

SENATE—Wednesday, November 18, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

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

O Thou Living Lord of Life, wilt Thou cross the threshold of our inner lives and abide with us, not only in the morning hour, but through every moment of this day. Make us honest enough to bear the vision of the truth wherever it may lead us. Spare us from any compromise with principle and from the expediency which wounds the soul and shrivels the character. In tense moments make us fit to live with. By the presence of Thy spirit enable us to contend without being contentious, to disagree without being disagreeable, to persevere without discouragement, and in all our ways to honor Thee. And when the day is done may we have the rest of those at peace with Thee and all mankind.

Bless this Nation and make it a blessing for furthering Thy kingdom of righteousness, justice, and love throughout the whole world.

In the Redeemer's name. 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 (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., November 18, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the period for the transaction of routine morning business today be limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

INTERESTING LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it may not be unusual that a Senator now and then receives a demand from a constituent that he resign. I assume some of the colleagues in the Senate Chamber at this time have received such a letter now and then from some crackpot in their States. I do not think my State of Ohio has a monopoly on crackbrain extremists and nuts.

The other day, Mr. President, I received an interesting letter from an Ohio constituent demanding that I immediately resign as Senator in order to permit Governor Rhodes to appoint Representative ROBERT TAFT, JR., Senator-elect, to take my place. No, the writer of that demand is not a crackpot, and could not be referred to as a crackpot, although his intelligence could be questioned. He is the majority floor leader of the Ohio House of Representatives. This fellow's name is Robert E. Levitt. Whether he is a crackbrain or not and lacking in intelligence, I leave to you to judge. I have misgivings about him.

His letter was interesting. In fact, he was so proud of it he released the contents to newspapermen. I was not surprised when I received the letter a few days later.

Robert E. Levitt, Canton, Ohio, Republican, wrote me as follows:

STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: I strongly urge your immediate resignation from the United States Senate.

This step would have a significant beneficial impact on the people of Ohio. First of all, it would permit the appointment of Senator-elect Robert Taft, Jr., and he could then acquire important Senate seniority over other newly elected first-term members of the Senate. This would be a real service to Ohio in terms of advantages accruing to Mr. Taft in securing more desirable committee appointments, etc.

A personal advantage in your resignation would be that you would no longer have any obligation to represent the people of Ohio in the United States Senate and, if you chose, would be free to continue your senile meddling and ill-advised, intemperate and inaccurate statements with respect to the unfortunate disturbances at Kent State University in May, 1970.

Your favorable consideration of this request would be the zenith in your public career and would be long and favorably remembered by the people of Ohio.

Yours truly,

ROBERT E. LEVITT.

Mr. President, it has been the rule in my Senate office for nearly 12 years to answer all letters from constituents, even those such as this from crackpots, nuts, and pipsqueaks. Therefore, I answered this fellow's letter. Mr. President, my letter to him is as follows:

Mr. ROBERT E. LEVITT,
Canton, Ohio

SIR: You are an ignorant jerk or a liar. Which is it? You wrote me a most insulting letter, of course giving it to the newspapers so you could read your name in print. You would be too cowardly to call me a senile meddler to my face else you might lose your false teeth. Furthermore, you are a liar in charging I made intemperate and inaccurate statements that guardsmen committed murder at Kent State last May 4th. Vice President Agnew, who of course has access to all the evidence in the Justice Department stated in California that "murder was committed by national guard officers and men on the Kent State campus—not murder in the first degree—but murder."

I am told you are regarded as the backside of a jackass. Furthermore, you are a silly ass in urging I resign from the U.S. Senate to permit Governor Rhodes to appoint Congressman Robert Taft, Jr. as Senator. Ohio voters determined six years ago they wanted me in the Senate instead of Taft. I will serve Ohio citizens with the same fidelity and zeal and vote in accord with my judgment and conscience right up to next January 4th just as I have for nearly 12 years. It would be unthinkable for me to render the disservice of resigning simply to permit Congressman Taft, Jr. to take over.

STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator.

A STRANGE ANIMAL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a constituent in Massachusetts last week was amazed to see washed up on the shore a strange animal, without surviving head, somewhat desiccated, long haired, with a body like a camel, and without legs—a very strange animal, indeed. It has not yet been fully identified.

