599,571	2,985,804	3,280,471	3,118,402
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	35,704,596	35,182,000		26,519,000	44,448,000	35,110,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	3,589,739	635,000		787,600	787,600	787,600
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,057,993	909,967	1,712,879	1,712,879	1,712,879	1,712,879
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	604,339	604,339	607,398	607,398	692,328	607,398
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,960,992	882,413		444,271	1,951,012	1,214,806
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	42,701	42,696		42,922	42,922	42,922
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	381,959	323,583				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	74,140,509	72,945,262	36,324,341	68,890,365	88,470,139	78,142,486
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	660,289	660,289	721,365	766,569	742,491	742,491
Teacher education and recruitment	689,322					
Research and innovation	27,317					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,376,928	660,289	721,365	766,569	742,491	742,491
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	6,874,002	8,325,655	8,325,655	9,679,706	8,633,651	8,711,735
State advisory councils		51,732	51,732	51,732	51,732	51,732
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		459,992	459,992	541,293	541,293	541,293
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	23,272	20,938	535,265	419,533	937,750	967,971
Innovation (pt. D)		257,508			326,947	326,947
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		405,780	405,780	473,558	676,752	575,159
Cooperative education (pt. G)		280,654	512,118	384,813	384,813	384,813
Work-study (pt. H)		102,996		133,289	133,289	133,289
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	1,132,973	1,272,206	1,440,646	1,440,646	1,440,646	1,440,646
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	8,030,247	11,177,461	11,731,188	13,124,570	13,126,873	13,133,585
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,335,930	[1] 1,042,262	[1] 1,326,557	[1] 1,027,268	[1] 1,326,557	[1] 1,027,268
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,032,353	3,570,372	3,802,964	3,764,934	4,141,426	3,764,934
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	2,951,774	3,062,674	2,936,761	3,834,117	4,075,365	4,075,365
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	459,026					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	40,000					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	241,008	244,330		156,114	244,330	199,785
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,006,475					
Language training and area studies	96,045					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,908,903	987,014			1,019,960	1,019,960
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,551,185	531,957			531,957	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	104,159	115,965	103,412	103,412	103,412	103,412
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	267,588				263,491	126,769
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,379,700					
Subtotal, higher education	15,424,146	9,604,574	8,219,694	8,935,845	11,756,498	10,367,493
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	319,962	318,302	307,392	307,392	307,392	307,392
Personnel development programs	581,689					
Teacher Corps	341,530					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,243,181	319,302	307,392	307,392	307,392	307,392
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	747,843	633,325	633,325	747,843	747,843	747,834
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,512	43,512	43,512	43,512	43,512	43,512
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,305	25,305	25,305	25,305	25,305	25,305
Construction (LSCA II)	168,885	157,812		96,578	187,865	142,221
College library resources (HEA II-A)	420,852					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	196,597	196,597		197,658	197,658	197,658
Subtotal, community education	1,642,503	1,096,060	741,651	1,150,405	1,241,692	1,196,048
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	542,682					
Total, Office of Education	102,400,196	95,801,948	58,045,631	93,175,146	115,645,085	103,889,495
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	96,547,970	95,801,948	58,045,631	93,175,146	115,645,085	103,889,495

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$11,517,854	$12,691,030	$13,007,855	$14,276,980	$14,037,548	$14,036,369
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					33,009	33,009
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					98,040	96,069
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,503,083	1,854,696	1,936,123	2,196,694	2,407,671	2,291,635
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	12,296,924	12,257,000		10,488,000	16,297,000	13,319,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	530,390	425,000				
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	819,428	701,488	1,320,448	1,320,448	1,320,048	1,320,448
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	513,297	513,297	514,477	514,477	584,013	514,477
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,105,278	520,831		262,224	1,151,555	720,652
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	29,065	30,374		30,689	30,689	30,689
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	259,983	230,194				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	29,725,302	29,473,910	17,028,903	29,339,512	36,209,973	32,613,348
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	451,985	451,985	493,793	524,736	508,254	508,254
Teacher education and recruitment	433,170					
Research and innovation	284,584					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,169,739	451,985	493,793	524,736	508,254	508,254
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,724,103	4,779,695	4,779,695	5,556,995	4,956,468	5,001,295
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	3,,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		264,079	264,079	310,748	310,748	310,748
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	47,383	15,000	441,142	357,901	538,350	555,699
Innovation (pt. D)		241,363			291,308	291,308
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		232,956	232,956	271,864	388,515	330,191
Cooperative education (pt. G)		258,011	424,493	332,928	332,928	332,928
Work-study (pt. H)		72,370		93,656	93,656	93,656
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	305,985	333,131	366,630	366,630	366,630	366,630
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,077,471	6,227,673	6,540,063	7,321,790	7,309,671	7,313,523
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,518,068	[1] 1,229,052	[1] 1,564,298	[1] 1,211,371	[1] 1,564,298	[1] 1,211,371
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	2,745,963	2,375,723	2,485,067	2,460,216	2,706,239	2,460,216
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	3,908,034	3,924,140	3,463,077	4,521,253	4,805,737	4,805,737
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	250,413					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	53,156					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	212,648	217,847		154,397	217,847	185,808
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	220,000					
Language training and area studies	453,264					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	1,372,312	709,565			719,018	719,018
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,618,385	525,349			525,349	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	100,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	178,004	106,412	93,637	93,637	93,637	93,637
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	312,641				281,549	136,773
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,517,613					
Subtotal, higher education	16,510,501	9,138,088	7,656,079	8,049,874	10,963,674	9,662,560
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	292,833	268,288	259,877	259,877	259,877	259,877
Personnel development programs	1,284,423					
Teacher Corps	369,943					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,947,199	268,288	259,877	259,877	259,877	259,877
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	565,959	483,592	483,592	565,959	565,959	565,959
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	42,526	42,526	42,526	42,526	42,526	42,526
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,220	25,220	25,220	25,220	25,220	25,320
Construction (LSCA II)	323,350	135,966		91,924	157,581	124,752
College library resources (HEA II-A)	376,750					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	357,552					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	165,768	165,768		169,913	169,913	169,913
Subtotal, community education	1,896,634	892,581	590,847	935,051	1,000,708	967,979
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education	142,010					
Total, Office of Education	55,468,856	46,452,525	32,569,562	46,871,840	56,252,157	51,325,541
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	49,313,337	46,452,525	32,569,562	46,871,840	56,252,157	51,325,541

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$16,156,287	$19,517,670	$19,233,459	$21,928,214	$21,564,289	$21,562,498
State administrative expenses	161,563	195,177	192,335	219,282	215,643	215,625
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					108,495	108,495
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					281,788	278,998
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,615,010	1,186,348	1,210,809	1,351,106	1,458,031	1,399,228
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	520,634	519,000		353,000	676,000	499,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	−8,575					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	420,151	345,700	650,730	650,730	650,730	650,730
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	374,730	374,730	368,640	368,640	420,793	368,640
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	892,132	389,684		196,196	861,591	524,424
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	17,219	16,718		16,429	16,429	16,429
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	154,028	126,702				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	20,303,179	22,771,729	21,755,973	25,183,597	26,353,789	25,724,067
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	314,074	314,074	343,126	364,627	353,174	353,174
Teacher education and recruitment	235,097					
Research and innovation	58,498					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	607,669	314,074	343,126	364,627	353,174	353,174
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	3,101,498	3,544,340	3,544,340	4,120,765	3,675,448	3,708,689
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		195,824	195,824	230,436	230,436	230,436
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	57,903	15,000	342,351	293,212	399,211	412,077
Innovation (pt. D)		224,418			253,901	253,901
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		172,745	172,745	201,601	288,101	244,851
Cooperative education (pt. G)		234,235	332,524	278,471	278,471	278,471
Work-study (pt. H)		41,745		54,023	54,023	54,023
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	497,755	550,582	615,329	615,329	615,329	615,329
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	3,657,156	5,009,957	5,234,181	5,824,905	5,825,988	5,828,845
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,434,297	[1] 570,018	[1] 725,500	[1] 561,817	[1] 725,500	[1] 561,817
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	1,854,608	1,938,617	2,012,278	1,992,155	2,191,371	1,992,155
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	1,783,385	1,787,768	1,606,128	2,096,896	2,228,836	2,228,836
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	119,460					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	33,850					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	191,149	194,239		152,867	194,239	173,348
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	655,786					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)		608,986			608,852	608,852
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	2,373,604	245,325			245,325	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	78,080	79,459	65,899	65,899	65,899	65,899
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	135,930				144,888	70,079
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	181,200					
Subtotal, higher education	8,891,349	5,474,412	4,459,805	4,919,634	6,454,910	5,750,986
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	85,395	182,934	178,789	178,789	178,789	178,789
Personnel development programs	552,878					
Teacher Corps	287,331					
Subtotal, education professions development	925,604	182,934	178,789	178,789	178,789	178,789
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	403,825	350,119	350,119	403,825	403,825	403,825
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,647	41,647	41,647	41,647	41,647	41,647
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,143	25,143	25,143	25,143	25,143	25,143
Construction (LSCA II)	308,680	116,492		87,775	130,586	109,181
College library resources (HEA II-A)	199,360					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities	283,826					
University community service programs (HEA I)	139,136	139,136		138,584	138,584	158,584
Subtotal, community education	1,441,126	712,226	456,418	736,483	779,294	757,889
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories	895,478					
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development	895,478					
Civil rights education	65,429					
Total, Office of Education	36,786,990	34,465,332	32,428,292	37,208,035	39,945,944	38,593,750
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	33,082,867	34,465,332	32,428,292	37,208,035	39,945,944	38,593,750

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$14,388,760	$17,432,234	$17,178,501	$19,585,340	$19,260,298	$19,258,698
State administrative expenses	150,000	174,322	171,785	195,853	192,603	192,587
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					138,987	138,987
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools					70,821	70,120
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,403,351	2,364,521	2,435,381	2,795,124	3,069,568	2,918,623
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,095,973	2,089,000		1,639,000	2,723,000	2,134,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	99,715					
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,153,770	982,463	1,849,342	1,849,342	1,849,342	1,849,342
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	565,995	565,995	569,933	569,933	650,238	569,933
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	1,720,045	781,646		393,538	1,728,217	1,062,970
Loans to nonprofit private schools	111,630					
State administration	41,056	40,967		40,682	40,682	40,682
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	367,246	310,476				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	24,097,541	24,841,624	22,304,942	27,168,812	29,823,756	28,335,942
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	625,438	625,438	683,290	726,107	703,300	703,300
Teacher education and recruitment	767,180					
Research and innovation	420,384					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,813,002	625,438	683,290	726,107	703,300	703,300
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	5,609,990	6,327,757	6,327,757	7,356,721	6,561,704	6,621,049
State advisory councils		39,318	39,318	39,318	39,318	39,318
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		349,608	349,608	411,391	411,391	411,391
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	128,533	15,913	504,927	399,668	712,704	735,672
Innovation (pt. D)		252,304			315,460	315,460
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		308,406	308,406	359,913	514,342	437,129
Cooperative education (pt. G)		273,356	483,876	368,090	368,090	368,090
Work-study (pt. H)		88,951		115,113	115,113	115,113
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	543,151	600,765	672,723	672,723	672,723	672,723
Special projects and teacher education	260,000					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,541,674	8,256,378	8,686,615	9,722,937	9,710,845	9,715,945
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,329,791	[1] 1,544,035	[1] 1,965,198	[1] 1,521,823	[1] 1,965,198	[1] 1,521,823
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	3,056,446	3,168,640	3,379,954	3,346,154	3,680,770	3,346,154
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	4,831,288	4,721,490	4,350,600	5,679,967	6,037,358	6,037,358
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	596,580					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search	73,884					
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	240,649	243,969		156,091	243,969	199,595
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	113,300					
Language training and area studies	822,013					
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	2,005,041	1,032,197			1,075,884	1,075,884
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	3,404,584	673,709			673,709	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	500,000					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	189,230	134,944	113,051	113,051	113,051	113,051
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	353,677				355,530	172,363
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	1,357,300					
Subtotal, higher education	21,923,783	11,568,984	9,858,803	10,867,086	14,195,469	12,516,228
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	282,828	335,694	323,915	323,915	323,915	323,915
Personnel development programs	1,014,790					
Teacher Corps	313,757					
Subtotal, education professions development	1,611,375	335,694	323,915	323,915	323,915	323,915
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	745,365	631,285	631,285	745,365	745,365	745,365
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	43,498	43,498	43,498	43,498	43,498	43,498
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304	25,304
Construction (LSCA II)	732,551	157,514		96,514	187,452	141,983
College library resources (HEA II-A)	518,630					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	276,081					
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	190,150	190,150		189,322	189,322	189,322
Subtotal, community education	2,571,088	1,087,260	739,596	1,139,512	1,230,450	1,184,981
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers	1,200,000					
Subtotal, research and development	1,200,000					
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	59,758,463	46,715,378	42,597,161	49,948,369	55,987,735	52,780,311
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	51,170,887	46,715,378	42,597,161	49,948,369	55,987,735	52,780,311

See footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference report
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Elementary and secondary education:						
Aid to school districts:						
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):						
Pt. A: Basic grants	$1,364,174	$1,401,274	$1,633,026	$1,633,026	$1,523,712	$1,633,026
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B.: Special incentive grants					74,149	75,149
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools						
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	580,075	501,223	507,391	534,204	554,494	543,345
Federally affected areas:						
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	1,696,509	1,691,000		1,774,000	2,287,000	2,058,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)						
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	87,394	73,280	137,939	137,939	137,939	137,939
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):						
Grants to States	249,634	249,634	249,024	249,024	283,559	249,024
Grants for special projects						
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):						
Grants to States	144,298	66,403		33,432	146,817	90,759
Loans to nonprofit private schools						
State administration	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	50,000	50,000				
Planning and evaluation		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	4,335,417	4,296,147	2,777,380	4,624,958	5,271,003	5,050,575
Education for the handicapped:						
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	100,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment	79,389					
Research and innovation						
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	179,389	100,000	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education:						
Grants to States (pt. B)	620,814	544,453	544,453	633,004	564,597	569,704
State advisory councils		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,063	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B)		30,081	30,081	35,398	35,398	35,398
Research and special project activities (pt. C)	87,014	15,000	225,670	216,809	61,324	63,300
Innovation (pt. D)		204,403			209,720	209,720
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F)		26,535	26,535	30,968	44,256	37,612
Cooperative education (pt. G)		206,175	223,898	214,150	214,150	214,150
Work-study (pt. H)		7,413		9,593	9,593	9,593
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):						
Grants to States	124,625	127,831	131,830	131,830	131,830	131,830
Special projects and teacher education						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	832,453	1,192,959	1,213,535	1,302,820	1,301,936	1,302,375
Higher education:						
Student assistance:						
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	365,050	[1] 122,359	[1] 155,734	[1] 120,598	[1] 155,734	[1] 120,598
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C)	516,201	273,002	286,624	283,758	312,133	283,758
Loans:						
Direct (NDEA II)	411,098	402,525	344,768	450,115	478,437	478,437
Insured:						
Advances for reserve funds						
Interest payments	23,343					
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search						
Institutional assistance:						
Aid to land-grant colleges:						
Annual	154,927	157,849		150,509	157,849	154,142
Permanent	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	118,900					
Language training and area studies						
Construction:						
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103)	169,890	87,843			94,578	94,578
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104)	247,470	52,868			52,868	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)						
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105)	71,006	47,216	47,545	47,545	47,545	47,545
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A)	28,359				29,187	14,153
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E)	240,581					
Subtotal, higher education	2,396,825	1,193,662	884,671	1,102,525	1,378,331	1,243,211
Education professions development:						
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	116,931	117,580	116,701	116,701	116,701	116,701
Personnel development programs	56,147					
Teacher Corps						
Subtotal, education professions development	173,078	117,580	116,701	116,701	116,701	116,701
Community education:						
Public libraries:						
Services:						
Grants to States (LSCA I)	153,903	144,375	144,375	153,903	153,903	153,903
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,292	40,292	40,292	40,292	40,292	40,292
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	25,025	25,025	25,025	25,025	25,025	25,025
Construction (LSCA II)	105,309	86,474		81,379	88,975	85,177
College library resources (HEA II-A)	49,573					
Librarian training (HEA II-B)						
Educational broadcasting facilities						
University community service programs (HEA I)	106,901	106,901		106,830	106,830	106,830
Subtotal, community education	520,512	442,576	249,201	446,938	454,534	450,736
Research and development:						
Educational laboratories						
Research and development centers						
Subtotal, research and development						
Civil rights education						
Total, Office of Education	8,437,674	7,342,924	5,341,488	7,793,942	8,722,505	8,363,598
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis [2]	7,841,382	7,342,924	5,341,488	7,793,942	8,722,505	8,363,598

[1] Initial year awards only.
[2] The 1969 actual column shows obligations for project-type programs where the State-by-State distribution cannot be predicted in advance, and therefore, is not shown in the 1970 and 1971 columns. For this reason the 1969 comparable figure excludes obligations for project-type programs.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I support the President's veto of H.R. 16916, the Office of Education appropriations for fiscal 1971. I have always been a strong supporter of educational programs, all the way from construction to research to student assistance. The Federal education budget has expanded rapidly in the last decade—from $886 million in 1960 to $5,389 million in the 1971 budget—and while there is still room for vast improvement, to say the least, we have gone a long way toward quality education for all Americans. The authorizing and funding legislation required to sustain this effort will continue to have my wholehearted support.

But neither the administration's nor my commitment to education is the issue here. The fiscal 1971 budget requested education outlays nearly $1 billion higher than the education outlays during the last year of the previous administration. It is obvious that the question raised by the President's veto is not whether to increase education spending, but rather over the size of those increases, and the types of programs which will benefit. The bill, as sent to the President, would spend more money for outmoded programs while cutting back on some of the innovative ideas so badly needed in our school systems today. For example, it would provide $126 million above the administration's budget request for the outdated and inequitable program of assistance to schools in federally impacted areas. I have always supported the principle of "impacted aid"—but the program in its present form pays millions to some of the wealthiest school districts in the country, while depriving some of the poorest and neediest districts of support they desperately need. The past four Presidents have tried to reform this costly pork-barrel program without success, and once again Congress is inflicting it on the American people—and asking them to pay the bill.

Having increased funds for this inequitable program, Congress then went ahead and cut back on some of the most promising of the administration's requests, for example, dropout prevention, economic opportunity grants and education research. No one can convince me that the increases for impacted areas could not better be spent for these worthy programs.

No, this veto cannot be interpreted as a lack of commitment to quality education on the part of the administration. Nor is there any substance to the claim that this is a case of misplaced priorities. The record also needs to be set straight here. The administration's budget request for national defense is down $7.7 billion from the last year of the previous administration, and the space budget is down $1 billion. Savings from defense and space cutbacks have been channeled into physical and human resource programs: Requested spending for community development and housing has nearly doubled during the Nixon administration. Allocations for human resource programs are up $18.3 billion under this administration, including requested spending increases of $1.3 billion for education and manpower, $3.3 billion for health, and $13.9 billion for veterans and income security programs. Simply put, President Nixon's requested national defense budget is about 10 percent below the defense spending level when he assumed office; his requests for human resource programs are up 27 percent.

Those are the facts—those who would distort the administration's record for their own political gratification would do well to spend just a moment examining the administration's record before continuing their specious tirade. This administration has made a sharp turnaround from the practices and priorities of the previous two Democrat administrations. False political claims to the contrary should be labeled as just that—false political claims.

In addition to achieving a significant realinement of priorities, the administration has been waging a determined effort to halt the inflationary spiral which has all but devastated the American pocketbook. During a decade of deficit spending under the two previous administrations, or public debt rose from $290.9 billion in 1960 to $374.7 billion in 1970. Interest on the public debt alone costs the American taxpayers $19.3 billion a year, or $53 million every day. Not only is this a horrendous burden in and of itself; it also exacts a heavy toll by forcing prices and interest rates for business and the consumer higher and higher and higher. Continued deficit spending and the inflation it causes hit hardest the working man, and those on fixed incomes.

We in Oregon are even more particularly aware of the disastrous impact inflation has had on the housing industry. So long as Government must borrow huge sums to finance its operations, money will be in short supply for the potential home buyer—another fact of life that the big spenders always seem to forget. Inflation will continue so long as we have deficit spending, and deficit spending will continue so long as Congress insists on spending more than it takes in in revenues. But spending is popular, taxing is not. So Congress takes the most expedient political route—spending without taxing. It is especially interesting to note that many of the Members of Congress who last year voted to reduce tax revenues are now voting for huge increases in Federal spending. Having voted to cut taxes, how can they now in good conscience vote to spend money that is not there? Every American taxpayer has learned that you cannot spend money that you do not have. But until Congress learns this same basic lesson, and begins to help the administration balance the Federal budget, we will see no end to this inflation. No, Congress is not doing the American taxpayer any favor by spending more than it earns in taxes. So long as this goes on, Congress is guaranteeing larger and larger deficits in the Federal budget, deficits which are then translated into inflationary price and interest increases for every American. During the short 30-month period between January 1968 and June 1970, the cost of living—as measured by the Consumer Price Index—rose 14 percent, the effective annual interest rate for conventional mortgages soared from 6.1 to 8.5 percent—an increase of 38.4 percent—and the purchasing power of a dollar in take home pay shrank to 86 cents.

These are the figures that the big spenders have apparently not examined, for I cannot believe they would wilfully choose inflation knowing the real price it exacts of each and every American.

An urgent choice is ours to make here today. We can vote against the administration's effort to bring inflation under control—to bring fiscal responsibility back into the Federal vocabulary. Or we can vote for further Federal deficits, further inflation, and a continuing price spiral. These are the issues and these are the choices. Inflation is the taxpayers number one enemy, so my vote will be on the side of a balanced budget. Mr. President, I, therefore, vote to sustain President Nixon's veto of the education appropriations bill in its current form.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I shall vote to override the President's veto of the education appropriations bill. I do so for a number of reasons.

First, I wholeheartedly agree with a pledge made by the President to the American people on October 1, 1968, and I quote:

> When we talk about cutting expenses of government, either Federal, State or local, the one area we can't shortchange is education.

Second, after the disruptive delays in the Federal funding of educational programs last year, to me there seems to be no alternative to overriding this veto. It is absolutely essential that the school districts have a firm idea of what their spending can be before the school year opens—and within the next 2 or 3 weeks, 52 million children will return to school across this land. Further delay will hurt thousands of school districts and colleges.

Third, there are many important line items in this appropriations bill. Funds for aid to impacted areas; funds for the handicapped or for the special programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act; funds for aid to colleges or higher education, including loans to students and grants for college work-study programs; funds for the Library Services and Construction Act, as well as funds for the education professions development; and funds for emergency school desegregation assistance. These are only a few of the vital programs funded by this bill.

Fourth, this vote today is, in my opinion, the establishment of priority spending. It is my conviction that the immediate, urgent educational needs of the American people and of the cities and towns throughout this country are deserving of the highest priority in the allocation of Federal funds and that these essential needs must be met as completely as we can reasonably do so within our legislative responsibility.

Fifth, when this bill passed both Houses of the Congress, there was not one single dissenting vote against it. It

passed the House by a vote of 357 to 0 and the Senate by a vote of 88 to 0. These votes show, in my opinion, that the Congress places the highest priority on spending funds for education.

Mr. President, I am in full agreement with the President wanting to exercise control over Federal expenditures and keeping budget deficits as close to zero as possible. I believe the President is correct in saying again that unless we control the level of deficit spending, or eliminate it altogether, we only prolong the day when the battle against higher prices and higher interest rates is won.

Unfortunately, the decision we face today is not limited to being for or against inflation or a balanced budget. We also must consider where we will place our priorities for Federal outlays in this and future fiscal years.

To my way of thinking, funds for education are not really an expenditure of our assets, but a sound investment in our country's future. It is with a clear conscience that I will vote to override this Presidential veto.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, today we in the Senate are presented with one of those opportunities of putting into practice what we have long been preaching. We have been voicing clearly and repeatedly our strong desire to redirect some of the priorities of this Nation. Today, we have been afforded the opportunity of proving that our rhetoric is not just that. Today, Mr. President, we can take firm and direct action toward this end by overriding the President's veto of the education bill (H.R. 16916).

The President stated that his veto of the education bill was painful—but that it was necessary to hold down inflation. The President has repeatedly stressed that while many programs are worthwhile and deserving of full funding when viewed separately—he must consider each program as part of the whole Federal budget. Let us then consider the education appropriation bill in the context of the entire Federal budget.

The amount at issue between the President and Congress—$453 million—amounts to about one-tenth of 1 percent of the total Federal budget for 1971, and about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the Gross National Product. Furthermore, for each $1,000 the administration now requests for spending from each American, $7.50 goes for elementary and secondary education, as opposed to $375 for military defense. The size of the entire education bill—$4.4 billion, is less than the cost overruns for some of our overgrown military projects.

Mr. President, I am for fighting inflation as much as anyone, but I must question the President's logic in continually asking the poor, the sick, and the schoolchildren to carry the burden of this fight, while at the same time supporting high cost overruns in our Defense Establishment, the SST, and a large space program.

Mr. President, concerning the vetoed education bill before us today, let us look closely at what we did to it. We provided for increases totaling $556 million, but we also provided for decreases of $103 million, making a net increase of $453 million—the figure the President used. Of the $556 million increase, $492 million was for direct grants to States and local governments. This, Mr. President, is most important to remember. The $492 million of the total $556 increase was for State and local grants—and not for money to be spent in Washington or wasted. This is not inflationary, but is a shift of the burden of taxation in this country.

The Federal Government is now paying only 8 percent of the cost of education. Just last week, 40 Governors attending a national meeting in Missouri unanimously adopted a resolution which set forth their conviction that a greater proportion of funding for education be borne by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I represent one of the least populated States in the Union, and yet I am no less concerned with the quality of education offered in our country's sprawling urban areas than in its rural areas. I firmly believe in accepting the challenge of John Adams who said:

> The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and we must be willing to bear the expense of it.

What affects one part of this country—affects us all, and we must all realize this.

About 72 percent of the Nation's population now reside in metropolitan areas. The local property owners of the city areas are bearing the heavy school tax burden of this influx of population into their communities. On account of the increasing cost of living and the added school tax load, the vast majority of our people in both urban and rural areas are demanding increased school aid from the Federal Government. The effect of increasing local property taxes has become so great as to result in the increasing regularity of local school bond issues being voted down.

Finally, Mr. President, it must be noted that a vote for increased spending for education is neither inflationary, but is wise and farsighted spending. Unlike many other appropriations, education spending offers a return on the investment. For every $1 spent on education, $14 is returned in the future through taxation. An investment in education is an investment in our country's future, and is repaid many times and in many ways. A better educated people produce more and pay more taxes.

To override this veto is not inflationary—it is good economics. To sustain the veto would not be a true saving. It would only be a postponement which would result in additional costs later.

Mr. President, President Nixon stated in the fall of 1968 that—

> When we talk about cutting the expense of government—either Federal, State, or local—the one area we can't shortchange is education. . . . When you cut expenditures for education, what you are doing is shortchanging the American future.

Mr. President, these words could not be more true. Education is the best investment in the future of America that one can make. It is only through education that the real problems of our society can be dealt with. Anything less, as the President has said—would be to "shortchange" the American future.

Mr. President, when this bill was finally approved by the Congress after careful consideration, it passed this body by a vote of 88 to 0. Today, we can do no less than to override this veto.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we have been told that increased expenditures for education are inflationary and that it is necessary to vote smaller sums for these worthy programs in order to "hold down the rising costs of living." The truth is that the administration is trying to make education and health programs pay the price of other ill-advised and inflationary policies.

The administration's budget reflected significant decreases in a number of education programs, as compared to 1970. The recommended figure for the Supplementary Centers Title was down $10 million from 1970. Funds for vocational education were $30 million below 1970. The recommendation for impacted areas was down by $95 million. Other vital educational programs like those under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act were recommended at the same level as 1970. This allowed no room for program expansion and improvement but, more significantly, it provided no funds to meet the rising costs which are experienced by education as well as by other Federal programs.

The same pattern emerged in higher education programs. The administration proposed a decrease of almost $20 million for NDEA loans. It proposed to drop all higher education facilities grants and, at the same time, to reduce funds for the facilities loan program.

What the administration recommended was, therefore, not a forward-looking budget. It was not even a "standstill" budget. In reality, it was a backward-looking budget.

In these circumstances, the Congress had no alternative but to act responsibly, and selectively, to increase funds for a number of education programs. The overall increase of $453 million in a bill exceeding $4 billion can hardly be regarded as excessive or irresponsible.

The Congress will surely reduce appropriations in other areas in order to permit the holding down of expenditures which the President has called for. What we need is the administration's help in attempting to cancel or defer unnecessary or low priority programs. I would like to see some of the burden of the fight against inflation borne by the ABM and other wasteful and unnecessary weapons systems. I would welcome a plea from the President to make reductions in the space program budget as a contribution to holding down prices. I do not want to place this burden upon the shoulders of our children. Investments in education are investments in the Nation's future.

The cost to my State of reducing the education appropriations to the level requested by the administration has been estimated at $10 million. The major portion of funds involved is for support of ongoing educational programs. Therefore, if these funds were not approved,

it would be necessary for the State and local governments to levy increased taxes in order to avoid program cutbacks. This will merely put more pressure on the seriously overburdened real estate tax base.

To finance the cost of the funds which would be lost to Minnesota under the President's recommendations, an average increase in taxes of 4 mills would be required. This would cost the owner of a house assessed at $10,000 $40 per year.

In my State, returning to the budget recommendations of the administration would cost public schools approximately $1.5 to $2.0 million under ESEA title I. Another $1.5 to $2.0 million would be lost under the impacted areas program. We would lose over $1 million under ESEA title III and NDEA title III. Another quarter of a million dollars would be lost if we were to return to the administration's proposals for the library services and construction program.

One of the most unwise reductions proposed by the administration is in the programs to support vocational education. We should be sharply increasing efforts in this important area, rather than cutting back. The conference committee's bill provided only a modest increase for this valuable program over the 1970 level. Cutting it back to the administration's figure would cost my State more than $1 million.

In higher education, the same situation applies. The University of Minnesota, alone, would lose about $2 million under the President's proposals. Students throughout the State are hard pressed for loan funds. The increased funds included in the bill for the NDEA loan program should permit many of them to continue their education.

The reaction from educators and public officials from my State has been overwhelming. I do not believe I have ever seen such strongly worded criticisms of a Presidential action by people in the education community. For example, the Minnesota Education Commissioner, Mr. Howard Casmey, wired the President in these words:

Deplore your irresponsible and politically motivated veto of educational appropriations bill. All people pay for public education and federal assistance is not inflationary. Give priority to human needs.

I believe the people know that this veto was politically inspired. The President was advised to approve the bill by many Congressmen from his own party. The bill was passed initially with the overwhelming support of Members from both sides of the aisle, in the House as well as in the Senate. The President is attempting to make it look as if a "spend-thrift" Democratic Congress is causing inflation. Members of Congress know that this is not the case. Just as we did last year, we are reshaping the Nation's priorities through the spending powers entrusted to us under the Constitution.

I do not believe in playing politics with education. I urge my colleagues to reject the President's veto and to join in the campaign for economies in other areas.

I ask unanimous consent that a number of telegrams from educators in my State be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 13, 1970.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your support requested for overriding veto of Education Appropriations Act. Education basic human need and noninflationary and must have high priority.

HOWARD B. CASMEY,
Commissioner of Education.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 17, 1970.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.:

Minnesota education association representating more than 40,000 thousand educators in public and private elementary secondary and higher education urges that you support efforts to override the veto by President Nixon of the HEW appropriation bill. Candidate Nixon in the fall of 1968 made the following statement to the teachers of America "seeing to 1' that young Americans are the best educated in the world, seeing to it that education is available to all our people, seeing to it that those who don't have an equal chance at the starting line are brought up to the starting line—this is the primary American objective. At budget cutting time. This is one area that must not be short changed. To do so would short change the future of our children and of our Nation."

"Investments in education are investments in our children. The kind of country they will live in, quality of life they will lead. Education is the one area in which we must not be miserly in which we must do everything necessary to help achieve the American dream."

Not only is the President's action unconsciousably but a serious threat to Minnesota programs that are already under way for the fall term. His action would cost Minnesota schools approximately 10 million dollars and would wipe out a substantial amount of the vocational school aid program, at a time when vocational education is badly needed.

The Congress must insist on establishing realistic national goals and redirecting national priority. To cut educational efforts under the guise of economy is indeed false economy and far more serious than might be realized.

A. L. GALLOP,
Executive Secretary Minnesota Education Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
August 14, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Contrary to Nixon's belief that the education increase "is not in the best interest of all the American people" we urge you to vote to override Nixon's veto of the education bill in order that we may become minimumly equipped to meet the challenges of the 70s.

FLORA ROGGE,
President Minnesota Federation of Teachers.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
August 12, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

350 superintendents of schools meeting in Saint Paul for their annual summer meeting urge passage of the educational bill over the Presidential veto. These funds are urgently needed.

LE ROY HOOD,
Legislative Chairman Minnesota Association of School Administrators.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 17, 1970.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your continued support of public education. Minnesota students need better education.

JOHN B. DAVID,
Superintendent of Schools, Minneapolis.

RICHARD F. ALLEN,
Chairman. Board of Education.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
August 17, 1970.

WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to override the President's veto of Education Appropriation Bill H.R. 16916.

Mrs. G. THEODORE MITAU,
Vice Chairman,
St. Paul Board of Education.

DULUTH, MINN.,
August 13, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge that you vote to override the President's veto on education.

LEROY MESEDAHL,
Supervisor Audiovisual, Duluth Schools.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
August 12, 1970.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

It is imperative that Congress votes to override the President's veto of funds for education. Please vote to override the veto.

GEORGE P. YOUNG,
Superintendent of Schools.
ST. PAUL, MINN.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
August 11 1970.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

$350,000 addition to our vocational school depends on override President's veto urge your support.

A. L. NELSON,
Superintendent.
WINONA, MINN.

HIBBING, MINN.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Presidential veto on education irresponsible priority of military over national educational needs urge continued dedication to children by overriding President's veto.

RON CARLSTROM,
Northern Organizer,
Minnesota Federated Teachers.

NEWBRIGHTON, MINN.,
August 12, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request that you vote to over ride the President's veto of education appropriations bill and expedite funding.

DON MURPHY,
Legislative Chairman Audiovisual Coordinators Association of Minnesota.

HIBBING, MINN.,
August 12, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Iron Range Council of Teachers strongly protest Nixon's veto of the education bill. We respectfully request that you use the prestige of your office and speak out publicly to tell the people of the folly of a veto that cuts aids to education while other less important budget items are being expanded.

GABRIEL BRISBOIS,
Iron Range Council of Teachers
Publicity Chairman.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 12, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to continue your strong support of education by voting to over ride the veto of the education bill. Thank you for your past efforts.

GEORGE BESKE,
Legislative Chairman,
BOB HILLEMAN,
Executive Secretary,
Hennepin Division, Minnesota Education Association.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the question before us is—shall we support the President of the United States in the veto of the appropriation bill for education? All citizens are interested in education, but this bill has unusual significance for those school districts that have been designated "impacted areas."

An example of an impacted area is a school district close to Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska. This happens to be the public schools of Bellevue. I understand that approximately 78 percent of the enrollment in the Bellevue schools is children coming from the homes of the military. This indeed has an impact—a very great impact—on that school district. Other schools in that immediate area are likewise seriously affected. This added cost of maintaining the school districts in such impacted areas should be borne by the Federal Treasury. The U.S. Air Force, as well as all branches of our military forces, exists for the benefit of all the people of the United States and all the people should share in the cost of maintaining our military.

The bill the President has vetoed calls for an appropriation of $4.4 billion. We should keep in mind that only about one-eighth of that amount is used for impacted areas. In my opinion, the impacted areas program should have first priority for all moneys appropriated because it is an education expense that should be borne by the Federal Treasury. I think it can be safely said that the controversial features of this appropriation bill center around those programs other than the funds for impacted areas and around the funds for impacted areas that in no sense involve the military.

I think it is well that we examine President Nixon's budget for education. President Nixon recommended a total appropriation for this bill of $3.9 billion. If we compare this with the last Johnson budget for education, we find that President Nixon has been much more liberal. The last Johnson budget was for $3.4 billion.

Last year's appropriation bill was likewise vetoed. That veto was sustained. Let us examine the figures. The Congress was 6 months late in getting that bill passed. It was not passed until January. On January 26 the bill was vetoed. This education appropriation bill that was vetoed at that time was for $4.2 billion. This veto was sustained by a vote of the House of Representatives on January 28. Within 22 days thereafter the House of Representatives passed a new bill. This was subsequently passed by the Senate and signed by the President on the 5th day of March 1970. It appropriated the sum of $3.8 billion. The taxpayers were saved $400 million by the veto power of the President.

It is interesting to see how the funds for impacted areas fared last year. The amount provided for impacted areas in the bill that President Nixon vetoed last year was $505 million. In the bill that Congress passed soon after the veto was sustained there was provided for schools in impacted areas $505 million. In other words, the veto of last year, which ended up in a savings to the Treasury of $400 million, did not reduce the amount of money provided for impacted areas. Practically the identical amount was carried in the second bill for this purpose as was carried in last year's bill that President Nixon vetoed.

Mr. President, no one disputes the fact that should the President's veto be sustained that the Congress would proceed immediately to pass another appropriation bill for a total amount acceptable to the President. No evidence has been submitted to indicate that in such a case the reductions for the new bill would be taken out of programs other than the program for impacted areas just as was done in last year's appropriation.

If my memory serves me correctly, the impacted areas program was brought into being because of the impact the military had on so many school districts. This program should be reformed to conform to that original intent. It has been expanded by Congress over the years to include many categories other than military. For instance, many Government workers in Washington, D.C., choose to live in nearby Maryland or Virginia. These people are permanent employees of the Government. They pay whatever income taxes, sales taxes, real estate taxes, and personal property taxes the other residents of those two States pay. They live over a wide area. They are well-paid, well-housed citizens and there is no equitable reason why the Federal Government should, from the impacted aid fund, make a payment to the school districts where these children attend. Yet that is the case to the tune of millions and millions of dollars. We desperately need a reform of the present law pertaining to aid for school districts in impacted areas. This problem will not be solved by overriding the President's veto. In fact, such action may contribute to further delay in meeting this issue squarely and paying in full the just cost of the education of the children whose fathers have been ordered into that particular school district by the Federal Government as part of the total defense of our country. The bill before us today calls for a total of $551 million for aid to impacted areas, but more than $250 million of that amount is for children whose parents are not connected with the military but fall in such categories as mentioned above in the Maryland and Virginia area near Washington, D.C.

The law for aid to impacted areas should be reformed, not only as to the categories that are to be included in what constitutes an impacted area but also attention should be given to the percentage of the children falling in such categories as compared with the total enrollment in the schools. It would seem to me that if the added burden on a school district by reason of a military installation does not increase the enrollment of that school by more than 8 or 9 or possibly 10 percent, that the school district involved should absorb that extra load without any special Federal aid because the existence of a military establishment does generate considerable business wherever it is located. If this problem is met, there would always be ample funds to take care of the full entitlement of those school districts that have been called upon to carry such a great extra load.

Finally, Mr. President, is there any broad, fundamental reason for supporting President Nixon's veto? The facts speak for themselves. I hold in my hand the last printed daily statement of the Treasury Department. The national debt, subject to limitation, stands at $378.9 billion. This statement shows that 1 year ago the amount was $360.3 billion. In other words, in 1 year the national debt has increased by $18.6 billion. This is because the Congress spends too much money. I would also like to call attention to the fact that this year the cost of paying the interest on the national debt will exceed $20 billion. This interest load must be carried before there is $1 available for any other purpose of Government no matter how meritorious. To go on increasing the national debt will not help the schools of the country. It will not help anything or anybody. It will mean, among other things, that the interest load which must be paid first will be greater next year and in all the years to come.

Mr. President, again I point out that there has been no evidence submitted that if President Nixon's veto is sustained that the schools in impacted areas will receive less than the amount carried in the vetoed bill. They did not last year. They ultimately got the same amount of money that was carried in last year's bill that President Nixon vetoed and which was sustained by the Congress.

The basic question before us is: Shall this bill in the overall be for the amount recommended by Mr. Nixon's budget of $3.9 billion, or shall that budget be exceeded by $500 million?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it would be terribly unfair and unrealistic to draw the conclusion that the President's veto of the Office of Education Appropriations bill and a vote to sustain the veto are at all indicative of any lack of concern over the needs of education. In fact, if one realizes that the President's budget request for Elementary and Secondary Ed-

ucation was $138 million more than the fiscal 1969 appropriation under the previous administration, it is evident that the President is acutely aware of the need for increased funds.

This awareness and concern must, however, be measured against the availability of money in the Federal Treasury.