I suggest that the proper name for this animal would be "extra session."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I be recognized for another 3 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN). The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

MURDER AT KENT STATE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, that special Portage County grand jury directed by Seabury Ford, Republican executive committee chairman of Portage County, and Robert Balyeat, special counsel to the Republican attorney general, handpicked by Governor Rhodes to direct proceedings of a special grand jury convened by these two and Robert Kane, Republican county prose-

cutor, reported as expected whitewashing the National Guardsmen. President White of Kent State University had not asked Governor Rhodes to send guardsmen onto the campus of Kent State. He did not want them there. He was shocked later when he knew their guns were loaded with live ammunition.

These friends of Governor Rhodes withheld from grand jurors the conclusions of 100 FBI agents. Also withheld from these special county grand jurors were the conclusions of seven investigative reporters released for publication following 2 weeks intensive investigation that murder was committed by guardsmen. In fact, Seabury Ford stated publicly following release of the Portage County grand jury report whitewashing the National Guardsmen and reporting they shot in self-defense. "The National Guardsmen should have shot all the troublemakers."

Mr. President, Seabury Ford and his associates made one surprising omission in the grand jury report. They failed to return four indictments naming four students, two girls and two boys, who were shot to death. The facts are that on Monday, May 4, not one National Guardsman required even first aid treatment and not one was injured except from their own tear gas. One guardsman fainted and another had a heart attack. Of four students killed and nine seriously wounded by National Guard gunfire, two were hit in front at a distance of from 50 to 150 feet and all others were hit by bullets striking in the side or back and at distances from 150 to 750 feet.

Dean Kahler whose ambition was to be a football coach was struck in the back. He will be in a wheelchair as long as he lives, paralyzed from the waist down. He was 300 feet from the frontline of National Guardsmen.

Allison Krause, a sweet, gentle girl, who on Sunday said hello to a National Guardsman slipped a flower into the trigger housing of his rifle, saying, "Flowers are better than bullets." Allison was a gentle, loving, beautiful, and happy girl, sometimes carried a little kitten and sat with it on the campus. She was 110 yards from the frontline of the guardsmen.

Robert Stamps of Cleveland, 609 feet distant from the frontline of guardsmen—twice the length of a football field—was shot in the back, the rifle bullet missing his spinal column by 1 inch and exiting in front.

Joseph Lewis, the closest to the frontline of guardsmen, made an obscene gesture toward a National Guardsman at a distance of 60 feet from the frontline of the guardsmen.

Jeffrey Miller, 85 yards to the frontline of the guardsmen, was shot and killed. Sandy Scheuer, 110 yards distant, was shot and killed. William Schroeder was facing away from the guardsmen when he was killed.

Not one of the students killed or wounded was a radical. Not one had participated in any violence in Kent at any time during the preceding week and not one resorted to violence that Monday morning.

The President's Commission on Campus Unrest, concluding its report, stated:

The indiscriminate firing of rifles into a crowd of students and the deaths that followed were unnecessary, unwarranted, and inexcusable.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. 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. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD OFFER EXCHANGE OF 36,000 PRISONERS OF WAR IN RETURN FOR 1,000 AMERICAN PRISONERS HELD IN NORTH AND SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in all the wars in the history of our Republic never have we had such an abominable system as "body count." This was concocted some years ago in the course of the undeclared war which we were then waging in Vietnam and which has now been expanded to fighting in Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. It is now even referred to by Pentagon leaders as the Indochinese war. Regardless of what this war is termed, it is an undeclared war. It is an immoral war in a land 10,000 miles from home, of no importance whatever to the United States. It is the most unpopular and the longest war ever waged in the Nation's history. With the exception of World War II, it is the most costly war in the loss of priceless American lives.

At this time, we believe that approximately 1,000 American fighting men, most of them officers in our Air Force, are prisoners of war. Most were known to have been shot down over North Vietnam and over the Gulf of Tonkin or South China Sea. Information from the Red Cross reveals that approximately 459 prisoners of war are held either by the Vietcong, or forces of the National Liberation Front, in South Vietnam or are held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam. We know only the names of these men. We know little of their health or treatment. The additional 500, reported as missing in action, are presumed prisoners of war. It is hoped and believed that practically all of them are prisoners of war. Some few may have been killed when their planes were shot down, but there is real hope that most are prisoners of war.