Early this year I pointed out that those in control of the Congress had made a decision on the No. 1 priority. That decision was made when, after doing an outstanding job on tax reform and picking up billions of dollars in additional revenue, those in control of the Congress decided to use that extra tax money for what I have termed excessive tax relief. The result was that the money needed for various high priority programs simply is not in the Treasury. It is gone. All other programs—education, health, pollution control, and the like have to take lower priority.

And so, looking at the availability of the money the Congress has given the Treasury, the President has had to construct a budget which, in some areas, does not call for spending as much as he wished. This leaves two alternatives: First, to keep spending within the limits of the Treasury's funds; or, second, engage in more multi-billion-dollar deficit spending, with the inevitable consequence of continued inflation and high interest rates. The President chose the first alternative, and I am quite sure that one reason he was elected was because the people of our country were deeply hurt and alarmed over the inflation which they were suffering under because of the unwise fiscal policies of the previous administration and the Democrat-controlled Congress which put them into effect.

Now we have a President with sound fiscal policies, but we still have the same control of the Congress and the same proclivity to spend billions of dollars more than our taxes produce. It would not be so bad if those in control of the Congress would be willing to impose tax increases necessary to meet the increased spending they promote, but they are unwilling to do this and prefer, instead, to let the people of our country continue to suffer under inflation and high interest rates.

I have consistently complained about the deficit spending by those in control of the Congress, and I have consistently voted for amendments to reduce expenditures so that our Federal Government would live within its means. Indeed, I am one of the few Members of Congress who has publicly advocated a continuation of the 5-percent surcharge in order to cover some of the additional appropriations being voted.

In looking at the conference report on the education appropriations bill, which the President vetoed, there are four major items to be considered. Moreover, these should be considered against the fiscal 1970 appropriations, because if the veto is sustained, the Congress will continue the appropriations for education at the level established for fiscal 1970.

The first item is elementary and secondary education, with the conference report $232 million over the fiscal 1970 level. Iowa's share of this overage would be only $3.2 million. The second item is Federal aid for impacted areas, with the conference report $31 million over the fiscal 1970 level. Iowa's share of this overage would be only $100,000. The third item is vocational and adult education, with the conference report $75 million over the fiscal 1970 level. Iowa's share of this overage would be only $1 million. And the fourth item is higher education, with the conference report $117 million over the fiscal 1970 level. Iowa's share of this would be none, because we would go down $500,000 on construction money and up $500,000 on NDEA loans. Moreover, the administration's program of guaranteed student loans—as distinguished from direct NDEA loans—is calculated to greatly increase the number of students who will be able to participate in loan programs; and a pending bill to improve the secondary market for such guaranteed loans is going to encourage banks and other lending institutions which are presently having a liquidity problem.

From the standpoint of my own State of Iowa, then, the impact of the veto and a sustaining of the veto would be minimal—compared to what would happen under a continuation of funds at the fiscal 1970 level. However, if the veto were sustained, I am entirely confident that a compromise could be worked out between the administration and the Congress, just as was done last January with the bill that was vetoed then, so that some of the increases would take place.

Measured against the inflationary harm arising from spending hundreds of millions of dollars more than is available in the treasury—not only in this bill but in others as well, against the very small difference to my State between the fiscal 1970 appropriation level and that provided in the conference report, I am satisfied that a vote to sustain the veto is the prudent course to follow. I might add that no one should realize the seriousness of the impact of inflation and high interest rates more than those directly involved in education. The single greatest aid to education the Congress could render would be to put a stop to inflation and high interest rates. And this means keeping Federal expenditures in reasonable balance with Federal tax revenue.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Wyoming primary election is being held today, which explains the absence of the senior Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE). Senator McGEE has asked that I present his view on the pending question before the Senate, the President's veto of H.R. 16916. I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McGEE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there is a philosophical gap separating my view of this bill from that of the President, who said in his veto message that he flatly refused "to go along with the kind of big spending that is wrong for all the American people."

It is my unswerving opinion that funds spent for education cannot be called expenditures, really. They are in fact an investment in this country's future. And certainly they are not wrong for the American people. What is wrong, in my view, is any attempt to make education the scapegoat for inflation.

With the opening of a new school term just around the corner, it is imperative that the Senate join the House of Representatives and vote to get these funds on their way to the schools and colleges and libraries before the academic year begins, thus giving education the type of priority treatment it deserves in this country.

There really is no partisan issue involved here. We dare not make education a partisan issue, for it is so vitally essential to the future well-being of the country. That importance was recognized by the Senate before when it approved this bill and when it approved the Conference Report without dissent. We voted for increasing the Federal government's effort in education. We voted for greater allocations for impacted school districts, for education of the handicapped, for vocational education and supplementary services. We wanted to aid land-grant colleges and university community services, allocate more money for community college construction and for libraries and educational broadcasting facilities. I am sure we still want to do these things.

I am confident, Mr. President, the Senate will vote for the people once again and choose to override this veto.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto of the education appropriations bill.

The national priorities being established for the coming year by a majority of the Congress are not the priorities that I would wish to set myself. Yet the fact has to be accepted that we are now, or are about to be, committed to the expenditure of billions of dollars for various programs about which I have the severest reservations, such as continuing an agricultural subsidy program that is obsolete and purchasing an anti-ballistic-missile system that is premature.

This money has been spent—it is gone and we are not fiscal wizards who can spend it twice. No new sources of revenue open up before us.

The President is correct in pointing to the fiscal dangers that confront the Nation. The new economics impose restraints that are painful, but nevertheless mandatory. The plain fact is that we have eaten our cake, and cannot now have it too.

The educational community stands to lose as much if not more from increased or continued inflation as any other segment of our society. Today's high costs in elementary, secondary and higher education are directly related to inflation and the increasingly larger bite it takes each year from the needs of American students. I am deeply concerned about our educational system. I think it needs more financial help rather than less. But if inflation continues, perhaps rises this year, the additional 5 percent, 6 percent, or 10 percent it will cost will be deducted not only from Federal appropriations, but from local and State as well as National school funds and will be far greater than the amount in dispute in this bill.

The President has, in effect, asked us to take a second look. His request follows other significant congressional decisions, examples of which I have already mentioned. It is my opinion that

we should take that second look in the light of current conditions. It may well be that Congress will decide again that the amount provided in the bill is irreducible and will determine to risk the larceny of inflation. But the President has done his duty by flagging the Congress and the Nation of the danger. We should do our duty by reexamining it.

In addition to his specific warning with respect to this bill, President Nixon has accurately and helpfully highlighted the continuing fiscal problem of our generation: whether we can simultaneously have guns and butter. This question has been raised in the context of the war in Vietnam. President Nixon is himself directly addressing the problem by his participation in the SALT talks aimed at reducing our heavy expenditures for strategic arms. But the problem persists and must be confronted honestly and candidly each time it presents itself for a new determination. I do not like the answer I feel compelled to give today. In the past I have voted against farm subsidies and the ABM and other untimely expenditures and so could rationally justify another position. But no rationalizing will alter the facts or change the figures. Inflation is a real and present danger to America's schools, teachers, and students. I shall vote to avert that danger.

EDUCATION AT HOME DESERVES OUR COMPLETE SUPPORT AND OUR VOTE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the House has seen fit to override Mr. Nixon's veto of the education appropriations bill. I hope that we in the Senate have the same foresight.

It is only fair to concede that adjusting our priority needs at home and abroad is a delicate procedure when inflation must be fought at the same time. But the administration erred when it measured educational funding with the same yardstick used to gage the worth of other programs.

Because its impact is so broad and so deep, the worth of education is, indeed, immeasurable, and this fact alone should assign it maximum priority.

The greatest wealth of any nation is its citizenry. And the citizens of tomorrow are the schoolchildren of today.

Any investment made in the cause of their education—be it time, energy, or money—will return dividends far beyond the original cost. By the same token, any cutback in funding will reap negative consequences which will be felt more and more profoundly with every passing year.

No one appreciates this fact more than the educator—the teacher, the principal, the superintendent of schools, the school board and all the others working at the vital task of educating our children. Sometimes I fear we may forget the devotion and dedication of those who go quietly about their work day after day to give our young people the kind of knowledge and training that will fit them for a life of accomplishment.

Mr. President, the amount at issue between the President and Congress is $453 million. On the surface, this would appear to be a substantial amount. But, when we consider that this figure represents barely one-fifth of one percent of the total Federal budget for 1971—and only one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the gross national product—perspective is restored.

The expenditure of an additional $453 million for education—at a time when we are spending billions on many other programs—we spend 15 times this much for farm subsidies—quite obviously takes on a different appearance.

But this same amount will make a great deal of difference to our students and to the educators who are trying to upgrade the quality of schools and teaching, and, ultimately, the quality of national life itself.

If it is not overridden, the President's veto will be a blow to schools everywhere including those in my own State of New Hampshire, where the need for Federal support of education is great.

It means that New Hampshire will lose $3.8 million—or roughly $5 per taxpayer.

We will lose $2,740,000, for instance, in funds for elementary and secondary education.

Of this amount, $2,277,000 will be lost to our schools in impacted areas along the seacoast—Dover, Portsmouth, Newmarket and other communities.

We will lose $560,000 for our colleges and other institutions of higher education.

And we will lose $175,000 in funds for our vocational and adult education institutions—$98,000 in funds for education of the handicapped—and so on down the line.

New Hampshire can ill afford such a setback.

Then, too, Mr. President, there is another consideration—time.

If the veto is sustained, the whole process of drawing up, considering, and voting on new legislation will begin again, with no assurance as to when the new bill would be enacted.

This means that in just a few weeks 52 million children would return to a school situation fraught with uncertainty.

A delay in the allocation of Federal funds to thousands of school districts and to thousands of colleges will hurt—not just the schools and the teaching process—but most importantly, the students.

As many parents—and most teachers—recall, this was the case last year when the President vetoed the education bill.

To prevent any delays this year, the Congress resolved to complete action before the start of the school year, so that school administrators would at least be able to plan on the use of funds for the year. Both House and Senate were successful in finishing their work this July.

However, the veto has interrupted the action and if it is sustained, all of our efforts will have been in vain. A repetition of last year's unfortunate situation will occur. School districts will be forced to rearrange schedules, to cut back on important programs, and in some cases, to close schools altogether. And, most important of all, in order to maintain minimum educational standards, our taxpayers will be called upon to make up the difference between funds available and funds required in local taxes.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that we can prevent this situation. To do my part, I will vote to override the President's veto, and thereby reaffirm my conviction that education continues to be vital to our Nation.

CHILDREN HAVE RIGHTS, TOO

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, last week America was taken aback by the veto of two critical appropriations measures by the President. The first bill contained funds Congress voted for housing, medical care for veterans, urban renewal, and water and sewer facilities.

We have heard much wailing these days about the plight of America in terms of domestic disorder. Our total national environment drastically requires reordering, restructuring, and reform. The vetoed funds I have already mentioned were a minimum attempt to hold back a tide that threatens to inundate the Nation. That veto has been sustained. What, then, will it mean? Urban renewal, new Government-aided housing, and other essential programs will be indefinitely delayed unless something is done.

In my own State of New Mexico, every metropolitan area will suffer accordingly. Those most in need of assistance will be hit most directly. Slums will continue to creep across the land. Urban blight will spread. Acute suffering and alienation will be their offspring. What we sow today, we shall reap tomorrow. Most lay people usually pass over water and sewer funds with but a passing glance. It is just not a subject that sets the national eyeballs atwitch, but I wonder how many people know how much a decent water and sewer system can and does mean to all the people in New Mexico. Their citizens have worked and scraped for years to come up with local money to make water and sewer systems a dream come true. Now, in many places across New Mexico, those dreams will be deferred.

Filth and danger of disease will have to be endured for still longer by thousands of people whose only sin is to want adequate water and sanitation facilities. Yet even more inexcusable is the veto of funds for medical care for our veterans. We are engaged in an endless struggle in Asia. Its harvest is death, disease, and crippling injuries. I shall not dwell now on arguments pro and con of this war. If we are to deny essential medical care to veterans of this and our other wars, we act in the most immoral, callous manner imaginable.

In New Mexico there is one old, short-of-funds facility to serve needs of 134,000 veterans, whose numbers are growing constantly. To veto funds for their treatment is one of the shabbiest ways of saving money any government ever indulged in. I wish to place myself on record as wanting to have no part of such a denial. In fiscal year 1969, my State received $51,333,403 for VA use for our veterans. That figure speaks for itself.

Yet it is the second veto, of the education appropriation measure, that has the least to recommend it. Here is where the Senate must act to override. The right of every American youngster to a decent educational opportunity is not negotiable. It is an utterly astounding act to veto such an integral portion of America's

future. Already, we can see decay setting in on various levels of our national education structure. Student loan funds are failing to meet requirements across the Nation. As inflation grows and grows, parents are finding it impossible to cope with skyrocketing education expenses. Student loan funds, which have meant a difference to so many young people by filling the gap, have been cut and cut again. How many will have to drop out of school because of their lack of availability?

Private schools are steadily closing across the Nation. We have just had several instances of this in Albuquerque. Everyone bemoans this. Everyone wails, wrings his hands, and murmurs about how it is too bad that a school had to close—that it could not keep its doors open any longer. But vetoing an education appropriations measure adds to it—compounding difficulties. Where are the bemoaners? Where are the sorrowers? Our children need help. This is not a partisan issue. Education is too essential for mere partisanship. The Senate affirmed this by approving the bill and the conference report without dissent. We all voted to increase the assistance of Government to education. To help impacted school districts with more money. For educating the handicapped. For vocational education. For libraries and educational broadcasting. We must continue to do these things. A shudder went through America's educational system because of this veto. It threatens the very structure of aid to education we have worked so hard over so many years to establish. This work was done by both parties over several administrations. It has been done in the name of our future—our heritage—our children. The Soviet Union does not shortchange its young in terms of education. While we battle to override a veto of education funds, they are building science cities and new technical institutes. So are the Chinese. So are our allies and industrial competitors.

My State of New Mexico is not a rich State. Our economy is fragile. Our tax base is slim, depending greatly on Federal aid to education, which has made significant differences across New Mexico in recent years. Many a child and young student in my State has received better educational opportunity because of Federal aid to our educational system. It is this lifeblood of finance that today stands endangered by the recent veto of the education appropriation.

In 1970, New Mexico received $29,033,563 in Federal aid to education. The President asked for $18,933,951 for my State in fiscal year 1971 in his budget request. Under the now-vetoed education measures, New Mexico would have received $33,379,172 in fiscal year 1971.

Just last week, Mr. President, the administration asked this body to approve an expansion of the ABM system. Here is what may very well turn out to be a $50 billion boondoggle. Here is a weapons system every physicist of stature in the Nation, when asked, has questioned the reliability of. Here is perhaps the ultimate in wasted military expenditure. Yet we are called upon to pass it, throw away the desperately needed cash, and call ourselves a responsible body.

But the education money is expendable. Surely this is an astonishing reversal of priorities. Surely there is something wrong when our veterans care is set aside. When sewer and water systems cannot be built. When housing and urban renewal funds are slashed and vetoed. And now we are told to watch helplessly while aid to impacted schools, to vocational education, to teacher training, bilingual education, student loans, all goes down the national drain. I think not, Mr. President. I believe education is too important. One does not try to reform transport by putting the horse into the cart. I shall vote to override the veto of the education bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the question, Shall the bill pass, the objection of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Constitution requires that this vote shall be determined by yeas and nays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may we have order so that we can hear the rollcall?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMINICK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE). If they were present and voting, they would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 16, as follows:

[No. 259 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Aiken	Gore	Murphy
Allen	Harris	Muskie
Allott	Hart	Nelson
Anderson	Hartke	Pastore
Bayh	Hatfield	Pearson
Bible	Holland	Pell
Boggs	Hollings	Percy
Brooke	Hruska	Prouty
Burdick	Hughes	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Ribicoff
Cannon	Javits	Russell
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Schweiker
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cook	Kennedy	Smith, Ill.
Cooper	Long	Spong
Cotton	Magnuson	Stennis
Cranston	Mansfield	Stevens
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Eagleton	McClellan	Talmadge
Eastland	McGovern	Tydings
Ellender	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fong	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Goodell	Moss	

NAYS—16

Baker	Griffin	Smith, Maine
Bellmon	Hansen	Thurmond
Bennett	Mathias	Tower
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dole	Packwood	
Goldwater	Saxbe	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Dominick, against.

NOT VOTING—6

Fannin	Gurney	Mundt
Gravel	McGee	Sparkman

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill, on reconsideration, was passed.

Mr. PELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK read as follows: A bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Under the previous order, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, two or three Senators have asked that I yield to them for brief insertions. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so without the time they take being charged to my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4260—INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today I introduce the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970. The wide range of concern within the Senate for the important matters dealt with in this bill is expressed by the fact that 26 Senators have joined as cosponsors. They are Senators COOPER, ANDERSON, BAKER, BAYH, BOGGS, BURDICK, CANNON, DODD, DOLE, EAGLETON, EASTLAND, GRAVEL, GURNEY, HARTKE, HOLLINGS, INOUYE, JACKSON, MCGEE, MONTOYA, MOSS, PACKWOOD, PERCY, SPARKMAN, SPONG, STEVENS, and YARBOROUGH.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works has completed 15 days of general highway hearings, hearings conducted to build a body of knowledge and viewpoints on which to base this bill. The subcommittee will conduct additional hearings on August 25 and September 9, 10, and 11. On August 25 we will review the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act as it relates to highways, and on September 9 the Secretary of Transportation will discuss the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 with us.

At the outset of our hearings this year, I said that highways must be viewed not as entities unto themselves, but as a tool for achieving broader public objectives. It is essential that this concept be reasserted, and I have attempted to do so in this measure.

I fully anticipate and hope that the proposed legislation will be discussed in detail and that recommendations to perfect it will be made in the subcommittee, in the committee, and in the Senate. I expect, likewise, for some of the provisions of this bill to be controversial, but I do believe that each of them is fully justified in the light of today's transportation requirements.

I am, however, openminded on this proposal, as I consistently try to be on every bill that I introduce. While this bill is soundly based, I can conceive of its improvement as we bring the knowledge and experience of the Senate to bear.

I have said that I believe highway legislation we will consider this year to be of more than routine importance. There are several reasons for this. For the past 14 years the Interstate and Defense System has been the principal highway concern of the United States. The Interstate System was conceived and remains the greatest public works project ever undertaken by any nation.

The Interstate System is now more than 70 percent completed. Consequently, it is essential that we now begin looking toward and planning for highway programs of the future. During the past 14 years our preoccupation with the Interstate System has been so great and this network of freeways has been a drain on our roadbuilding resources to the extent that there now exists a substantial backlog of highway demands. The primary and secondary highway systems have been neglected while the Interstate System has evolved in directions that were not anticipated and could not have been foreseen in 1956.

At the same time, there have been many changes in public attitudes and in transportation requirements that must be given considerable weight in formulating national policy and writing highway legislation. Among these is the growing public demand, particularly in urban areas, for greater involvement by people in highway decisions that affect their lives and homes. Closely allied with this trend is the growing demand in many areas for improved and expanded public transportation facilities. Recent years have also seen increased concern with environmental quality, and certainly highways have a profound effect on the environment, an effect which must be taken into consideration in planning and designing roadways.

We recently witnessed the severe adverse effect automobiles can have on the environment in the smog conditions that prevailed over several major metropolitan areas, including Washington, D.C. The location and design of highways can help alleviate this situation, but the problem will never be completely solved until the automobiles themselves are so improved that they no longer emit dangerous substances into the atmosphere.

In the hearings by the Subcommittee on Roads, many aspects of highway construction and related activities were discussed. Appearing before us were Members of both Houses of Congress, Governors and mayors, administrators from Government agencies concerned with transportation, citizen groups, trade and professional organizations, and concerned individuals.

As you would imagine from such a diversified group, many viewpoints were expressed, and a number of recommendations were made for consideration of the Senate.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, which I present today, is a response to the broadened concept of highways as not only the principal means of surface transportation in the United States but as an increasingly important factor in determining the style and quality of our national life.

In some respects, it is the continuation and refinement of earlier highway legislation. It enlarges considerably on provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. But I also consider it significant in that it approaches new problems with new ideas. In that sense, there is much in this bill that is innovative, and there is much that will help determine national transportation policies and priorities for the rest of this century.

While the Congress is morally committed to the substantial completion of the Interstate System, it is imperative that we begin now to lay the groundwork for highway programs for the post-Interstate period. Many factors have contributed to the delay in completing the Interstate System beyond its original target. The cost of the system far exceeds the original projections of 1956. It is now anticipated that the Interstate System can be completed by 1977, and this bill includes provision for a firm cutoff date beyond which 90 percent Federal participation in interstate construction would not be available. I also anticipate that some highly controversial and expensive sections of interstate highways in urban areas will not be built, thus reducing the cost and time needed for completion.