I have no means of knowing how many of the 36,000 Vietcong and North Vietnamese held as prisoners by the friendly forces of South Vietnam are officers. Probably relatively few are in fact officers. It is sad to relate that the South Vietnamese armed forces usually torture prisoners of war turned over to them by American GI's. We know from pictures

on our screens that invariably Vietcong taken prisoners are immediately tortured by the South Vietnamese, sometimes even murdered. Americans witnessed on their television screens Ky's henchman General Loan, now a high official in the Saigon militarist regime, manacle a Vietcong officer, violating the Geneva regulations, and then murder him. Loan emptied his revolver into the prisoner, immediately after the unfortunate soldier was turned over to him by the Americans.

It is an unfortunate policy that prisoners taken by our GI's are turned over to ARVN forces who do very little fighting but invariably torture or murder prisoners of war.

Veterans of World War II never beheld a German prisoner of war hooded with his hands manacled behind him as is common practice with captured Vietcong or North Vietnamese. We should by all means offer to exchange all these 36,000 prisoners of war for the 1,000 Americans. This operation, of course, should be handled entirely by the International Red Cross and in accord with the Geneva rules, to which we are a signatory, pertaining to the humane treatment of prisoners of war.

Here is one proposal which might be accepted, as the Pentagon claims the Vietcong are suffering a shortage of manpower due to heavy losses. Unfortunately, this would be a slow process. There is one quick answer to our involvement in this undeclared war and to the return of our missing soldiers. This would be to end our involvement in the brutal, immoral Southeast Asia war immediately and then bring the boys home in the same manner they were sent there, in ships and planes, and at the same time welcome the return of all Americans who have been held as prisoners of war.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. 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.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY TO PLAY "GAME OF THE YEAR"

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on Saturday, November 21st, in Columbus, Ohio, the University of Michigan's football team is scheduled to engage a football team from Ohio.

The University of Michigan and Ohio State University will play the most important collegiate football game of the 1970 season. People from the great State of Ohio remember well a year ago when

the Buckeyes proved to be no match for the mighty Wolverines of Michigan. The University of Michigan victory—a convincing 24 to 12 decision—rocked the partisans of Ohio State.

Throughout the past year, Buckeye fans have been waiting for this rematch. In fact, winning this game seems to have become an obsession. Press reports indicate that Ohio State has been preparing for this game since the day after last year's defeat. But let me say, that neither threats in the press nor an aroused Ohio citizenry can intimidate this great Michigan team. On behalf of Coach Bo Schembechler's Wolverines, let me say that Michigan will indeed show up for the game this Saturday.

A national television audience will also witness this classic. I have full confidence that when it is over, the world will know that the mighty Wolverines are the superior team, worthy of number one national rank.

My judgment, however, has been disputed by the distinguished junior Senator—and soon to be senior Senator—from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE).

The good Senator—perhaps more out of loyalty than keen insight—because he is an Ohio State alumnus—has even gone so far as to make a gentlemanly wager on the outcome of the contest.

Mr. President, the wager is this:

If, by some twist of fate, Ohio State should emerge the winner, I have agreed to present my good friend from Ohio with a fish. Not just an ordinary fish, mind you, but a Coho Salmon, which has quickened the heartbeat of many an angler in Michigan and is a most tempting meal fit for a king—not to mention a distinguished son from Ohio.

On the other hand, Mr. President, if Michigan wins on Saturday, the Senator from Ohio will present the junior Senator from Michigan with a glass container of one of Scotland's most famous products, which will be ensconced at the bottom of a bushel basket teeming with Buckeyes.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that following Saturday's game the squirrels on the Capitol grounds will be well fed this winter.

And so on Saturday, Mr. President, Michigan fans the world over will be singing with great gusto, Hail to the Victors.

LIMITATION ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, last night on station WTOP, at 10 o'clock, there was presented probably one of the most comprehensive editorial statements yet made in regard to the political broadcast bill.

Although I might say, Mr. President, that while I do not totally agree with all of the statements and proposals made on the program last night, I feel it is important, in regard to the reckless action of the Senate in picking on one medium as opposed to an overall campaign reform bill that can really get the job done. I have obtained a copy of the

script, entitled "Money and Morality and Politics."

I should like to read the first three or four paragraphs, Mr. President:

Has television become a menace to the American political system?

Growing numbers of people seem to think so. Particularly among the press and among politicians, there's a clamor to curb and restrain broadcast stations, in the dreamy hope that this somehow will make the body politic well again.

The hue-and-cry in some instances borders on hysteria. TV and radio are being caricatured as little black boxes spouting venom and smear and pap on behalf of candidates for public office. The real focus ought to be on those *politicians* who deal in venom and smear and pap when they get on the air.

Television, in particular, is being characterized as a money-hungry machine which enriches itself during the election season, and which singlehandedly is inflating the costs of campaigning beyond the reach of the ordinary candidate. That's poppycock.

Money—and its potentially corrupting influence—is very much a problem in American politics. But the problem neither begins nor ends with television.

We at Post-Newsweek Stations are appalled at the reckless and dangerous exaggerations which are flying about.

All media—and that includes broadcasting—have some unmet obligations in the handling of elections.

But while Congress and rival media have been on the warpath to put broadcasters down, there has been much winking at the real issues of money and morality which are undermining our political system.

Many newspapers have sanctimoniously cheered Congress on with its anti-broadcasting legislation. But most newspapers have a long way to go to meet their obligations to the American electorate.

There is a sickness in politics, but TV and radio haven't caused it.

It goes on, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the entire script be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MONEY AND MORALITY AND POLITICS

(An editorial statement by WTOP-TV, written and narrated by Norman Davis, executive producer, Ray Hubbard, produced by Post-Newsweek stations)

NORMAN DAVIS. Has television become a menace to the American political system?

Growing numbers of people seem to think so. Particularly among the press and among politicians, there's a clamor to curb and restrain broadcast stations, in the dreamy hope that this somehow will make the body politic well again.

The hue-and-cry in some instances borders on hysteria. TV and radio are being caricatured as little black boxes spouting venom and smear and pap on behalf of candidates for public office. The real focus ought to be on those *politicians* who deal in venom and smear and pap when they get on the air.

Television, in particular, is being characterized as a money-hungry machine which enriches itself during the election season, and which singlehandedly is inflating the costs of campaigning beyond the reach of the ordinary candidate. That's poppycock.

Money—and its potentially corrupting influence—is very much a problem in American politics. But the problem neither begins nor ends with television.

We at Post-Newsweek Stations are appalled at the reckless and dangerous exaggerations which are flying about.

All media—and that includes broadcasting—have some unmet obligations in the handling of elections.

But while Congress and rival media have been on the warpath to put broadcasters down, there has been much winking at the real issues of money and morality which are undermining our political system.

Many newspapers have sanctimoniously cheered Congress on with its anti-broadcasting legislation. But most newspapers have a long way to go to meet their obligations to the American electorate.

There is a sickness in politics, but TV and radio haven't caused it. In the next half-hour, we'll attempt to show you what has.

The 1970 election season was a record-setter in almost every way. Time called it a "contest of bank accounts and artful contrivance," and in large measure that's what it was.

Never before had so many voters been wooed by so much money. Maybe forty or fifty million dollars in Congressional campaigns alone.

Never before had there been such massive merchandising of faces and philosophy. Showers of dollars bought slick brochures, computerized battleplans, helicopters, high-powered consultants, newspaper displays, telephone solicitation, bumper stickers, billboards, and much more.

Never before had television and radio been used so extensively. Because the campaign was more *visible* on television than anywhere else, it was for many only a short jump to conclude that whatever was cockeyed and distasteful in the campaign must have been the fault of television.

Television became the scapegoat in 1970.

Candidates flocked to television for one reason: it's far and away the most dynamic and personal way to get to the voters.

It's true that some candidates had more access to television than others—but don't stop there. Candidates with bulging money-bags had better access to *all* media than did those whose campaign treasures were small. This is a singularly important point: it was the availability of *money* which meant access to the voters—or the lack of access.

There's one stark truism about politics in the '70s: a fat bankroll can't guarantee victory, but you can't mount a major campaign without a big treasure-chest.

That's the issue on which Congress has turned its back.

It took big money to go for a seat in Congress in 1970. It took big money to defend a seat in Congress. A candidate in a contested House race had to have at least \$100,000 to compete. In Senate races, that figure goes up to \$250,000 as a minimum, even in small states.