Since highways affect virtually every aspect of our life, either directly or indirectly, it is logical that responsibility for their planning and execution should be broadly based so as to accurately reflect the needs and wishes of the people who will pay for and be served by these highways. This bill looks to filling this need by giving to Governors, mayors, and other local authorities a greater voice in highway decisions, since they are the direct and elected representatives of the people.

The effect of highways on the environmental, social, and economic life of our communities is widely recognized. This bill contains provisions seeking to assure that there are no adverse impacts on these factors as a result of highway construction. It plainly states what must be considered in the planning and construction of highways and provides the mechanism and money for meeting these requirements. To further assure that highways conform to the broader social objectives I have proposed a planning procedure under which highways and other public works facilities must be justified on the basis of and necessity in advancing community goals.

Recognizing, as we all do, that highways are not the exclusive domain of cars, I have included a section allowing highway funds to be used in support of public transportation systems.

Highways can be made to perform their functions more efficiently if there are sound, well-operated bus systems using them. It is only logical that if a bus can carry the same number of people as 15 or 20 cars, then highways are more fully utilized and congestion reduced through a public transportation system. This would likewise reduce the demand for additional highway construction with the associated problems and high cost, particularly in urban areas where these funds would be spent. The reduction of traffic loads on highways and the resulting speedier movement of vehicles would contribute to the lowering of air pollution levels.

I can conceive of a high ratio of benefits to the motorist from the relatively modest amounts that would be spent under this section to assist public transportation.

The problems facing public transportation in the United States were raised repeatedly during the subcommittee's hearings. This section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 places them before Members of the Senate for further exploration and discussion.

The long neglected needs of our cities are provided for by the establishment and financing of an urban roadway system. The urgency for replacing the many old and deteriorated highway bridges virtually required the inclusion of a sec-

tion establishing a nationwide bridge replacement program.

One of the major problems of highway construction in urban areas is that of housing for people who are displaced. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 made great strides toward solving this problem by requiring replacement housing to be available before a roadbuilding project could be started. The proposal I present today expands the ability of highway authorities to provide the required replacement housing in instances where it is certified to be not otherwise available—a situation said to occur very infrequently.

This would not place highway departments in the housing business but would, I believe, expedite the construction of roadways that are delayed because of the nonavailability of replacement housing. In operation, this provision would doubtless be invoked infrequently to allow highway departments to build, rehabilitate or otherwise make housing available to persons displaced by road construction who would then purchase it from the departments.

I see this section as a last-resort tool to facilitate the start of work on highway segments so important that they cannot wait for housing shortages to be corrected through normal channels.

This bill provides that for the first time the highway safety and beautification programs be financed from the highway trust fund. Both of these programs, closely related to safe, efficient highway operations, have been seriously underfinanced in the past, so much so that their full implementation has never been possible. By utilizing the resources of the trust fund, both of these programs will have a reasonable assurance of continued financing that can produce results.

These are some of the major provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970. The complete measure is discussed in detail in a section-by-section explanation which I offer for inclusion in the RECORD.

American reliance on the motor vehicle for most transportation has become well established. There are now more than 100 million automobiles in the United States, and the growth in their numbers is much more rapid than had been anticipated.

"The love affair with the automobile," as quoted quite often, has brought with it many of the advantages of a personal, convenient mode of transportation. But this expansion of automobile use also has created severe problems associated with moving, servicing and storing them.

The bill I introduce today addresses itself to many of these problems and their solutions.

I conclude this discussion of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 by focusing attention on the highway trust fund. The trust fund was established in 1956 at the same time construction of the Interstate System was accelerated. There is a prevailing misconception that the fund was established solely to facilitate construction of the Interstate System. While the heavy demands of the Interstate System do take the largest proportion of the funds, the primary and secondary roads programs also are financed from the trust fund and actually have priority over the Interstate System.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Roads, in speeches and other public statements by a considerable number of concerned individuals, in newspaper editorials, and elsewhere there have been many proposals in recent months for modifying the highway trust fund. At the same time, there has been a spirited defense of the fund and arguments for retaining it substantially in its present form to meet future highway needs. The most frequently advocated change is for the establishment of a single, unified trust fund to finance programs in all areas of transportation, including highways, airports and airways, railroads and mass transit. Many of the proposals are supported by strong and persuasive arguments.

From testimony heard by the Subcommittee on Roads, which I have the responsibility to chair, and from what I have heard and read recently, I believe that this year we are witnessing the first skirmish in what will become a major battle for the transportation dollar in the years immediately ahead.

I also detect a growing and unfortunate polarization between holders of differing viewpoints that could complicate the process of arriving at an equitable solution. There are those who accuse the so-called highway lobby of wanting to pave the country over with concrete. The other side maintains that their opponents are aiming for a complete halt in all highway construction.

I have listened carefully and I have read carefully, and I am convinced that neither of these assessments is correct. Those individuals and organizations involved in roadbuilding recognize the need for support of other forms of transportation, and even the most ardent supporter of mass transit sees the necessity to continue improving highway facilities.

I believe that there are essential truths on both sides, and I hope that all groups concerned with transportation can maintain the rational dialog that is necessary to meet the challenges we face. We recognize the need for a balanced national transportation system, and we can achieve it, but not without a lot of hard work on the part of all concerned.

Some modes of transportation certainly have been neglected. This can be partially attributed to the lack of coherent rational transportation policy as well as to a shortage of financing. The Congress is, I believe, aware of these problems and is concerned with solving them. The recently enacted airport and airways trust fund was a step in that direction. I hope we will likewise move quickly in other areas, particularly those concerning our national railroad system, which appears to be facing great difficulties, and the urban mass transit systems which are needed by many of our cities if they are to avoid traffic strangulation.

The highway trust fund is undoubtedly an attractive and appealing potential source of revenue to meet these needs.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, in fact, expands considerably the area of highway related activities which are financed by the trust fund.

I cannot, of course, predict what will happen in the future, but it is imperative that no substantial changes be made in highway trust fund revenues until the Interstate System is finished.

Through the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 we can make important progress toward creating and implementing a comprehensive national transportation policy in which highways and the other vital segments of our transportation system are utilized to the fullest to achieve the goals of American society.

Mr. President, I urge Members of the Senate to study this bill carefully, and I invite every Member to share with the Subcommittee on Roads and the Committee on Public Works their viewpoints and their knowledge so that we may produce an act that truly reflects the needs and aspirations of the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4260) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code and to provide for statewide public works planning, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanation, presented by Mr. RANDOLPH, is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1970

Section 101. Short Title. This Act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970.

Section 102. Revision of Authorization of Appropriations for the Interstate Program.

This section would provide authorizations for the Interstate Program through fiscal 1977. The fiscal year 1974 authorization presently set at $2.225 billion would be increased to $4 billion and the authorizations for fiscal years 1975 and 1976 would also be $4 billion with $2.125 billion authorized for fiscal year 1977.

Present authorizations as contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 extended to fiscal year 1974 and were based on a $56.8 billion estimate of the cost of completion of the Interstate System. The Interstate authorizations contained in the 1968 Act for the Federal share of the Interstate System totaled $50.35 billion.

The amounts which would be authorized by this section of the 1970 Act are based on the 1970 estimate of $69.870 billion to complete the Interstate System. It requires a $12 billion increase in the Federal share and therefore the new authorization years of 1975, 1976 and 1977 are added.

As of March 31, 1970, 29,906 miles of Interstate highway were open to travel. Construction on the entire system as of the same date has involved the expenditure of approximately $40 billion.

Section 103. Authorization of Use of Cost Estimate for Apportionment of Interstate Funds.

This section would authorize the use of the apportionment factors for the Inter-

state System contained in Table 5 of House Document 91–317 in making the apportionments through fiscal year 1974. It will be necessary to revise the table if Section 105 is adopted by the Congress to meet problems which would be encountered in North Dakota, Nebraska and other States.

Section 104. Extension of Time for Completion of System.

The time for the completion of the Interstate System would be extended to June 30, 1977. This section would direct the Secretary to submit to the Congress a revised Interstate System cost estimate in January 1976.

Section 105. Minimum One-Half Percent Appropriation Factor for Interstate System.

This section would amend Section 104(b)(5) of Title 23, United States Code to insure that no State shall receive less than one-half of one per centum of the apportionment for the Interstate System in any year. This provision is necessary because of the problem encountered in North Dakota and Nebraska and a few other States whose cost of completion of the Interstate System has become so small in relationship to the total cost of completion of the Interstate System as to make it difficult for them to maintain a meaningful level of construction activity on the Interstate System. This situation is the result in part of the designation of the additional 1500 miles of Interstate System provided by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 and the fact that the States involved have done an excellent job in bringing their portion of the Interstate System to early completion. This amendment would be an interim solution to the problem of the change over from the present Interstate program to any major post-Interstate program. The completion of the functional classification study required by the 1968 act and the results of the implementation of proposed Section 108 of this act will provide sufficient additional information by 1972 to enable the Congress to arrive at a permanent solution to the problem of the change over.

Section 106. Authorizations.

This section would provide authorizations for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, their urban extensions, the Federal domain road program, including forest and public lands highways, and for the highway safety and beautification programs.

Subparagraph (1) would authorize $1.050 billion for the primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions in areas of less than 50,000 population. The funds would be divided 55 per centum for the primary system; 35 per centum for the secondary system and 10 per centum for their urban extensions.

Subparagraph (2) of Section 106 would authorize funds for the Federal-aid urban system which would be created by Section 107 of the bill. The authorization for this road program would be $450 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

The authorizations in paragraphs (1) and (2) are the first major departure in the authorization schedule for the Federal-aid road program since the creation of the secondary system and urban extension program in the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944 and the acceleration of construction of the Interstate System in 1956.

The $1.5 billion which would be represented by the authorizations contained in paragraphs (1) and (2) is an increase of $75 million over and above authorizations for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions contained in the 1968 Act. In that Act, $1.1 billion was authorized for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for the regular ABC program; $125 million for a special AB program for rural roads; and $200 million for the so-called TOPICS program, the Traffic Operations Improvement Programs in Urban Areas for each of those years.

The $1.050 billion, which Section 106 would authorize for the ABC program was arrived at by factoring the existing $1.1 billion authorization in accordance with the statutory division of 45 per centum primary; 30 per centum secondary; and 25 per centum urban and by factoring the $125 million AB program by factoring its statutory division of 60 per centum primary and 40 per centum secondary which resulted in the following amounts:

For the primary system:

	Million
45% x $1.1 billion equals	$495
60% x $125 million equals	75
Total	570

For the secondary system:

	Million
30% x $1.1 billion equals	$330
40% x $125 million equals	50
Total	380

The urban extension portion of the ABC system under existing authority amounted to $275 million. This was divided in the proportions in which urban populations are located in areas of more than 50,000 and less than 50,000. According to information from the Census Bureau, this is a 60–40 ratio. This results in an allocation for urban extensions in areas of less than 50,000 of $110 million. While these amounts when added together come to $1.060 billion, the figure was cut back to $1.050 billion. The amount in paragraph (2) of Section 106 was arrived at by taking the $200 million authorization in the existing TOPICS program which would be discontinued, adding to it $165 million, that portion of the existing "C" system, which was attributable to urban areas over 50,000, and adding $85 million.

This rearrangement excluding the additional $85 million roughly approximates how funds are being spent under existing authorizations.

All of these amounts will be appropriated from the Trust Fund and under existing law are drawn from the fund before any other highway funds are available for apportionment to the States.

Paragraph 3 of Section 106 would also authorize $33 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for forest highways and $16 million for each of these years for public lands highways. For the first time, these funds would come from the Highway Trust Fund. In addition, this section would authorize funds for the other Federal Domain Road programs from the General Fund in the following amounts.

[In millions]

Forest Development Roads & Trails:	
1972	$170
1973	170
Public Lands Development Roads and Trails:	
1972	3
1973	5
Park Roads and Trails:	
1972	----
1973	30
Parkways:	
1972	11
1973	11
Indian Reservation Roads and Bridges:	
1972	----
1973	30

Authorizations for the Highway Safety and Beautification Programs which for the first time would also be from the Highway Trust Fund are as follows:

[In millions]

Highway Safety Programs (Section 402):	
1971	0
1972	$100
1973	100
Highway Safety Research and Development (sec. 403):	
1971	0
1972	70
1973	115
Control of outdoor advertising (sec. 131):	
1971	20
1972	20
1973	20
Control of junkyards (sec. 136):	
1971	3
1972	3
1973	3
Landscaping and Scenic enhancement (sec. 319(b)):	
1971	20
1972	20
1973	20
Administration of Sections 131, 136 and 319(b):	
1971	1.250
1972	1.250
1973	1.250

Section 107. Federal-Aid Urban System.

This section would establish a new Federal-aid highway system, the Federal-aid urban system, in each urban area of 50,000 population or more. The urban system would be designed to facilitate the flow of traffic in urban areas and serve the goals and objectives of the community as determined by the responsible local officials. It would implement the urban transportation planning process required under section 134 of title 23. In addition, the urban system would include extensions of primary and secondary roads in these areas. Routes on the Federal-aid urban system would be selected by the appropriate local officials subject to the approval of the State and of the Secretary.

The funds authorized to be appropriated for the Federal-aid urban system would be apportioned to the States in the ratio which their population in urban areas of 50,000 or more bears to the nation's population in such areas. In addition to highway construction, these funds would be available to carry out the kinds of activities for which the discontinued TOPICS program was designed, for construction and development of fringe parking facilities, and for support of existing public transportation systems which new section 143 of Title 23 would authorize. The Federal share payable for projects on this system would be the same as for the ABC System—50 per centum.

Section 108. Elimination of Segments of the Interstate System Not to be Constructed.

This provision would insure the early completion of the presently designated Interstate System by requiring the States to submit to the Secretary by July 1, 1972 a firm schedule for the completion of segments on the Interstate System and to have brought these segments to the construction stage by July 1, 1975. Any segment not included in the schedule by 1972 or ready for construction by 1975 will remain as part of the Interstate System but would not be eligible for funding at the 90–10 ratio.

It is hoped that this provision would result in a careful reconsideration of a number of highly controversial and very expensive segments of the Interstate System which may not be essential to a fully connected system of Interstate and Defense Highways. At the present time, there are approximately 13 segments of the Interstate System representing some $4 billion based on present cost estimates which may have to be re-examined. Under the law, responsibility for inclusion of these projects on the Interstate System rests with the States and communities involved, and this language in no way is designed to require their elimination.

Section 109. Economic, Social, Environmental and Other Impact.

This section amends various provisions of Title 23 to insure proper consideration of economic, social, environmental and other impacts of highway construction.

The definition of "construction" and "highway" contained in Section 101 (a), Title 23, United States Code, would be expanded to require fuller consideration of these matters in the various stages of highway design and construction.

The Secretary is directed to issue guidelines for avoiding, minimizing and overcoming adverse economic, social, environmental and other impacts of Federal-aid highway projects.

After July 1, 1974, all plans and specifications for any future project would be required to include adequate measures to solve the impact problems identified in an analysis of the project. Among the problems which would be accounted for are:

(1) air, noise, and water pollution;

(2) destruction, or disruption of man-made and natural resources, aesthetic values, community cohesion, and the availability of public facilities and services;

(3) adverse employment effects, and tax and property value losses;

(4) injurious displacement of people, businesses, and farms; and

(5) disruption of desirable community and regional growth.

Subsection (b) would require soil erosion control plans for each highway project. Subsection (c) would require the Secretary to issue noise level standards for highways and to require that the appropriate standards would be applied to proposed highway projects.

Subsection (d) would authorize research programs designed to develop understanding of how to deal with adverse economic, social and environmental effects.

Section 110. Airport Access. This section would require the Secretary to give priority to projects which will provide adequate, direct and convenient access to public airports.

Section 111. Cost Reduction. The Secretary would be authorized to secure a value engineering or other cost reduction analysis of the plans, specifications and estimates for proposed Federal-aid highway projects when he determined such action advisable.

Section 112. Public Hearings. This section would strengthen the public hearing process. The two-hearing procedure, established by regulation after enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, would be enacted into law. An additional hearing would be required on urban plans required under Section 134 of title 23 to afford citizens the opportunity to present their views as to the transportation systems which would best serve their needs. Responsibility for conducting the hearings would be placed with State and local officials designated by the Governor or the duly constituted State authority. The certification and transcript of the hearing now required by law would have to be accompanied by a report indicating the consideration given to the economic, social, environmental and other impacts of the plan, highway location and design and various alternatives raised at the hearings or otherwise considered by the highway department.

Amendments to the public hearings section would not change the basic legislative character of the hearing process. The purpose is to increase the ability of citizens to make their views known and to insure that the issues raised in a public hearing are given the consideration they deserve.

Section 113. Control of Outdoor Advertising. This section would authorize the use of up to $15 million of the funds authorized under paragraph (12) of section 106 for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, for demonstration projects to determine the best means of accomplishing the control of outdoor advertising.

This provision is similar to the language of S. 1442, passed by the Senate during the First Session of the 91st Congress.

Section 114. Urban Planning. This section would amend Section 134, Title 23, United States Code to require consultation with local officials prior to the construction of highways in urban areas of 50,000 population or more.

Section 115. Fringe and Corridor Parking Facilities. This section would enact as a continuing program the demonstration fringe parking program provided by the 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act. Funds for fringe and corridor parking facilities authorized under this section would be available from authorizations for the Federal-aid urban system.

Section 116. Equal Employment Opportunity. This section would authorize the Secretary to develop, conduct and administer highway construction-related training and skills improvement programs for the training of construction workers.

Section 117. Additional Authorizations in Chapter I. Three new sections are added to the end of Chapter I of Title 23, United States Code.

Section 142. Relocation Housing. This section would authorize the Secretary to approve as part of the cost of construction, the cost of acquiring, constructing, rehabilitating, or relocating housing as replacement housing for individuals and families who will be displaced by a project if such project on any Federal-aid system cannot proceed to actual construction because replacement housing required by law cannot otherwise be made available. This is a last resort authority to be used only when replacement housing is not available and the urban project involved is of such importance as to require its immediate construction. Based on information developed in connection with the planning and design of segments of the Interstate System in major urban areas, indications are that the cost of the relocation housing program would not exceed 3 per centum of the total construction cost for the Federal-aid highway program. This means approximately $130 million a year.

Section 143. Public Transportation. This section would authorize the Secretary to approve the use of portions of Federal-aid Urban System funds, by State or local public agency, for the operation of public transportation facilities when he determines that the use of these funds would reduce the need for additional highway construction and would improve the use of highway facilities of an urban area of 50,000 population or more.

This language is primarily directed to the maintenance and expansion of bus service—the major form of public transportation in the Nation—and is designed to focus the issue of the purposes for which highway funds may be legitimately used.

Section 144. Special Bridge Program. This section would establish a replacement program for bridges on any Federal-aid system which are no longer capable of safely handling traffic. A National priority inventory would determine which bridges should be replaced first. The priority would be based on safety and the economic importance of the structure to the area served. The Federal share payable for these projects would be up to 75 per centum, and $150 million would be authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972 and 1973 for this program.

Section 118. The Highway Safety Act of 1966 would be amended to provide that apportionment of safety funds to the States would be based on 75 per centum on the population and 25 per centum on the public road mileage in each State, but that no State would receive less than one-fourth of one per centum of the total apportionment.

Section 119. This section would provide for the establishment of a highway program for the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. The Federal contribution to the cost of approved projects on this system would be 70 per centum, and $2 million for each territory is authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972 and 1973 for this purpose.

Section 120. This section would provide $100 million for the construction of the Darien Gap Highway, which would connect the Inter-American Highway with the Pan American Highway System of South America. Obligation and expenditure of funds would be on the same basis as the funding authorized for the Inter-American Highway.

Section 121. Relocation assistance payments for replacement housing would be expanded to include compensation for any increased rates of interest required for the financing of a replacement dwelling.

Section 122. This section would extend the time required for compliance by the States with certain provisions of Chapter 5 of Title 23, United States Code (Highway Relocation Assistance) until January 1, 1971, for those States which could not submit the required constitutional amendment for ratification prior to July 1, 1970.

Section 123. This section would authorize the President to enter into negotiations with Canada to reach an agreement authorizing paving and reconstructing a portion of the Alaska Highway.

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS AND FACILITIES ACT OF 1970

Section 201. Short Title. This title would create the Public Works and Public Facilities Act of 1970.