In the big glamorous races, the figures were astronomical. Howard Metzenbaum in Ohio spent over a million dollars in an unsuccessful try for a Senate seat. In New York, Nelson Rockefeller was swept back into the governor's office on a tide of greenbacks that may have totalled six million dollars. The three-way Senate race in New York among Buckley, Ottinger, and Goodell consumed overall some five or six million dollars. It may have been more.

Candidates either inherited the money, earned it, or went begging for it. Scores of powerful, wealthy special interests were eager to provide it, and it can reasonably be assumed that big contributions very often came with strings attached.

Money—not television or radio—is a very serious danger to the American political system. Our notion of a free society will become a farce if candidates routinely can buy high public office—or can be bought on the way there.

Senator Thomas Eagleton has warned of what looms ahead: "government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich."

What has Congress done to enable the qualified citizen who isn't rich to have a crack at public office? Nothing.

Instead Congress whipped up and passed last September an anti-broadcasting bill. The legislation would set rigid limits on the amount of money candidates could spend on TV and radio. The bill said nothing about any other medium.

Such a law could not succeed in its intended goal of giving the poor candidate a break.

If a candidate has a bundle of money at his disposal and is restricted on his use of radio and TV, do you think for a minute that he'll save his money? Not a chance. He'll put every available nickel into billboards, newspapers, direct mail, vast computer systems, or anything else that will help get him elected. Where will that leave the candidate who isn't well-heeled? Out in the cold, where he is today.

There's another dangerous pitfall in the bill Congress has aimed at TV and radio. It would strike at and constrict the medium which is the most successful device ever known for getting political information to the public. Some of that information is trivial and banal, but no matter. In a free society, the individual citizen has to sort out the political wheat from the political chaff, and over the long run he seems to do it rather well.

Television contributes very substantially to that sorting-out process. The nation needs a greater flow of political information—not less. The bill approved by Congress doesn't do anything for political communication.

Fortunately, the bill was vetoed by the President in October. Unfortunately, there's talk now in Congress of attempting to override that veto.

The TV-radio bill was a mis-guided missile. What we need from Congress is a barrage of bills that will deal with the real money problems in politics. We have suggestions on how that can be done.

Proposal #1. Congress should write legislation that will deal with the overall money spent in political campaigns.

There really are only two basic remedies—either a ceiling on spending, or a floor beneath spending.

If a ceiling on all spending were imposed, it would say to candidates: you can spend your money any way you want, but you must not spend more than X dollars. A ceiling—toughly enforced—would mean that public office no longer would go to the highest bidder. Many are quick to argue that spending ceilings are unenforceable. We're ready to argue that Congress has never seriously tried the enforcement approach.

The principal alternative to a ceiling is a floor. That means that every serious candidate would be assured a money base from which to pursue a campaign. We're talking here about some form of public subsidy for campaigns.

This is not the place to examine the relative merits of spending ceilings or spending floors. But until Congress goes for one or the other, the rich candidates will continue to have the overwhelming advantage in politics.

It's well to point out that not only do wealthy contenders have advantages—incumbents do, too. People already in office have many forums and plenty of recognition. Those who challenge incumbents also need opportunities for recognition.

There's another way in which Congress can sharply diminish the influence of big money in politics.

Proposal #2. Congress should enact the strongest possible disclosure law for contributions and expenditures in political campaigns.

The present disclosure law is a wretched failure. It allows politicians to hide the sources of campaign money and the ways in which it is spent.

The persistent refusal of Congress to open to public view the ledgers of campaign finance is a monumental hypocrisy.

For Congress to point an accusing finger at television, while permitting the real truth, about political money to be concealed, is to introduce a red herring into a serious issue.

A disclosure law that really discloses will deter special interest groups from flooding key races with big money, because they'd be visible for the first time.

Not just any disclosure law will do. There are dozens lying around and most of them are made of fluff. The toughest bill drafted so far was the so-called Ashmore-Goodell bill of 1967. We call on Congress to write it into law.

There's another hidden way in which many Congressmen feather their own nests, and it ought to be halted.