Section 202. This section would request the President to assist States in the development of a continuous, comprehensive, coordinated planning process to facilitate the enunciation by State authorities of the overall goals, objectives and priorities of the State with regard to a wide range of public policy determinations relating to conservation, energy production, education, water quality and water supply, air quality, resource utilization and preservation, community and residential development and the like. Enunciation of State objectives, goals and priorities with respect to these important subjects, together with the short and long range forecasts of State and community growth, would enable the State to better gauge its urban, suburban and rural development and to develop the public facilities and transportation services it believes necessary to meet the needs of its citizens.

Section 203. This section would require the President by July 1, 1972 to issue guidelines and procedures for the development of such plans.

Section 204. This section would require that statewide plans be coordinated with existing urban and economic development plans and such other Federal planning as may be required or authorized now or in the future.

Section 205. This section would make available to the States funds for carrying out the planning process in accordance with the provisions of Section 301 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and under the language of the section, no State could receive more than 10 per centum or less than one per centum of the aggregate planning funds.

Section 206. This section would provide that after July 1, 1974, every Federal agency which has jurisdiction over any public works program shall insure that the projects developed under those grant-in-aid programs are designed to implement the plan. With respect to direct Federal activities, Federal agencies would be required to conduct their activities in conformance with State plans unless the President determines that the paramount interests of the United States are to the contrary. Twenty-five million dollars for each of the fiscal years 1971 and 1972

would be authorized for this planning program.

This title is designed to increase the State's capability to rationalize the many Federal public works programs so that overall State goals and objectives will be met. While the Act would require that the planning be done in accordance with guidelines and procedures designed by the President, there is no Federal approval required once the plans are established. It would be assumed, however, that the President would direct Federal agencies to participate with the States in the development of the plans.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on July 1, I introduced the administration highway bill, S. 4055, which I consider a very constructive bill. I have agreed to join as a cosponsor of the proposal of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works. Senator RANDOLPH is joining as a sponsor of the administration bill. In this way, both proposals will be before our committee for consideration as we work out our recommendation to the Senate.

Since that time, several members of the Committee on Public Works have expressed an interest in joining as sponsors of the administration bill, and a number are sponsoring both bills. This shows the broad interest of the members of the committee in developing an improved highway system.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to add to what the Senator from Kentucky has said. He is not only an able Senator in his own right, but also, I know that chairmen of committees, as I am, could never have a stronger arm for the purposes of such legislation than Senator COOPER.

I have joined Senator COOPER in his proposal, the so-called administration measure, and he has joined with other Senators in support of the general purposes of my proposal.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

I have had an opportunity to study the bill that has been offered by the distinguished chairman. It has new initiatives in it. It has several new important programs, and I think that as it will finally come out of our committee, it will be a very great bill.

We all have learned to serve with our chairman in a nonpartisan way, and we all have profited by his leadership in the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of the administration highway bill, S. 4055: The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFESSIONS OF A CONSERVATIVE SOCIOLOGIST

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a conservative in the field of social science is a rarity, particularly one in sociology. Edwin Harwood, an assistant professor of sociology at Rice University, happens to be one of those rarities. As such, he presents an interesting view on today's students in his article, "Confessions of a Conservative Sociologist."

According to Professor Harwood, giving up the leisured and rich campus life for a 9-to-5 job is anathema to many students. As they do not want to face the harsh routines of adult life, how can they expect others in society to accept them. Therefore, because they are guilty, they cannot stand up to the militants and since the good campus life cannot continue indefinitely, they are angry.

I believe this article, which was published in the August 12 issue of the Wall Street Journal, will be of interest to all my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONFESSIONS OF A CONSERVATIVE SOCIOLOGIST

(By Edwin Harwood)

Everyone knows sociologists are biased. While I was taking in the poolside sun at a Houston motel recently, the man lounging next to me asked how I liked the book I had just picked up and was about to start reading—Ladislas Farago's "Patton: Ordeal and Triumph." I said I liked it because Patton the man intrigued me. The conversation warmed up. He had come down from Chicago to root for the Cubs against our Astros. Asked what brought me to Houston, I told him I lived here and taught sociology at Rice. He gave me a puzzled look, his eyes roving back to the book. What, he wanted to know, did I think about the campus disturbances.

That was all the opening I needed. I launched into my hard-lining talk about permissive campus authorities, the illogic of blaming Columbia University's 1968 spring disorders on Agnew's rhetoric, and how the fatuous "we want to be liked by the kids" attitude of college faculties only insured that they would be scorned by the kids. Summing it up, I said the universities were becoming the cancer of our society far more than its conscience—if we disregarded the causes students and faculty claimed they stood for and looked instead at the way they were behaving.

My poolside friend liked it, every word. Now *that*, he confessed, was not what he expected any sociologist to say!

I have gone through this before with acquaintances from outside academia, but always with some mixed feelings about the effect of my words. Should I try to correct an image of my profession many people have that is sadly accurate for large numbers of us? The fact is we are biased and we have contributed to the mischief, and I would not want to think that any patch job I did would lessen the chance that some Middle American might write his Congressman in anger at what we are teaching his children.

THE TAXPAYER'S OBLIGATIONS

The Bill of Rights as both he and I interpret it says only that those committed to revolution have the rights of assembly and free speech. It does not say the taxpayer is obliged to underwrite them by paying their salaries while they throw a wrench into the machinery of our government. Middle Americans are hard to get worked up in the first place. Because they are tempted to let things slide and mind their own business, there is the danger that if they meet just one no nonsense conservative in sociology, they will feel at ease. No, I can only hope that they get to know some of the rest of us.

My only motive for wearing conservative convictions on my sleeve is to spare myself embarassment in encounters with these civil people who are trying to do a job and raise their children, and are at loggerheads wondering how to repair at home the damaged ethics and etiquette their kids bring back from college.

We always assumed that free public higher education would raise the sons and daughters of the less privileged into better jobs. Did we ever consider, as the economist Joseph Schumpeter pointed out over 30 years ago, that the expansion of mass higher education could lead easily to a deterioration in teaching, with the result that students would be psychologically prepared for elite occupations in the Establishment without getting the necessary training to enter those occupations? Colleges were not, Schumpeter emphasized, just a matter of money, if nature set limits to the number of good scholars and teachers she chose to furnish for the task.

Consequently, today there is a good chance that the young man who once would have been content to follow his dad into the plant or apprentice himself in his uncle's craft, will now—thanks to the deterioration of college education accompanying its rapid spread—become psychologically unemployable.

He finds he cannot become a doctor, a lawyer, a corporation executive or a professor, but he will not take some lowly salaried white-collar job that would subject him to the indignities of taking other people's orders and following a bureaucracy's routines. After having touched the great traditions of Western thought, that would be a "cop out." But neither can he go back to his dad's plant and work as an operative, a plumber or a maintenance man. He is in limbo.

College, with its well-tended lawns and gardens, plushly furnished student gathering rooms and library alcoves, sauna, squash and tennis facilities, theater and concerts has introduced him to an affluent life-style—I would say, to the upper middle class lifestyle. (Can you think of any country club more richly equipped than the ordinary state college campus?) To graduate from that will mean for many students to graduate down to something infinitely less desirable. It means, as one Rice senior explained his contempt for a nine-to-five job to me, giving up the leisured and rich campus life for the discipline that most lower middle class and working class Americans are subject to, of being an ordertaker and an early-riser.

It is not the strange paradox many think that the University of California at Santa Barbara—one of the loveliest, best situated and lavishly equipped schools in the California system—should have become the scene of some of the worst rioting, that included the precincts of the business community serving it. Nor is it odd that well-dressed, suntanned kids could be found moving between dorms and classroom buildings covered with Eldridge Cleaver's enraged visage. That campus has the affluent American life-style and more, a West Coast Waikiki with the difference that while some study is expected of the guests there are no hotel bills to be paid.

Yet students can see that others work in the adjoining business district, and that these others have to get up much earlier in the morning than they to serve their needs: To take their orders for books, clothing, food and whatever else the student needs.

Guilt at the "oppression" of a business routine afflicting others, that the student is being adjusted to reject, weakens his self-confidence. If he doesn't want to face the harsh routine of adult life, how can he expect the blacks to accept theirs, or any group in society that must toil from 8 to 5 in return for a two or three week vacation at the end of the year? Because he is guilty, he connot stand up to black militants. And he is

also angry because he knows that the good life on campus will not go on forever.

Students see that their professors can take off at any time of the day to run errands, and that instead of the one-and-a-half or two-day weekend, they can arrange a teaching schedule that will give them three or even four days. If an old friend comes to town and wants a tour or a conference beckons, classes can be cancelled or re-scheduled. Naturally many students would like to have the very same freedoms for themselves. Academic salaries being what they are today, the economic privations that used to insure that only dedicated scholars would want these freedoms are no longer available to stem the flood of seekers after academic positions. It is this factor, not the draft as is so often claimed, that explains why so many undergraduates want to continue in graduate school.

THE NEW LEISURED CLASS

Radicals, who once told us that the leisured classes of society were parasitical for taking goods while refusing to work, are now defending the abuses of the new leisured class, of students and ex-students and anyone else in rebelling against society. In "The Making of a Counter Culture," Theodore Roszak defends the college dropout's rejection of a job. Why, he asks, should hippies be expected to work, even when they continue to demand the services others must produce, if America has "an economy of cybernated abundance that does not need their labor, that is rapidly severing the tie between work and wages, that suffers from hard-core poverty due to maldistribution, not scarcity." Given these "facts" about the American economy, Roszak believes the college dropout's refusal to get a "good respectable forty-hour-week job" is just simple good sense.

In another book addressed to young people "dedicated to the possibility of radical change," a sociologist, also teaching in the California systems, tells us that since full automation is just one decade off, "If you wanted to lie on the bench and do nothing, you could obtain the necessities of life produced in abundance by machines . . . nobody would be forced by economic necessity to work for somebody else or take a job he did not like." Only if the person wants luxury goods will he have to work to earn the money for them. (Frank Lindenfeld "Work, Automation, and Alienation" in "Radical Perspectives on Social Problems." Macmillan.)

Just how those automated bicycles, shoes, radios and telephones—none of them luxury goods in the article's view—are to be packaged, marketed and brought down to the beach is unclear. This sociologist raises the important question only to dismiss it: "Would people work if they didn't have to? That this question can be raised seriously is a reflection on the pecuniary twist of our values."

Who can blame the Middle American for getting sore at us when his youngster comes home from college and confronts the folks with *that*.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S WARNING ON THE HIGH COST OF SURRENDER IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW, speaking before the Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention, warned the country that "there is no security in retreat" and called for the defeat of the Hatfield-McGovern amendment.

He said that the so-called "amendment to end the war in Vietnam," if it were carried, "will go down in history as the amendment that lost the war in Vietnam and destroyed the chances for freedom and peace in Southeast Asia for the balance of the century."

He warned that the amendment would deal a fatal blow to the Paris peace talks because it would deprive our representatives of any diplomatic leverage.

He also warned that the amendment, if it carried, would destroy our credibility around the world and result in the rapid erosion of the system of alliances we have so laboriously built up.

And, he warned that the Nonproliferation Treaty would become a dead letter as every nation rushed to develop its own defenses, in the conviction that America can no longer be counted on.

I applaud the Vice President for saying some things that badly needed saying.

Some of the language he used was harsh, and the Vice President was aware of this. But it is a situation that calls for harsh language, because the stakes involved are exactly as the Vice President described them.

I know that some of the Senators who espouse immediate withdrawal from Vietnam took angry issue with the Vice President this morning. That is their privilege.

But as one Senator, I want to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the Vice President's evaluation.

As long ago as May of 1969, I made a speech in the Senate which I deliberately captioned "Shall We Run Up the White Flag in Vietnam?"

In this speech, I made the point, as the Vice President has now done more forcefully, that the demand for an immediate pullout was really a demand that we run up the white flag and surrender.

I pointed out, as the Vice President has, that such a surrender would result in an early Communist takeover in all of Southeast Asia.

Beyond this, looking at the world as it is today, I think it is a virtual certainty that our humiliation in Vietnam would encourage Kim Il Sung, the lunatic dictator of North Korea, to launch a second war of aggression against South Korea; that it would greatly increase the prospect of Soviet-Arab extremists action against Israel; that it might move the Soviet Union to challenge us with a renewed blockade of Berlin; and that it would result in an early harvest of "wars of national liberation" throughout Latin America and the underdeveloped world.

Mr. President, I can understand the frustration of the Senators who today support the so-called amendment to end the war in Vietnam. But, with Vice President AGNEW, I cannot help asking whether they have stopped to consider the consequences that are almost certain to flow from the course they now advocate.

President Nixon is winding down our involvement in Vietnam at a rapid rate.

But he is attempting to do so in a carefully measured way that gives the South Vietnamese time to prepare themselves to take over the much greater burden of defense they will be called upon to carry.

In this effort, I believe that President Nixon is entitled to the unstinting support of the American people and the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the entire text of Vice President AGNEW's speech before the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of my Senate speech of May 8, 1969, captioned "Shall We Run Up the White Flag in Vietnam?"

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGNEW: "THERE IS NO SECURITY IN RETREAT"

(NOTE.—Following is the text of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew's address to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in Miami Beach.)

I would like to speak to you today of a rising threat to everything our servicemen have fought to accomplish in Southeast Asia—a threat embodied in the Hatfield-McGovern Amendment.

Should this proposed amendment become law, unless America declares war, President Nixon would be forced to end any military aid to Laos and to halt all military operations in South Vietnam—twenty weeks from today. Every American soldier, sailor, marine and airman would have to be out of Vietnam by June 30 of next year—ten-and-a-half months from today.

Hatfield-McGovern is a blueprint for the first defeat in the history of the United States—and for chaos and communism for the future of South Vietnam. The Washington Post was generous to call this amendment "reckless." It is worse than that; if adopted by the Senate and passed by the House, this publicized "Amendment to End the War" in Vietnam will go down in history as the amendment that lost the war in Vietnam and destroyed the chances for freedom and peace in Southeast Asia for the balance of the century.

Nothing less is at stake.

But, if this amendment, and any similarly irresponsible proposal which may be offered, can go down in humiliating defeat for its sponsors in the Senate—then this nation will not go down in humiliating defeat on the battlefields of Southeast Asia—I promise you that.

Today, I have a simple question. I am here to ask you, as fellow Americans, and fellow veterans—can the President of the United States count on your support?

"TRAGIC BLUNDER"

The charges I have already made here are among the strongest since I took office as Vice President. But no more dangerous proposal has been presented to the American Congress in those 19 months—or in 19 years for that matter. While I do not question the patriotism of the sponsors of this amendment—I do deeply question their wisdom, their judgment and their logic. They are horribly wrong—and if their grave error is enacted into law, generations of Asians and Americans will suffer for their tragic blunder.

Let us look at the inevitable consequences should Hatfield-McGovern be enacted.

First, the amendment would be a final lethal blow to the Paris peace talks. Any vestige of hope that the enemy will negotiate with Ambassador Bruce at Paris would disappear overnight—for the last incentives for the enemy to talk seriously would be gone. He would have gotten what he came to Paris to get—a fixed final timetable for all Americans to get out of South Vietnam. Why should the enemy offer concessions to the United States for something Senators Hatfield and McGovern and their allies will give him free of charge in four months?

Should this amendment become law, and all American military operations in Southeast Asia cease by December 31, the immense burden of this war would fall immediately and totally upon South Vietnam. The government and people there would confront, alone and all at once, the completion of the enormous tasks of creating a stable demo-

cratic society, promoting economic and social reform, fighting an internal war against guerrillas and defending their nation from invasion from three frontiers.

"BLOODBATH PREDICTED"

Though South Vietnam has made enormous strides in development in recent years—today she could not carry those burdens alone. No developing nation could.

Hence, the result of a unilateral, precipitous American abandonment of South Vietnam would be the collapse of the government, chaos in the country—and ultimately the kind of Communism that literally decimated the civilian population of Hue in the Tet offensive.

The Rand Corporation estimates that if Communism prevails in South Vietnam, 100,000 Vietnamese who placed their faith in us will die for that error in judgment. Douglass Pike, the nation's foremost expert on the Vietcong, estimates 3 million South Vietnamese could lose their lives in the blood bath following a Communist victory.

Assuredly, this is not what Senators Hatfield, McGovern, and those supporting them want—but that is what they are inviting.

They say their amendment will provide for transport and a refuge for Vietnamese who would fear for their lives when the Americans go. But how—and where? Do Senators Hatfield and McGovern have in mind opening up Oregon and South Dakota to resettle the refugees? Hardly. And the place for these men and women who believe so deeply in freedom that they will become exiles rather than submit to the Communist yoke is not Oregon or South Dakota—it is South Vietnam.

CONSEQUENCES OF COLLAPSE

It is clear from their mention of "provision" for refugees that Senators Hatfield and McGovern have considered that the collapse of South Vietnam will indeed be one consequence of their amendment. But have they considered the consequences of that collapse?

One wonders if they really give a damn.

If South Vietnam collapses then victory and success go to the hard-liners in Hanoi and Peking who counseled belligerence and war instead of peace and negotiation.

If South Vietnam collapses, then 285,000 Americans will have suffered and 43,000 will have died for nothing. An American Army, undefeated on the field of battle, will come home in humiliation because impatient pacifists in the Senate lost the war. What will be the reaction then when the American people wake up to learn that the thousands of lives and billions in taxes over a decade had been spent only to find national humiliation and disaster at the end of the road?

Will they then reward the blind impatient politicians who could not see the war through its final hours—and so snatched, for America, military defeat from the jaws of political victory?

If South Vietnam collapses, then Southeast Asia is gone. Those who do not believe in the Domino Theory, as the President has put it, have not talked to the dominoes. Already, Cambodia is half-occupied by North Vietnamese and VietCong. Laos is half-occupied by North Vietnamese and VietCong. Laos is half-occupied by North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao. Thailand is fighting its own Communist insurgency, aided and encouraged from without. Does any rational man believe these countries—or Malaysia and Singapore at the end of the peninsula—can survive if South as well as North Vietnam should come under the rule of militant Communists?

Have the isolationists in the Senate pondered the full consequences of America's defeat in South Vietnam—and freedom's defeat in Southeast Asia?

Looking down the road to the year 2000, we see most Asian nations on the threshold of technological maturity; we see an Asia that contains 60 per cent of all humanity; we see a world in which there are ten Asians for every American.

Are the isolationists content to let that Asia go by default to the Communists because they lacked the perseverence to see this through?

LOST CONFIDENCE

Well, we are not, my fellow Americans and my fellow veterans—and the President is not—and together we shall see this war through to an honorable end that will do justice to the sacrifices of all our sons.

Have the isolationists considered the impact of the abandonment of this one ally upon America's other allies around the world? Could any nation put trust in the word and capacity of the United States—if we slink home, defeated, from the battlefield of Southeast Asia?

The lessons for nations like Germany and Japan—even India—would be clear: The inescapable conclusion would be that the United States cannot be counted upon in the crunch and nations must depend upon themselves to survive. The non-proliferation treaty would be forgotten as every state rushed to develop its greatest possible deterrent. If collective security is a failure in Vietnam—who will place confidence in it in Europe or the Middle East?

As I stated moments ago, while I do not question the patriotism of the Senators I criticize, I do question their wisdom, their logic and their judgment—and I question also their sense of justice.

PRESIDENT'S RECORD

Some of the same Senators who bewailed a Democratic President's lack of power in foreign policy 10 years ago now contend that this newly installed Republican President has too much power.

Some of the same Senators who supported the "peace plank" at the Democratic National Convention in 1968 now condemn a President who has taken more risks for peace than that plank contained.

Some of the same Senators who were silent while a Democratic President sent 532,000 American soldiers to Vietnam are obstructing and undercutting a President who is bringing 265,000 Americans home.

What is there in the record of this President to justify the attitude and actions of these Senators?

When President Nixon took office there were 532,500 Americans troops in Vietnam. He did not send more troops in—he started bringing the boys home. He pledged in June of last year to bring home 25,000 troops; they have come home. He pledged in September to bring home 35,000 more; they have come home; he pledged in December to bring home 50,000 more; they have come home. Every promise he has made to the American people about the war in Asia, he has kept. American casualties are a third of what they were in 1968; time is now on the side of the allies, not the side of the enemy; and still they malign his policies and his performance.

"ACT OF COURAGE"

The President has turned the war over to the South Vietnamese as rapidly as they have become prepared to shoulder the burden.

To proceed slower than that is to break faith with the American people. But to move faster than security dictates is to risk the lives of our men and invite a victory for Communism that tens of thousands of our lads died to prevent.

And no matter what the McGoverns and Hatfields propose—the President is not going to take those risks with the lives of American men.