Proposal #3. Congress ought to see to it that its members are prevented from using staff, offices, and communications facilities to promote their candidacies. The Twentieth Century Fund and other study groups have found flagrant abuses in this area. The advantages to incumbent Congressmen in such situations are enormous.

Proposal #4. Congress ought to provide for at least one free mailing for each legally-qualified candidate for Congress.

This might involve one 2-ounce letter to the equivalent of each registered voter in a House district or in the state for Senatorial candidates. It might be wise at the outset to limit the service to general elections.

A free mailing would give substantial aid to the poor candidate. It would cause barely a ripple in the U.S. Mail.

Proposal #5. Congress should amend the federal communications act at least to the extent of exempting candidates in major races from the provisions of Section 315.

Section 315 is a notorious provision which seriously hampers useful dialogue during political campaigns. It requires broadcasters who give air time to the major candidates in a race to give equal time to frivolous or splinter candidates, who may be many in number.

Most broadcasters would provide more exposure for the serious candidates if the law were amended. As the *Wall Street Journal* observed, "The best idea . . . would be to give television wide leeway to see what sort of job it could do."

The single TV-radio bill which is now in dispute cannot reduce the unfair advantage held by rich candidates. The proposals we have made for Congress can make politics much more fair.

The communications media in the United States, by and large, also are vulnerable on the matter of providing access for candidates to the voters.

Proposal #6. All media, we believe, should reduce charges to candidates across the board. That means all media—TV, radio, newspapers, billboards, direct mail, and all other. All media should voluntarily adopt substantial discounts for political advertising.

One of the glaring hypocrisies of the day is that many newspapers which have heaped praise on Congress for ordering spending limits on TV and radio make no meaningful contribution themselves toward the reduction of campaign costs.

The ten leading newspapers in the country in terms of circulation treat candidates, with very minor exceptions, like any other advertising clients.

That's inexcusable. All media should encourage political ads with worthwhile discounts.

Proposal #7. All media, we believe, should voluntarily provide some free services to candidates—beyond the usual business of covering the news.

By this we refer to free air time, free newspaper space, free billboard space, and so on. This free access should apply at least to candidates in major races, and at least in general elections.

Such policies would materially ease the financial squeeze on many candidates.

We think this is so important that national bodies such as the National Association of Broadcasters and the American Newspaper Publishers Association should write this commitment explicitly into their code, and blow the whistle on members who ignore it.

During the 1970 campaign, Post-Newsweek Stations engaged in some successful experimenting in this direction.

All of our stations—WTOP television and radio in Washington, WJXT in Jacksonville, WPLG-TV in Miami, and WCKY radio in Cincinnati—provided a 50% discount on all advertising rates across the board to political candidates.

In addition, all of our stations provided substantial free time to candidates in major races. It cost the candidates nothing at all and they did with the time as they wished.

The total value of the time given away outright—combined with the money saved for candidates through our discounts—was \$413,000. We think this very materially increased the opportunities for candidates in the communities we serve to reach the voters.

TV and radio have been unjustly blamed for the money problems in politics. Now, some also are trying to hold broadcasters accountable for the poor manners and bad taste of politicians—particularly that which shows up in political advertising. That's not fair, either.

Again, because politics is most visible on the television tube, many have assumed that TV stations are responsible for the political garbage which sometimes is produced.

Jack Gould, the radio-TV critic for the *New York Times*, put it this way:

"In (the) wretched spot announcements and the dismal prose of the campaign on TV there was no serious discussion of the overriding issues of the day. Rather, in many states there was mere invective, with innumerable candidates saying that, if elected, they had some magic formula for making good on promises."

Well, since when has campaigning been any different? How often in all of this country's history have candidates dealt with serious issues before any large audience?

If we can turn a phrase, the problem is not the medium—it's the message. The solution is not with television stations. The solution lies with politicians.

Some would like to deal with the glossy, superficial politics of 1970 by invoking censorship or other restraints on the media.

How soon will we demand, instead, more responsible and mature behavior by politicians?

The Federal Trade Commission has the role of assuring truth-in-advertising. We applaud that. We think candidates ought to give more respect to the principle of truth-in-political advertising.

Sometimes political ads get pretty rough. The smear was very much in evidence in the 1970 campaign.

(On film: ads from three campaigns in 1970.)

(1 minute montage of photos and such showing smear tactics in earlier times.)