The Senate sponsors of Hatfield-McGovern cannot win this war; they cannot conclude an honorable peace, but they can lose this war—as well as guarantee the ultimate failure of the uneasy peace to follow—if they convince enough of their colleagues to support their amendment.

CAMBODIAN DECISION

They argue in the Senate that the Cambodian decision underscores the need to place limits and restrictions upon the President—to force upon him a timetable for withdrawal. I do not agree with that assessment. In my view, the President's decision to enter Cambodia and capture and destroy those tons of enemy arms and ammunition that would otherwise have been killing American men was an act of courage and the finest hour in the Nixon Presidency.

The Cambodian decision does not argue for putting shackles upon this President. It argues eloquently the case that the Senate should leave the President alone to exercise his Constitutional powers as Commander-in-Chief and determine what is necessary to protect the lives of American men.

Senator Fulbright now seeks a larger role for his committee in the conduct of foreign policy—but where the President decided and acted in a matter of hours to protect American lives—it took Mr. Fulbright and his colleagues seven weeks to decide on a simple amendment. His is a history of querulous "fuddy-duddying."

Many of the men in this great organization trace their military service to their country back to World War I. Yet, today, we see abroad in our land and in the halls of Congress the voices of that same shortsighted isolationism that lost the peace after World War I and helped to bring on World War II.

Let us not again forget the lesson that for the United States, there is no security in a retreat from the world. Let us not again force an American President to make in deepening despair the kind of statement that Woodrow Wilson made in St. Louis just 10 months after the armistice in France:

"If," he said, "(the Covenant of the League of Nations) should ever in any important aspect be impaired, I would feel like asking the Secretary of War to get the boys who went across the water to fight, together on some field where I could go and see them, and I would stand up before them and say,

" 'Boys, I told you before you went across the seas that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promises; but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise. You are betrayed. You fought for something that you did not get.

" 'And the Glory of the Armies and Navies of the United States is gone like a dream in the night, and there ensues upon it, in the suitable darkness of the night, the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nations before this war came; and there will come sometime, in the vengeful Providence of God, another struggle in which, not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world.' "

Let us never force an American President to say that again.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1969]

SHALL WE RUN UP THE WHITE FLAG IN VIETNAM?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have not spoken on the subject of the Vietnam war since November of 1967. Because of recent developments, I now consider my duty to take up the subject again. And I do so with the hope that many Senators who cannot be present will at least read what I have to say.

I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee.

There is no question that the great majority of the American people feel weary and

frustrated over the seeming endlessness of the Vietnam war and that they would like to see it concluded on acceptable terms at the earliest possible date.

It is clear, too, that this mood is reflected in Congress.

We would, of course, have peace tomorrow if we were prepared to throw in the sponge and withdraw on Vietcong terms. But the great majority of those who have been critical of our Vietnam involvement do not propose this. They would, on the contrary, strongly oppose the suggestion that we raise the white flag or that we scuttle and run in Vietnam.

Nor do they say that it should be none of our concern if the Communists take over in Vietnam and then proceed to massacre their opponents by the scores of thousands, as they have done in every country in which they have come to power.

Nor, do they go so far as saying that it is of no concern at all to our national security if the whole of Southeast Asia falls under Communist control.

Although there are countless nuances in the ranks of the opposition to this war, the majority of them convey the impression, although one could wish that they were more explicit on this point, that they, too, would like to see the war ended in an honorable manner, which protects the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to determine their own future and which does not undermine the security of free Asia and our own country.

The main thrust of their criticism is that the administration has not been doing enough to bring about a negotiated settlement in the Vietnam conflict.

No one can be blamed for being impatient over the Vietnam war. All of us want to see the killing stopped. Indeed, on the day President Johnson announced that he had ordered the bombing of North Vietnam stopped, I made a statement calling for an immediate across-the-board ceasefire, including the cessation of terrorist activities.

It has been a source of deep regret to me that we have not made the call for a total ceasefire our official position, from the beginning, in the Paris peace talks. It is a position that would have the support of all those who are committed to peace; and if the Communist delegations refused to go along with our proposal for a ceasefire, the onus for the continuation of the killing would clearly be on their shoulders.

But while we all wish to see the killing stopped as soon as possible, we must also be concerned over the possibility that too many public manifestations of impatience may give Hanoi the impression that the American will to resist has been broken, and that we are about to raise the white flag in Vietnam.

Needless to say, surrender is not the intention of most of those who have spoken impatiently, and particularly in recent weeks.

But when prominent and respected members of both parties and important private organizations and retired Government officials warn the Nixon administration that it has only a few months at the most to settle the Vietnam war, or when the call is made for an immediate, or almost immediate, withdrawal of American forces, the hard fact is that this is like telling the North Vietnamese Communists that if they hold on for just another few months, they will have us in a position where they can settle the war on their own terms.

Imagine the position our negotiators in Paris would be in if they implored the Communists to reach an agreement with us in a hurry, because the American people are increasingly impatient with the war and the Nixon administration will be in serious trouble if it does not end the war in two or three months.

If they said this, then the Vietnamese Communist delegation in Paris would simply sit back and wait for the American home front to collapse.

THE REDUCTION OF AMERICAN FORCES IN VIETNAM

Some of our ablest Vietnam experts are convinced that, even in the absence of an agreement with Hanoi, we can begin to withdraw some of our forces from Vietnam this year without adversely affecting the conduct of the war or our position in the peace negotiations. They believe that we could only gain from a carefully phased de-Americanization of the war, geared to the improved combat capabilities of the South Vietanamese forces, the state of the battle, and progress in the Paris peace talks.

A point of crisis was reached in 1964 and 1965 which made a massive entry of American forces imperative in order to prevent a Communist victory. This was so for a number of reasons.

First, we did not do as well as we might have done in the early stages because we lacked understanding of the nature of Communist political warfare.

Second, we failed to train and equip the South Vietnamese forces properly, so that until very recently they were at a serious disadvantage in competing with the superbly equipped Vietcong forces.

Third, we failed to use our influence to promote certain essential social and political reforms.

Finally, a massive American entry became essential when Hanoi decided to go for broke in South Vietnam by reinforcing the Vietcong with entire divisions of the North Vietnamese army.

The American buildup that took place after 1964 saved Vietnam from what appeared to be an almost certain Communist victory. This is its historic justification. But it inevitably had certain byproduct disadvantages.

It encouraged the Vietnamese people to regard the war more as an American conflict than as their own.

It produced widespread popular resentment, as the presence of large numbers of alien and affluent forces invariably does.

It played into the hands of the Vietcong propagandists by lending seeming authenticity to their charge that the Americans are imperialist invaders.

If we can now reverse the process and start de-Americanizing the war, most Vietnamese would welcome it, provided of course, that what is involved is an orderly and phased reduction in forces, and not a precipitate abandonment of the battlefield.

There are many reasons for believing that President Nixon has been thinking in terms of such an orderly reduction, even if there is no agreement with the Communists, and that there have already been discussions with our Vietnamese allies on the subject.

In an early press conference, President Nixon stated that he did not want to see a single American soldier in Vietnam for a day longer than was necessary. Since that time, President Thieu has announced that the expansion and improvement of the South Vietnamese forces will make it possible for them, at an early date, to take over a much larger share of the battle from their American allies.

But it does not help in this situation if President Nixon is publicly pushed and prodded to withdraw or reduce American forces.

The enemy could derive small comfort from a phased and orderly reduction of American forces, agreed upon with our Asian allies. The enemy, may however, become even more stubborn and inflexible if we give him the impression that the President has been compelled by mounting public criticism to embark on a complete pullout of American forces.

THE AMERICAN HOME FRONT

Actually, the picture of overwhelming popular opposition to our Vietnam commitment painted by the critics goes far beyond the facts.

The most recent Gallup Poll on the Vietnam war, published on March 22, 1969, showed that only 26 percent of the American people favored pulling out of Vietnam. A much larger group, 32 percent, said that they were in favor of going all out to win the war; 19 percent said that they favored a continuation of the present policy; while another 19 percent said that they were in favor of an end to the war as soon as possible, but did not demand a pullout or criticize the conduct of the war.

What this adds up to is that the administration can count on the backing of 70 percent of the American people if it calls for further patience and perseverance in honoring our Vietnam commitment.

Significantly, the Gallup report said that up to this point the public had not blamed President Nixon for any lack of progress in the Vietnam situation.

Despite the clamor and confusion which the critics have generated, the basic good judgment of the American people is once again manifested in these figures.

Certainly, these figures do not suggest that the American people are ready to raise the white flag in Vietnam, or that the Nixon administration will be in deep trouble if it does not find a solution in 2 or 3 months, as some people have suggested. When the critics make such dire predictions they are lapsing into the all-too-common error of identifying their own opinions with public opinion.

It has, of course, been Hanoi's belief for some time now that growing opposition in the United States to the Vietnam war would force us to withdraw on the Communist Vietnamese terms. Nor has Hanoi ever been bashful about stating this position publicly. Almost 4 years ago, when three Washington Post correspondents interviewed the Vietcong representative in Moscow, he made it clear to them that the National Liberation Front was counting on American public opinion rather than on military victory or on negotiations to force an American withdrawal.

In support of this contention, the Vietcong representatives flourished in front of the American correspondents a big batch of signed advertisements and appeals and speeches critical of American policy in Vietnam—see exhibit A.

In a recent article on "Vietcong Propaganda Abroad," Dr. Chester Bain, one of our foremost Vietnam scholars, said that the worldwide Communist propaganda effort on the Vietnam war is probably the largest and best coordinated campaign of its kind in history—see exhibit B.

Documents recently captured from the Vietcong show that, while they have been disappointed by the military failure of their recent offensive, the Communist leaders nevertheless believe that this offensive achieved its major purpose by encouraging the antiwar movement in the United States.

THE SEVERAL FACES OF THE VIETNAM CRITICS

There is a tiny minority in our country who have been particularly responsive to the Vietcong propaganda because their opposition to our Vietnam policy stems clearly from a commitment to the revolutionary overthrow of our Government. They do not oppose our involvement in Vietnam for pacifist or humanitarian reasons. They oppose our involvement because they frankly favor a Vietcong victory.

Some, but not all, of these extremist critics have made no effort to conceal their motivation.

For example, Prof. Eugene Genovese, of Rutgers, created nationwide indignation

when he said publicly in 1965 that he would welcome a Vietcong victory.

And, on the other side of the continent, at the University of California in Berkeley, Dr. Stefan Smale, one of the two chief organizers of the Vietnam Day Committee, told the press that he and his colleagues wanted the Vietcong to defeat the United States, because such a defeat would break American power elsewhere in the world and would also help to bring about revolutionary changes in the United States.

As small as the group represented by Smale and Genovese may be, they have nevertheless, played a role out of all proportion to their numbers in organizing and in giving leadership to the anti-Vietnam agitation in this country.

The fact that many of the leaders of the anti-Vietnam agitation are motivated not by pacifism, or by high ideals, but by a revolutionary anti-Americanism has become increasingly obvious. Indeed, many of the old-line pacifists and liberals who cooperated with the anti-Vietnam movement in its earlier stages, are gravely concerned over this development.

Mr. Philip Altbach, a Ford Foundation fellow at the University of Chicago and president of the Student Peace Union from 1959 to 1964, said early last year in the Socialist Party organ that a large part of the Vietnam protest movement is not a peace movement at all, but, on the contrary, wants to see a Communist military victory in the conflict. He complained about the strident chorus of anti-Americanism in the Vietnam peace movement, and said that it had the effect of presenting a one-sided view of the situation.

The revolutionary critics of our Vietnam policy have an unquestioned capacity for mischief and noisemaking, because they have all the zeal of the political fanatic.

To this revolutionary minority one cannot appeal for patience for the sample reason that they are ideologically committed both to a Vietcong victory and to the overthrow of our own Nation.

But the great majority of those who oppose the war have nothing in common with the revolutionary opponents of our Vietnam commitment. They would be unhappy about a Vietcong victory. But they nevertheless oppose our involvement in Vietnam either because they are pacifists, or because they believe we are overextended, or because they think that the Vietnam war is not the kind of war we should be involved in, or because they feel weary and frustrated and are disposed to regard the war as hopeless, or because they think it has not been properly managed or because they feel we are not moving fast enough to get the war concluded.

I can understand their position, and it is to these people that I am speaking today.

Since the honest critics of our Vietnam policy would unquestionably prefer to see an honorable settlement to a surrender, it should be possible to appeal to them for a limited measure of patience.

One cannot and should not ask them to forgo their criticism. I do not do so.

But surely it is not too much to ask that they weigh their statements carefully so that what they say cannot be exploited to undercut the position of President Nixon or of his representatives in Paris.

POLITICAL FACTORS FAVORING AN EARLY SETTLEMENT

At this point, some of those who are impatient with the Vietnam war will ask how long we must be prepared to wait while the war drags on and on.

Under other circumstances, it might be more difficult to venture an estimate. But within the past 8 months there has been a dramatic shift in the world situation which, in my opinion, militates against the indefinite prolongation of the Vietnam conflict and in favor of an honorable settlement at a relatively early date.

The Vietnam war would not have been possible without the massive assistance that Hanoi has been receiving from both the Soviet Union and Red China.

In order to make itself eligible for assistance from both sides, Hanoi has been playing an exceedingly delicate balancing act between Moscow and Peking. As tightrope walkers, indeed, the North Vietnamese Communists have shown themselves to be second to none in the world of politics.

However, a situation has now developed which will make this balancing act increasingly difficult. And even if Hanoi should succeed in maintaining a neutral stance between Moscow and Peking, the chances are that Hanoi's two chief suppliers will both be compelled to deescalate the scale of their military support.

Moscow's occupation of Czechoslovakia in August of last year and the political clampdown which it imposed on the Czechoslovakian Government last month have not by a long shot solved all of Moscow's problems in central Europe.

Despite the new controls, the Czechs continue to voice their defiance of the Soviet occupiers and the press continues to find ways of partially circumventing the censorship regulations.

The occupation, moreover, has resulted in widespread criticism and discontent throughout the world Communist movement, and the criticism has been particularly marked in the case of the European Communist Parties.

Elsewhere in central Europe, the cauldron of discontent continues to simmer despite the occupation of Czechoslovakia.

A press dispatch of March 4, for example, quoted a high-ranking Soviet Party official as saying that Moscow's great concern at the moment is the situation in Poland. This situation he described as roughly the same as the situation in Czechoslovakia at the end of 1966, that is, just before the overthrow of the conservative Novotny government—see exhibit E.

Apparently completely unintimidated by the Brezhnev doctrine and the numerous threats that have been made against them, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Albania continue to hurl defiance at Moscow and to reject the concept of "limited sovereignty" which the Kremlin now seeks to impose on all other Communist nations.

And while all this is going on in central Europe, the growing accumulation of differences and tensions between Moscow and Peking has now erupted in an almost explosive intensification of the Sino-Soviet dispute.

There have, of course, been clashes before this along the Sino-Soviet frontier. But this is the first time that both sides have pulled out all the stops and moved to full-fledged propaganda and political warfare against each other. As a result of this outpouring of hate propaganda on both sides, there can be no doubt that both the Russians and the Chinese now hate each other with a genuine passion.

There can be no doubt, too, that this all-out hate propaganda has produced a much more precarious political situation and increased the probability of military conflict. There have been a number of indications that Moscow is seriously worried that Red China will be able to exploit the discontent of the tribal minorities in the border regions to stir up a Vietcong type guerrilla insurgency.

The Sino-Soviet dispute, if anything, is bound to intensify over the coming period; the trend has gone too far to be reversed.

Both governments will be under pressure to increase the already very large forces they maintain along the Siberian frontier.

Simultaneously, Moscow must confront the probability that its political position in central Europe will continue to deteriorate and that the intellectual revolt in the Communist countries will continue to grow.

All the evidence points to the conclusion that, as great as our own difficulties may be, both the internal and external difficulties faced by Peking and Moscow far exceed our own.

This does not mean that we can afford to relax our own guard on the assumption that the intensification of the Sino-Soviet conflict, by itself, will safeguard the Western World. Desperation always has a quality of unpredictability about it; and for this reason, the desperation and frustration which both Moscow and Peking must now feel may actually increase instead of decrease the danger to the free world.

Nevertheless, there is no question but that Moscow and Peking, both, will have to devote more of their energies and more of their resources over the coming period to their internal problems and to their problems with each other. To this extent it is reasonable to assume that Hanoi will not be able to count on the same degree of assistance from the Communist superpowers.

Besides, it is clear that North Vietnam is suffering desperately from the consequences of the war and that the North Vietnamese people are even more impatient and dissatisfied than the American people.

In a recent interview with an Italian journalist, General Giap, the North Vietnamese defense minister, conceded that the war had cost North Vietnam 500,000 dead. This is the equivalent of almost 7 million dead for a country the size of the United States.

On top of these incredible casualties, it is only reasonable to assume that Communist medical facilities have been utterly overwhelmed by the need to cope with the many hundreds of thousands of wounded, a large percentage of them maimed for life.

Remarkably enough, the figure of 500,000 dead, which was confirmed by General Giap, jibes almost exactly with our own estimates.

General Giap subsequently denied that he had made any such statement in the course of the interview. The Italian journalist replied that she had checked her notes carefully with the two friends, both Italian leftists, who accompanied her on her visit to Giap.

That General Giap subsequently denied the statement which he had made in an unguarded moment is not surprising. Hanoi's official position to this day is that there are no North Vietnamese forces serving in the South. In order to support this myth, Hanoi has had to organize one of the most remarkable campaigns of national deception in history.

Not merely does the North Vietnamese press make no mention of North Vietnamese activities and casualties in South Vietnam, but, to support this deception, the hundreds of thousands of servicemen who have been sent south have for all practical purposes become "non-people."

They are not permitted to write to their families.

They are not permitted any home leave.

And it is the ultimate inhumanity of this deception that even the tens of thousands of amputees and war-maimed are not permitted to return home, because this would give the lie away. What happens to these pitiful "non-people" is uncertain, but there are indications that they are detained in special centers in Laos and Cambodia and in secure areas of South Vietnam. They linger on in their awful suffering, cut off from their country and their families by a government that cannot admit their existence.

Those who are disposed to listen to the North Vietnamese Communists or to regard them as agrarian reformers, would do well to ponder the moral implications of the elaborate and inhuman facade that Hanoi

has erected to support the lie that it has not intervened in South Vietnam.

Not very surprisingly, there have been many evidences of division and discontent in North Vietnam and the North Vietnamese Communist Party and the Vietcong movement itself. How deep this discontent goes may be gaged from the fact that among those arrested by Hanoi have been a number of important party functionaries.

In North Vietnam during 1968 the Ho Chi Minh regime, already as ruthless as the Stalinist regime at its worst, introduced still further Draconian measures to deal with discontent and attempted subversion and sabotage. These measures were not kept secret. Their introduction was trumpeted aloud by press and radio, in an obvious effort to terrorize would-be resisters.

And in South Vietnam, at the same time as the will to resist is perceptibly weakening in America, the rate of defection from the Vietcong forces has soared to record levels. During the months of March and April, an average of 1,000 Vietcong defectors many of them officers and political cadres, have come over to the side of the government each week.

Recently captured documents reveal the grave concern of the Vietcong leaders over the growing defection rate. Vietcong unit commanders are warned that if any soldier shows himself particularly cooperative or willing to accept duties, he should be suspected of trying to set things up for his defection to the government side.

Captured documents also reveal concern over the general level of morale. They complain that too many Vietcong are keeping their eyes on the Paris negotiations instead of on the battlefield.

All of these facts strongly suggest that if we can show the stamina and courage to persist along the path of honor in Vietnam, Hanoi will in the not very distant future show a greater willingness than it does today to come to reasonable terms.

It is a situation that calls above all for patience, a situation which requires that all those who are impatient not only weigh the implications that will be read into their words but also weigh the consequences of an American defeat in Vietnam.

For let there be no mistake on this point: If we abandon Vietnam, or if we are defeated in Vietnam, or if we negotiate a settlement that paves the way for an early Communist takeover there, then it would mark the beginning of the end for American credibility and for America as a great nation.

I do not have much patience with those who say it does not make much difference who takes over there. I will say more about that later, but let me say right now that it makes a great deal of difference. If we have not learned that lesson from history, then we have a lot of catching up to do.

THE HIGH COST OF SURRENDER

President Johnson's historic announcement of March 31, 1968, led to widespread speculation that the American will to resist was nearing collapse. In the wake of the President's statement, Field Marshal Sir Gerald Templer, commander of the British Commonwealth forces that defeated the Communist insurgency in Malaya after World War II, warned of the consequences of an American pullout. He said:

"If the Americans pull out of Vietnam, the Communists will take over the whole of Southeast Asia—and Burma, India, right up to the Caspian Sea, would go. An American withdrawal would have absolutely disastrous effects, not only in the Far East but further afield."

These words deserve the most serious consideration, especially on the part of our antiwar critics, because they come from an Englishman who has a profound and intimate personal knowledge of Southeast Asia and of Communist guerrilla warfare.

Sir Gerald's word were echoed a few days later in a statement by Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman of Malaysia, who is widely regarded as one of Asia's ablest democratic statesmen. Let me quote what the Malaysian Prime Minister said:

"If the Americans for some reason decided to give up this war in Vietnam and the North decided to take over the South, then it will be the end of us all."

Very similar statements have in the past been made by Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma of Laos, by Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore, and even by Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia. Their statements all coincided with the statement of the Malaysian Prime Minister on the essential point that an American defeat in Vietnam, or an American withdrawal from Vietnam, would be absolutely disastrous for the whole of Southeast Asia.

Let me also quote again the bitter words written by the well-known Filipino commentator, Vincente Villamin. He said:

"The abandonment of Vietnam, would be an indelible blemish on America's honor. It would reduce America in the estimation of mankind to a dismal third-rate power, despite her wealth, her culture, and her nuclear arsenal. It would make every American ashamed of his Government and would make every individual American distrusted everywhere on earth."

Similar opinions have been expressed by other Far Eastern anti-Communist leaders, ranging in their political views from conservative to neutralist to socialist—see exhibit F.

The high price of surrender has also been underscored by some of our best and wisest friends in Europe. The London Economist, which is generally regarded as free Europe's foremost political periodical, and which has also been stanchly pro-American through thick and thin, had this to say about the cost of a surrender in Vietnam, in words that should be noted and remembered:

"It is arguable that the cost of victory, in terms of bloodshed, is proving to be too great: but the cost of betrayal could be even greater. In the last analysis it is for Mr. Nixon to decide; it may yet become Nixon's war. The Americans have made considerable headway in the military field, and a modest degree of headway with their pacification program. If they have the endurance, they can still win the war, in the sense of definitely preventing a Communist takeover. After backing so many rickety regimes through thick and thin, it would be tragic if they were to ditch this much better government to let the Liberation Front in. It is an illusion to imagine that the United States can agree to a compromise peace that would amount to a sell-out and retain any credibility in Asia. Nor in Asia alone; for in this shrunken world credibility is indivisible."

The cost of defeat has also been underscored by American experts who are sensitive to the realities of international politics. Shortly before he became President, Mr. Nixon's principal foreign policy adviser, Dr. Henry M. Kissinger put the matter in these terms:

"The commitment of 500,000 Americans has settled the issue of the importance of Vietnam. For what is involved now is confidence in American promises. However, fashionable it is to ridicule the terms "credibility" or "prestige," they are not empty phrases; other nations can gear their actions to ours only if they can count on our steadiness. The collapse of the American effort in Vietnam would not mollify many critics; most of them would simply add the charge of unreliability to the accusation of bad judgment. Those whose safety or national goals depend on American commitments could only be dismayed. In many parts of the world—the Middle East, Europe, Latin America, even Japan—stability depends on confidence in American promises. Unilateral withdrawal, or a settlement which unintentionally amounts to the same thing, could therefore lead to the erosion of restraints and to an even more dangerous international situation."

So, let there be no illusion about the heavy price America will have to pay, in prestige and respect and credibility and world power, if it should seek to extricate itself from the Vietnam conflict under anything less than honorable conditions which assure the independence of South Vietnam.

THE TERMS OF PEACE

There are those who say that to talk in these terms is equivalent to demanding unconditional surrender by Hanoi.

My reply to this is that to talk in anything less than these terms should be equivalent to offering our own unconditional surrender to Hanoi.

The fact is that we do not demand an unconditional surrender.

We are already on record as favoring the inclusion of North Vietnam among the beneficiaries of the vast Mekong River plan. The experts who have worked on this plan tell us that it has a far greater potential for the entire region, that is, for Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and North Vietnam, than the TVA had for our Southern States. And the point has further been made that, economically, North Vietnam would gain far more from the peaceful cooperation with the rest of Southeast Asia within the framework of the Mekong River plan than it could ever hope to gain from the conquest of South Vietnam.

If Ho Chi Minh is really a Titoist, as some of the critics of the war pretend, the best way he could prove this would be to terminate the war, thus extricating himself from both the Red Chinese and the Soviet embrace, and to take his country into the Mekong River plan.

Moreover, the South Vietnamese Government has already made it abundantly clear that, while it opposes a coalition government, it is willing to promise a general amnesty when hostilities cease, to agree to free elections under international supervision, to assure the National Liberation Front of the right to participate openly in these elections on a non-Communist program, and even to enter into negotiations with the Vietcong in the interest of achieving a settlement.

This is conceding a good deal. In fact I do not know where people get the idea that our side is the inflexible one, and that we have refused to make any concessions to bring an end to the war.

Hanoi, therefore, can have peace in Vietnam on terms that do not represent an unconditional surrender for its side and which, indeed, would bring substantial benefits to it.

AGAIN THE NEED FOR PATIENCE

It is my judgment and prayer that this tragic and costly war will come to a close soon. It may not end in 3 months or 4 months; but then neither will it take 3 or 4 years.

But whether the war is terminated honorably or dishonorably depends in the final analysis on the patience and fortitude and unity we can display on the home front over the coming critical months.

Writing in the Washington Star on January 23, 1969, foreign editor Crosby S. Noyes said that "a demand in this country for quick results in the negotiations is a sure prescription for disaster." Mr. Noyes appealed for an abatement in the clamor for quick results. My own appeal for patience and solidarity is directed in the first place to those critics who until recently agreed that it was essential to the security of the free world to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam, but who now urge that we extricate ourselves on any conditions because the war is proving to

be longer and more costly than they anticipated.

This is a position which is difficult to understand.

THE MORALITY OF OUR VIETNAM COMMITMENT

If it was morally and politically right to come to the defense of South Vietnam to prevent a Communist takeover, then it does not cease to be right simply because the going has become tougher, or because the war is more costly.

Whether the cost of the Vietnam war is justifiable or unjustifiable depends in the final analysis, on one's estimate of the enemy.

If one believes that the Vietcong Communists are simple agrarian reformers, as many people believed about the Chinese Communists before they came to power, the Vietnam war would be difficult to justify.

The scales of justification give another reading, however, if one believes that the Communist system is just as totalitarian as the Nazi system; that it is equally contemptuous of human rights and human life; that the total volume of human suffering produced by this system even surpasses the volume of suffering under the Nazis, and that it is just as fanatically committed to the expansion of its empire, to the destruction of freedom, and, above all, to the destruction of the United States of America as the chief bastion of freedom.

That is the reading I get, and I think history is on my side in this estimate.

There are those who will reply to this that some Communist regimes today are less oppressive and some more oppressive, and that it is a mistake to lump them all together.

I have never lumped them altogether; my critics have sometimes thrown that bale of hay at me, but they will have trouble finding it in the record because it is not there.

While all Communist regimes are tyrannical, it has been true, historically, that some have been more bloody than others.

In the spectrum of bloodiness, however, the tyranny of Ho Chi Minh does not belong with the Dubcek regime in Czechoslovakia; it belongs, rather, with the bloodiest of all Communist regimes, the regimes of Stalin and Mao Tse Tung. That this is so should not be surprising in view of the fact that Ho Chi Minh himself is one of the small surviving band of original unreconstructed Bolsheviks.

Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam must be resisted because it poses basically the same kind of danger to the freedom and security of the nations in the area, as did the Nazi regime. The only serious difference is that the Communists have refined the means of subversion and aggression to a point never dreamed of by the Nazis.

A Communist victory must also be resisted because, as Hanoi has repeatedly pointed out, such a victory would demonstrate America's complete inability to cope with "wars of national liberation" and would pave the way to more "wars of national liberation" in other parts of the world, especially in Latin America.

Finally, a Communist victory must be resisted on simple moral and humanitarian grounds.

Hoang Van Chi, a former North Vietnamese Government official, has estimated that more than 500,000 North Vietnamese were executed or killed in one way or another during the period when the Ho Chi Minh regime was consolidating its rule over North Vietnam. And this figure would unquestionably have been very much higher if it had not been for the fact that some 1 million North Vietnamese, out of their hatred of communism, took advantage of the Geneva Agreement to flee to South Vietnam.

There are many reasons for believing that the massacre that would take place in South Vietnam if the Vietcong were to come to power there would far exceed, in scale and ferocity, the massacre that characterized the establishment of Communist rule in the north.

It is common knowledge, for example, that the Vietcong have prepared long lists of political opponents whom they plan to massacre as soon as they take over. These lists include Government officials at every level, officers and noncommissioned officers in the army, religious leaders, labor leaders, and countless thousands of those who escaped from the north.

There are some who say that the number slated for execution by the Vietcong may run as high as several million. This estimate may be on the high side. But that the Vietcong execution lists are intended in earnest was demonstrated in the most gruesome manner during the Tet offensive of last year, when the Vietcong briefly occupied the city of Hue.

In Hue proper, when it was liberated from Communist control, the allies dug up from mass graves the bodies of more than 1,000 Vietnamese civilians who had been executed by the Vietcong. Many of them had been buried alive, with their hands tied behind their backs.

More mass graves containing the bodies of civilians executed by the Vietcong are being discovered all the time in the general vicinity of Hue. For example, a mass grave discovered about 12 miles southeast of Hue toward the end of March has thus far disgorged 134 bodies. Again, many of these had been buried alive. And this last April 7, another press report said that South Vietnamese soldiers had discovered a new mass grave about 3 miles north of the first one—see exhibit G.

Moreover, if the Vietcong should ever take power, the victims of their terror would not be limited to those who hold leadership positions and whose names appear on their execution lists. The incredible bestiality with which the Vietcong have fought the war makes it certain that a Communist victory would also be followed by mass killings of men, women, and children in areas that are considered unfriendly to them.

There could be no more dramatic evidence of the Vietcong capacity for indiscriminate massacre than what happened to the simple Montagnard people of the village of Dak Son in December, 1967.

Attacking the village by night, the Vietcong went with flame throwers from house to house, killing indiscriminately, at point-blank range, men, women, and children. When they were through with their flame throwers, 250 unarmed Montagnards, mostly women and children, had been killed; another 500 were missing, some of them dead, some of them kidnaped, some of them escaped; and scores more were suffering from ghastly burn wounds over much of their bodies.

Let no one, therefore, who now demands our immediate withdrawal from Vietnam plead innocence or ignorance if this agitation should in fact compel our withdrawal, and if, in consequence of this withdrawal, there takes place the frightful massacre of the innocents which has attended the establishment of Communist rule in every country.

In the accounting of history they will not be able to escape their responsibility for helping to make this massacre possible.

Nor will they be able to escape responsibility for the subjugation of other Southeast Asian countries by communism which would be bound to follow in the wake of an American capitulation in Vietnam. As the highly esteemed Institute for Strategic Affairs pointed out in a study last week, the validity of the domino theory can no longer be challenged.

When some of us talked about the domino theory a year or two or three ago, we were told, "That is old fashioned; that is a lot of bunk." Mr. President, it was not bunk then and it is not now. All you have to do to realize this is study history, look at the map, and think about the matter.

Referring to the Hanoi-backed Communist insurgencies in Laos and Cambodia, the institute's report said that these dominos were already ripe for tumbling, and that even Thailand's position was precarious.

The Vietnam war has been long and costly, in my judgment longer and costlier than it should have been because it has been so tragically mishandled.

The recognition that we have made errors, moreover, does not mean that we should now cut and run; it simply means that we must move as rapidly as possible to eliminate the errors, at the same time as we move to reduce and terminate the scale of hostilities.

To many people it no doubt appears that we have achieved nothing through our sacrifices. But despite the errors we have made, our efforts in Vietnam have served the cause of freedom well.

Through our sacrifices we have purchased precious time for the free nations of the Far East; and, with few exceptions, these nations have made good use of this time to strengthen their institutions and build up their economies.

Indonesia was saved from going Communist by a hair's breath; and it is probably no exaggeration to say that our Vietnam commitment made the difference between victory and defeat in this case, because, had another half dozen senior officers sided with the rebels, the Communists would almost certainly have emerged triumphant.

In the balance of history, therefore, our intervention in Vietnam has been anything but fruitless.

The American people have always carried themselves with exemplary fortitude in difficulties and crises.

By history and by temperament, they are not a people disposed to accept humiliation or to raise the white flag of surrender.

If the full facts on Vietnam were now put before the American people, the administration would have the backing of the overwhelming majority for a policy of continued firmness.

President Nixon must be given credit for doing everything in his power, for walking the extra mile and more, in an effort to put an end to the Vietnam war.

In this effort he needs and deserves the understanding and support of the American people. He deserves it all the more because no American President ever inherited a more difficult situation.

We are now closer to a settlement than we have ever been before.

As I have been speaking, the Communist-run National Liberation Front has issued in Paris a 10-point peace program of their own as a basis for a settlement in Vietnam. There has been no chance to analyze this proposal as yet. But it may signal the beginning of serious movement in the negotiations.

So I ask the honest critics of our Vietnam policy, the congressional critics in particular, to withhold their criticism for a while and let President Nixon and his representatives do the speaking for the United States, so that they can bring an end to this awful war.

I ask for patience because it is a fact that the President's position is undercut by calls for an immediate pull-out or by arbitrary deadlines for getting out of Vietnam.

Now, I am sure that the administration will not be misled by the clamor which comes from the misguided and from those who have lost hope and are now impatient.

Nor will the administration permit this clamor to reduce it to a suppliant posture in the Paris negotiations, because nothing could be more fatal to the outcome of the Vietnam war.

And, let us hope that the administration

will not allow this clamor to silence its voice at home or prevent it from reaffirming, in positive terms which every American can understand, the importance of Vietnam to the cause of freedom and the overwhelming moral and political justification for our presence there.

This is something, to my great regret, which the Johnson administration failed to do; and for this, it paid a very heavy penalty.

So let us all work to achieve a just and honorable settlement of the Vietnam conflict.

Let us constantly and repeatedly test the sincerity of the Communist negotiators by urging their acceptance of a total ceasefire.

Let us not say anything which might lead the enemy to believe that we are ready to surrender or put up the white flag.

And let us never repeat the folly of base appeasement because this will, as surely as day follows night, inevitably result in new aggression and new bloodshed under far more terrible circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks several exhibits relating to what I have said today.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

EXHIBIT A

Stephen R. Rosenfeld, Washington Post, May 28, 1965: "Flourishing a batch of American cartoons, signed advertisements, and speeches critical of American policy in Vietnam, the Front's new representative in Moscow made clear his reliance on American public opinion rather than on military victory or negotiations, to compel American withdrawal."

EXHIBIT B

Dr. Chester A. Bain, Foreign Service Journal, October, 1968: "The communists' worldwide propaganda effort on the Vietnam war is probably greater and better coordinated than any other propaganda campaign in history.

"Viet Cong and Hanoi propaganda directives point to groups upon whom to concentrate—pacifists, families of servicemen with the allies in Vietnam, student groups, church organizations. And they suggest means of encouraging dissent with American policy—anti-war demonstration, military desertions, and alienation of European countries from the United States. The echoes reverberate worldwide, produced and directed by an elaborate and sophisticated propaganda mechanism."

EXHIBIT C

Dr. Stefan Smale, the Oakland Tribune, October 29, 1965: "We want the Vietcong to defeat the United States for international reasons. If the U.S. is defeated in Southeast Asia, this will help break American power elsewhere in the world. This would give new impetus to revolutionary social change (wars of liberation) in such places as Africa and Latin America. And if surrounded by revolutionary changes, it will in turn make it easier to achieve radical change in the United States."

EXHIBIT D

Mr. Philip Altbach, New America, November 24, 1965: "There is a strong undercurrent in the protest movement which tends to view a Vietcong victory as a positive aim . . . The strident chorus of anti-Americanism has had the effect of presenting a one-sided view of the situation . . . A substantial part of the Vietnam protest movement is not a peace movement at all but rather supports the Communist side of the conflict."

EXHIBIT E

The New York Times, March 4, 1969: "An East European source asserted tonight that the apparent shifting in Communist tactics on Berlin in the last week reflected a division in the Politburo of the Soviet Communist party.

"The source, who said he was quoting an official of the Soviet party Secretariat who recently visited his capital, said it was significant that the Soviet leaders who had favored a conciliatory policy on Berlin in Presidium meetings were the ones who pleaded against an invasion of Czechoslovakia last year.

* * * * *

"The Soviet official was reported to have said that among Moscow's greatest concerns at the moment is the situation in Poland. The country is 'roughly the same as Czechoslovakia at the end of 1966,' the official was quoted as having said. That period was a year before President Antonin Novotny was ousted by the Czechoslovakia Politburo and replaced as party leader by Alexander Dubcek, an advocate of reform."

EXHIBIT F

STATEMENTS ON VIETNAM BY ASIAN LEADERS

Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos, Manila, 1966: "It is established beyond dispute that the war in Viet-Nam is not a civil war. It is a war on an international scale involving massive aggression from Communist North Viet-Nam with the active encouragement of Communist China."

Korean President Pak Chung Hui, Korea, 1966: "The forces which support and control the Viet Cong in Free Viet-Nam today are the same forces which 16 years ago supported and controlled the southward aggression of the Communist troops in Korea . . . the situation in Viet-Nam is more than a simple domestic problem of that country. It represents rather a confrontation of the free world with Communist tyranny."

Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, May 9, 1967: "They launched these attacks because they want to create civil war. . . .

"If we fail in our operations against them and if the Khmer [Cambodian] Viet Minh emerge victorious, they can transform the nation into a Communist country. If not they must continue to accept independence and neutrality. . . .

"The masters of the Khmer Viet Minh are the Viet Minh and the Viet Cong."

Eisaku Sato, Premier of Japan, November 14, 1967: "I wish to express my deep respect to you, Mr. President [Johnson], for the great efforts being made by the United States under your able leadership to bring peace and stability to the world, particularly in Asia in this moment."

Rajmohan Gandhi, editor of Himmat magazine, February 1965: "There is dangerous thinking in the West . . . progressives of the West believe that Communism will win and the best that they can do is surrender peaceably to it . . . they are free to expound their ideas from remote positions. But there are millions of people in Southeast Asia and 450 million people of India who, in spite of the basic defects in the structure of their society, will not permit themselves to be traded in the drawing rooms and cabinets of the Western world . . .

"If America compromises on this vital issue of freedom in Asia, she will have to pay the price dearly. . . . It is alarming that [responsible commentators] of the West should talk so lightheartedly about leaving India's eastern flank open to the dangers of Chinese invasion.

"[The] counsel of retreat to the West is certainly not what Asians want. We want and need the presence of the West on Asia's land and sea. The West can provide the power of balance to contain Communist China until such a time as democratic nations like India and Japan can provide it."

Singapore Premier Lee Kuan Yew, May 6, 1965: "If the Communists are able to advance their frontiers to envelop South Viet-Nam it will be only a matter of time before the same process of emasculation by military and political techniques will overtake the neighboring countries."

Prime Minister of Laos, Prince Souvanna Phouma, November 2, 1967: "We were fully satisfied with the [1962] Geneva accords. We thought that the nightmare of internal subversion and foreign aggression was over. But, alas, our people were grievously deceived. The accords were immediately and shamelessly violated . . . the Pathet Lao . . . , valet of the Hanoi Government, continued its sabotage. War, instead of stopping, grew more intense. Today, five years after the signature of the Geneva accords, we can count about 40,000 North Vietnamese soldiers in our territory. They are fighting beside 15,000 Pathet Lao, armed, paid, trained and encadred by North Viet-Nam. Development of our country is paralyzed. Thousands of refugees stream into Governmental zones. Hundreds of villages are abandoned. Only half of the soil is cultivated. The Ho Chi Minh trail has become an active transit route for North Vietnamese forces . . . But, the most distressing aspect is to think that this useless, bloody, tragedy could not have occurred if some ideological, greedy nations had not come and interfered directly or indirectly in our internal affairs. By what right, what moral, do they assume the right to 'liberate' us?"

The late Prime Minister Harold Holt of Australia: "It is in Vietnam that aggressive communist pressure—the greatest political danger in Asia today—is most severe and direct, and it is in this area that we must, for the time being, concentrate much of our defense effort and resources. . . .

"Let me repeat, in simple terms, why we are in Vietnam:

"We are there because we believe in the right of people to be free.

"We are there because we responded to an appeal for aid against aggression.

"We are there because security and stability in South East Asia are vital to our own security and stability.

"We are there because we want peace, not war, and independence, not serfdom, to be the lot of the peoples of Asia.

"We are there because we do not believe that our great Pacific partner, the United States, should stand alone for freedom.

"We will continue to be there while the aggression persists because, as a free and independent nation, we cannot honourably do otherwise."

Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia: "The fact is that as long as the Americans are there, China cannot yet swallow Cambodia. And what prevents the Americans from swallowing Cambodia is precisely the fact that China is there."

New Zealand Foreign Minister, Keith Holyoke: "Nothing is more essential to the maintenance of peace than a recognition that so-called wars of national "liberation" must be successfully challenged. . . . Vietnam is a small nation, New Zealand is much smaller. And we have a particular interest to protect the right of all nations, however small, to work out their future free from the threat of aggresion and conquest."

Armed Forces Daily, Indonesia, October 24, 1967: "Regardless of one's views on the war, it is evident that U.S. forces in Vietnam are both a deterrent to communist attack and a shield against Communist expansion in Southeast Asia. If U.S. forces are withdrawn to Australia, it would be very easy for the Chinese communists to continue their aggression and expansion to the south."

Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand: "Let us smaller and weaker nations

candidly face the facts and realize that the imminent dangers which may descend upon our nations are less likely to come from nuclear deployment—although that can never be ruled out—than from combinations of military and political ventures which their proponents euphemistically call "wars of national liberation," and which, for all intents and purposes, are hardly different from the one which Adolf Hitler launched against the Sudetenland nearly thirty years ago. Such undertakings nowadays may be more insidious but no less lethal to our free and healthy existence. . . .

"North Vietnam and its supporters in the communist world, as well as its Vietcong agents in South Vietnam, wanted the outside world to believe that the war of conquest they have been waging for many years against the small and independent country of South Vietnam is a genuine national uprising or, to use their current terminology, a 'war of national liberation.'"

"This travesty of the truth has convinced neither the South Vietnamese people nor those who live near the scene of the crime and who are directly or otherwise suffering from its nefarious consequences. Only those who are farther away whose minds are less perceptive of the existing realities, and those who are always liberal with other people's freedom or are prompted by less than altruistic reasons, allow themselves to fall victims of this crude propaganda.

"But if questions as to what they think of the conflict in Vietnam are directed to those Asians who have their feet firmly on the ground and whose vision has not been clouded by the outlandish ideology of the frustrated author of 'Das Kapital,' they would reply in unison that it is in effect an old-styled colonial conquest with only a few renovated outward trimmings. . . ."

Mr. K. K. Sinha, director, Political and Social Studies Institute, Calcutta: "You cannot help being involved; you are involved, whether you like it or not. Your present indifference is a factor favoring one side in the battle. So don't imagine that by your silence you can escape.

"I have gone through much of the literature on Vietnam and more is coming out. One thing I am already convinced of and that is that this struggle is local as well as universal. Its final result will be crucial both for that small country—flapping like a small side-pocket for coins in the jacket of a continent—as well as for the continent and the world. Vietnam is a world issue indeed."

EXHIBIT G

A SECOND GRAVE OF DEAD CIVILIANS FOUND NEAR HUE

The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Monday, April 7, 1969:

"DA NANG, SOUTH VIETNAM (AP).—A second mass grave containing bodies of men and women executed by Communist troops during the 1968 Tet offensive was found near Hue today.

"Workers exhumed 20 bodies and are continuing to open the grave 10 miles east of Hue during the remainder of the week.

"Twelve days ago, a Vietnamese soldier on patrol tripped across a wire binding the hands of a buried man. As they uncovered that body, the authorities found the first mass grave and in the following days removed 134 bodies.

"That area was about 12 miles southeast of Hue. The new gravesite is three miles north of the first one.

"We have no idea how many bodies we will find in this new gravesite," said one U.S. advisor. He added that Vietnamese soldiers patrolling the area also are checking reports of additional gravesites."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, tomorrow we will have a chance to complete the business we began here last week—approval of the orderly, prudent, limited expansion into phase II of the Safeguard ABM system.

We can complete this approval by defeating the pending amendment introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Today, I want to explain some of my reasons for opposing the Brooke amendment.

I am frank to admit that it is not entirely clear to me what the proponents of this amendment intend it to do. But I am satisfied that, regardless of the intentions of the proponents, it will work in one of the following two ways. On the one hand, it may enable us to have less defense than the phase II proposal will give but at the full cost of the phase II proposal. On the other hand, it may enable us to have the same amount of defense as the phase II proposal would give, but at a greatly increased cost.

I am inclined to think that the real effect of the pending amendment would be the former—less defense for the same amount of money. Let me explain.

It is particularly difficult to interpret the effect that the Brooke amendment would have on the Safeguard deployment configuration. I think the most likely intention of the amendment is to approximate modified phase II in adding one more Safeguard site to be paid for by the proposed funding. Where this amendment works a significant revision of the proposal worked out by the Armed Services Committee is in requiring that the additional site be located somewhere in the Minuteman fields, either near Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., or near Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., that is, the significant effect of the Brooke amendment would be in preventing the proposed funds from being used for one of the purposes for which they are proposed—for a site in the area of Whiteman Air Force Base, Miss.

Mr. President, this significant revision is unwise and unacceptable for two reasons. First, it reduces the defense effectiveness that will be purchased with the proposed funds—funds which the pending amendment does not seek to reduce. Second, this revision would guarantee that we would face severe deployment schedule delays as we expand our interceptor force to counter the increase in Soviet offensive capability.

I want to consider these matters in reverse order, which is in the order of ascending importance.

First, consider the effect on deployment schedules.

If this amendment is adopted, then regardless which of the two phase I site areas is selected to receive the additional site, there will be severe deployment delays since the increasing Soviet offensive capability makes it imperative for us to expand to a site beyond the Grand Forks and Malmstrom fields—as provided for by the unamended phase II proposal.

Consider these facts. If we proceed with the unamended phase II proposal, the Whiteman site will be operational by mid-1975. But, if the proposed amendment is accepted, thereby denying permission to begin work on the Whiteman site, there will be a minimum delay of 1 full year in making operational the third site, which was to have been at Whiteman but was instead improvised around the Grand Forks or Malmstrom Minuteman fields. The reason for this delay is clear.

During early planning for an ABM system, the four Minuteman fields near Grand Forks, Malmstrom, Whiteman, and Warren Air Force Bases were determined to be most suitable for defense. Thus preliminary surveys were conducted to determine how to tailor the defense of each field. Separate surveys were needed for each field because the geographical configurations of these fields vary.

As a result of these crucial surveys, an optimum defense was tailored for each field. If this proposed amendment passes, thereby mandating the expenditure of funds for a hitherto unthought of second defense site at either Grand Forks or Malmstrom, then some hasty improvising will be required. But there are limits to how hasty it could be; that is, it will take 4 months to do the kind of survey and detailed analysis which has already been done for the Whiteman site. In addition, climatic conditions in North Dakota or Montana will cause an additional 8-month delay over the projected construction timetable for the Whiteman site. Thus there will be a 12-month deployment delay resulting from construction problems, and from the need for expensive new surveys and analyses which will be needed as a result of scrapping the Whiteman program for which expensive surveys and analyses have already been done.

Now consider the way the amendment's revision would damage defense effectiveness.

A second site at one of the phase I locations will effect two kinds of reductions in our capability to defend Minutemen: First, because of the shape of the Minuteman fields as just described, the number of Minuteman silos that could be protected by a third site at Grand Forks or Malmstrom would be a maximum of about 70 percent of the number that will be protected by the proposed site at Whiteman; second, for an equal cost program, fewer interceptors could be deployed effectively with the third site at Grand Forks or Malmstrom. This further reduction would limit the number of interceptors at Grand Forks or

Malmstrom to about 35 percent of the interceptors planned for the Whiteman site. This would be caused primarily by the necessity to compensate for the program stretchout costs resulting from the delayed availability of a third site at Grand Forks or Malmstrom.

Mr. President, there is a final consideration which we should consider in evaluating the effect of the Brooke amendment on our defense capability. This consideration is the definite reduction in the protection that can be provided to our other land-based deterrent—our strategic bomber force. The modified phase II defense of Minuteman also can provide protection for 15 to 20 percent of the strategic bomber force bases. But if defense of Minuteman is confined to Grand Forks and Malmstrom we will only be able to protect about 5 percent of the strategic bomber bases.

Once again we must bear in mind that the pending amendment does not propose to reduce funding. Therefore, once again we must emphasize that this amendment will purchase less defense for our money.

Mr. President, the reasons I have outlined are among the most important reasons for rejecting the proposed amendment. They all call attention to the fact that this amendment proposes a revision in an extremely complex technical program. This program has been carefully designed by numerous specialists and has been the subject of long and intensive hearing in the Senate.

This amendment has not been the subject of hearings. It would effect a precipitate, ill-considered, inefficient, costly, wasteful, and perhaps very dangerous improvisation in a matter of the utmost complexity. This is why the proposed amendment should be defeated.

Mr. President, before closing today, I would like to take issue with two points made by the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), when he announced his support for the Brooke amendment. Senators will find the Senator's statement on page 28690 of the RECORD for August 13.

The Senator said this:

> The amendment leaves intact every dollar recommended by the committee for work on ABM. It authorizes precisely the same rate of production on ABM components. It provides accordingly the full momentum of an on-going ABM program, and of a growing capability to expand the systems deployment should the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks fail.

Mr. President, I want to take issue with this statement on two grounds:

First, as I have argued today, the proposed amendment would only guarantee the spending momentum of ABM without guaranteeing the capability momentum. I have to think, Mr. President, that this fact will be clear to the Soviet military experts, including those who are advising the Soviet negotiators at SALT.

Second, the distinguished Senator is misunderstanding the prerequisite for making our ABM system useful to our SALT negotiators. That is, he suggests that we need only be able to manufacture the hardware for ABM, and not that we be continuing to deploy our defensive interceptors at a rate responsive to their deployment of offensive missiles. Of course, this is not true.

Mr. President, there is one other point I want to raise concerning the distinguished Senator's statement. He suggests that the Brooke amendment will be useful for "defense in depth" with Safeguard components, and that this program has the backing of "a number of experts." He does not tell us who these experts are and I can find no testimony, expert or otherwise, in the record of the hearings that supports this plan for what he terms "defense in depth" with Safeguard components.

It is easy to understand why such support is lacking. This plan of "defense in depth" is only required when the enemy is targeting more than one reentry vehicle for each missile silo. Since we are not yet faced with anything like this, "defense in depth" would be a wasteful redundancy.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate with a lengthy speech at this point. But in anticipation of the vote tomorrow on the ABM, I believe it will be helpful to my colleagues to have in the RECORD a statement developing the technical arguments in favor of "defense in depth."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a study, plus an editorial in today's New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TECHNICAL ADVANTAGES OF DEFENSE IN DEPTH UNDER AMENDMENT 821

The technical arguments for the Brooke amendment derive from the fact that the planned Safeguard defense of Minuteman sites is grossly inadequate in two respects: the radars are vulnerable and the number of Sprint interceptors is severely limited. If the Brooke approach is adopted, money not used for defense of Whiteman (and later Warren) Air Force Base could be used to accelerate work on a dedicated hard point defense (an option not discussed further here), or to strengthen the planned defenses at Malmstrom and Grand Forks. This can be done either by buying more Sprints and an extra Missile Site Radar or by buying many more Sprints and foregoing the extra radar.

If the former approach were adopted, it would be possible to have two radars at Malmstrom. If they were properly sited; i.e. far enough apart so that they both could not be destroyed by a single nuclear burst, yet close enough together so that either could control most of the Sprint interceptors at the base, there would be substantial advantage for the defense against heavy attacks. To negate the defense, the attacker would have to destroy *both* radars. The defense need defend only one. Thus, in effect, the defense would have to intercept only ½ of the warheads the attacker might deliver against the radars.

If radars were cheap, it would obviously be advantageous to have several at each base to be defended. However, since MSRs cost about $190 million each (including data processing systems), using two radars at Malmstrom implies buying many fewer Sprints. Thus, it is not obvious that one should deploy two radars for Malmstrom or buy more Sprints. It depends on the weight of the hypothesized attack.

To illustrate these points some simplified calculations have been made and the results are shown in Table I. The calculations are based on the following assumptions:

1. If the deployment recommended by the Armed Services Committee is pursued, the number of Sprints at Grand Forks, Malmstrom and Whiteman Air Force Bases will in each case be sufficient to intercept 60 arriving Soviet warheads.

2. Each Soviet arriving warhead is assumed to have a 100% probability of destroying its target, be it an MSR or a Minuteman missile. (A retargeting capability for Soviet ICBMs is implied in this arrangement.)

3. The effective radius of the Sprint missile is such that 100 Minuteman silos can be defended at each base if only a single MSR is used.

4. If the Spartans for Whiteman are not bought, it will be possible to buy enough additional Sprints to accomplish 50 additional intercepts.

5. If the MSR for Whiteman is not bought, it will be possible to buy Sprints to accomplish 80 additional intercepts.

TABLE I

	Minutemen surviving the arrival of N soviet warheads. N equals—				Number of arriving warheads to destroy all Minutemen
	700	800	1,000	1,200	
Case I: Defense of 3 bases (committee recommendation)	300	260	120	0	1,180
Options Under Brooke amendment:					
Case II: Defense of 2 bases, 1 MSR at each, plus added interceptors	300	200	155	100	1,310
Case III: Defense of 2 bases, 1 MSR at Grand Forks, 2 widely separated MSR's, at Malmstrom, plus added interceptors	300	277	153	30	1,230
Case IV: Defense of 2 bases, 1 MSR at Grand Forks, 2 closely spaced MSR's at Malmstrom, plus added interceptors	300	200	100	100	1,400

The intercept capabilities assumed are, of course, only approximate since the number of Sprints to be deployed at each base is not public and since kill probability against adversary warheads is unknown. However, the assumptions in this regard and also as regards tradeoffs between Sprints, Spartans and MSRs seem consistent with cost figures given by the Defense Department and assumptions used by them in analyses they have made.

Case I of Table I is for the deployment advocated by the Committee. The other three cases are all consistent with the Brooke proposal. They assume that the same level of funds as proposed for the Whiteman deployment is available to reinforce the defense at the first two sites. A number of observations can be made.

At the lowest attack level indicated, the same number of Minutemen (300) survive regardless of the defense. This is because the defense is irrelevant at these low attack levels. 700 Minutemen are undefended (by Sprints) in all cases. Therefor, if the Soviet Union could deliver only 700 warheads, it would presumably limit the attack to undefended Minutemen.

If the money saved from foregoing the Whiteman deployments were expended entirely for Sprints (case 2), it is seen that the defense is not as effective as that recommended by the Armed Services Committee against 800 delivered Soviet warheads, but *it is considerably better than the deployment recommended by the Committee if the Soviets can deliver 1000 warheads or more.*

Under these assumptions, if two MSRs are deployed at Malmstrom and if they are widely separated (case 3) so that essentially all of the Minutemen at that base are defended (instead of only half as would be the case with only 1 MSR per base), the number of Minutemen surviving is larger than with the Committee's recommended deployment at all attack levels (except, of course, at low levels where it is the same).

If 2 MSRs are deployed at Malmstrom and are sited so that each can control all the interceptors at its base (case 4), the number of surviving Minutemans is relatively low if the number of arriving Soviet warheads is 800–1000, but relatively high for heavier attacks. In this case the Soviets would have to deliver some 1400 warheads to destroy the Minuteman force, while only 1180 would be required if the system were spread more thinly at 3 bases.

The preferred outcomes for each Soviet attack level are indicated by underscoring. It is seen that deployment 3 is superior or at least as good as the Committee proposal at all levels of attack and that *deployment 4 is the preferred deployment for the heavier Soviet attack.* To repeat, these deployment options assume the same dollar level for all cases, including the Committee proposal.

The calculations are, of course, inexact because the actual numbers of Sprints are not public knowledge and other assumptions are open to some question.

In particular, the assumptions made regarding both Sprint and Soviet ICBM effectiveness, although consistent with those generally used by the Administration, are probably optimistic. Moreover, tactics other than simply exhausting U.S. Sprints, e.g. an attack based on saturating the U.S. defense capability, an attack based on a Soviet warhead leaking through the defenses, or an attack based on blackout bursts at successively lower levels might be used by the USSR.

However, different assumptions regarding numbers of Sprints, their effectiveness, or Soviet effectiveness and tactics could not change the general conclusion: *Defense in depth, as allowed by the Brooke approach, could provide a more effective defense of Minuteman than the Committee approach against a heavy Soviet attack and at least as good a defense against low levels of attack.*

A similar analysis has been made assuming, on the one hand, that under the Armed Services approach, Warren as well as Whiteman Air Force Base would be defended; and on the other, that with the Brooke approach the money for *both* Whiteman and Warren would be diverted to strengthening the two northern base defenses. The conclusions are qualitatively the same. *The Brooke approach provides a better defense at high levels of attack and at least as good a defense at low levels.*

SALT AND THE SENATE

From its origins in the Johnson Administration, the Safeguard ABM system has been a missile in search of a mission. The public rationale for anti-ballistic missile defense has been chosen, and repeatedly altered, in terms of what makes the best sales pitch to Congress.

This summer's curious rationale, just repeated at a White House press briefing in New Orleans, is that Safeguard expansion is the only way to get Russia to accept both a unilateral limitation of offensive SS–9 missiles and a mutual limitation of defensive ABM's at a low or zero level.

The immediate Presidential objective is to defeat in tomorrow's Senate vote the Brooke amendment, which seeks to suspend expansion of the Safeguard system beyond the two sites approved by a 50-to-50 tie vote last year. But the slight progress reported from Vienna in the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT), which have just adjourned until November, hardly bears out the Administration case.

Neither Safeguard, nor the deployment of multiple warhead MIRV missiles, nor any of the other measures explained as aiding "negotiations from strength," has hastened the still-lacking Soviet counterproposals needed to advance the SALT negotiations. But they probably have hastened countermeasures in Soviet weaponry, a likelihood that challenges the value of expanding Safeguard at this point as a supposed "bargaining chip" for SALT.

The Administration has defended its decision to seek a limited rather than a comprehensive halt in the nuclear missile race on the grounds that it would be better to halt expansion now of those weapons that can be halted easily in the growing nuclear arsenals of the two superpowers and to take up more difficult issues in a later phase of the talks.

The same argument was made, unfortunately, in 1963 for going ahead with a limited Soviet-American ban on testing nuclear warheads. Instead of accepting Premier Khrushchev's offer of two or three inspections a year to permit a comprehensive ban, including underground explosions, it was argued that continuous negotiations would achieve a comprehensive test ban later.

History has shown (1) that the proposal of two or three inspections a year, then seemingly few and risky, would arouse far less concern today, now that detection methods have improved; (2) that underground testing has permitted the weapons race to proceed at full speed, giving the world ABM and MIRV, which a comprehensive ban probably would have headed off; and (3) most important, that the limited test ban, by quieting world protest, has made it virtually impossible to achieve a comprehensive ban.

Whether a comprehensive rather than a limited halt in the missile race can still be achieved in the SALT talks now depends primarily on Moscow and the United States Congress.

If the Soviet Union really wants to halt the missile race and insists, in its counterproposals next fall, on banning MIRV and ABM, it is doubtful that the Nixon Administration can continue to demand on-site inspection and the other conditions it has advanced that make a comprehensive agreement impossible.

If the Senate still wants the comprehensive mutual halt in missile deployment it proposed by overwhelming vote last spring, it can begin to put teeth in its resolution by voting the Brooke amendment this week.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MURPHY TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, at the conclusion of the 1 hour set aside under the special order for tomorrow, under which the able majority leader and the able minority leader would be recognized, that the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McGOVERN TOMORROW MORNING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the disposition of the reading of the Journal of proceedings on tomorrow morning, the able Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes, with the understanding that the pending question on the unfinished business, the amendment offered by the able Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), then be laid before the Senate at 10 tomorrow morning, and with the further understanding that the control of the time and the time for voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) as agreed to yesterday still stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 19, 1970, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 18, 1970:

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for terms of 4 years from August 3, 1970:

James Chipman Fletcher, of Utah, vice Alfred Robert Zipf, term expired.

John Phillip McGovern, of Texas, vice Dr. Kathryn M. Smith, term expired.

INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Social Development Institute for the terms indicated (new positions):

FOR A TERM OF 2 YEARS

Luis A. Ferre, of Puerto Rico.
John A. Hannah, of Michigan.

FOR A TERM OF 4 YEARS

John Richardson, Jr., of Virginia.
Charles W. Robinson, of California.

FOR A TERM OF 6 YEARS

Augustin S. Hart, Jr., of Illinois.
George Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.
Charles A. Meyer, of Pennsylvania.