What should be done about unfair and superficial campaign tactics? Is there any remedy for a blitz of television spot announcements?

These are tough questions, but one thing is for sure: We certainly want as little restraint as possible from the government on these things. The writers of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution intended it that way.

Freedom of speech, you see, applies to politicians quite as much as to any other citizens. Unless politicians—both in and out of office—have the freedom to attack vigorously and to criticize severely, those in power will become *entrenched* in power, and the free society will cease to exist.

The line between severe criticism and personal vilification is very thinly drawn—if you can find it.

The First Amendment *must* apply to politics to the fullest possible extent. If we have to suffer some fools along with the wise men, that's the risk built into a democratic society.

The ultimate judge of campaign morality is and must be the voter. The 1970 elections showed in some situations that voters reject excesses of money and extreme tactics in campaigns.

The best single remedy for foul play in elections is to take steps that will quicken the backlash.

Since 1954, there has existed a Fair Campaign Practices Committee—a private, non-profit, bipartisan group which serves as an *intermediary* when the political dirt flies. Here is the committee's Executive Director, Samuel Archibald.

The unfairness in those TV spots ought to be obvious. Some television political smears have become classic. Here are some from the 1950's and the 1960's.

On film: selection of ads from earlier campaigns.)

Foul play certainly isn't limited to political ads on television.

(Tydings ad.)

One of the most controversial ads of 1970 was this one. It appeared in scores of newspapers across the country, although a number of major market newspapers refused to publish it.

The target in this case was Maryland Senator Joseph Tydings. In slightly varied form, the same ad was used to attack other candidates. The thrust of the copy is an attempt to link Tydings with the statements and positions of others. It's a textbook case of guilt-by-association—a below-the-belt tactic which has no place in responsible politics. (Murphy ad.)

This ad, if anything, is even more evil because it's so coarsely done. It appeared in the Los Angeles Times on the Monday before election day. The text makes it rather clear that a vote for John Tunney for the Senate is a vote for anarchy. The advertisement is a gross distortion of the candidate's views and record. A more reckless political play on fear would be hard to find.

The political woods were full of half-truths, innuendos, and defamations in 1970. That's always been the case, however. The smear probably is as old as the spoken word. It certainly is as old as politics in America.

SAMUEL ARCHIBALD. The Fair Campaign Practices Committee doesn't make findings. It doesn't issue judgments. As a matter of fact, I don't think that any organization—a government organization or a private organization—should make judgments in this area. It's too much power to put in the hands of any group. The Committee just collects the facts from both sides when there is a complaint of violation of the Code of Fair Campaign Practices. It makes these facts available to the information media, and the information media writes a story about it, covering both sides, a comprehensive and objective story usually in the context of the Code of Fair Campaign Practices, and the voters make the judgment on election day.

This is an effective way, it works. Eighty-

four percent of the candidates who filed a valid complaint of violation with the Committee went on to win their races. I think that proves that this sort of a democratic system does work.

MR. DAVIS. For almost 200 years in this country, news media have filled a vital role as critics, judges, and irritants. News media have the key responsibility for challenging what politicians say in their political ads—and elsewhere. There are a number of steps which can be taken to curb abuses on the political stump.

Proposal No. 8. News media should aggressively support the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. In an election season, the committee's files are bulging with charges and replies on smear tactics. All media—newspapers in particular—should give these cases prominent display. Some brighter light turned on the committee's activities could make political morality a lively and continuing issue.

Proposal No. 9. We believe all news media have an affirmative duty to create *more* situations in which candidates *confront each other*. Candidates who decline to face their opponents deserve scorn and criticism. Confrontation is immensely valuable because it forces candidates to defend their statements and their actions.

TV and radio have managed this with debates and other formats. We need more of that. A few newspapers and news magazines devote many, many columns to confrontations between candidates. We need more of that.

The New York Times, for example, devoted three whole pages recently to the transcript of an interview with all candidates for Governor of New York. U.S. News & World Report long has made a practice of intensively grilling candidates and publishing the outcome.

Our Washington television station—WTOP-TV—recently devoted an entire evening of prime time to debates and confrontations among candidates for governor, Senator, Congressman, and other seats.

Proposal No. 10. We believe that *all* media should voluntarily adopt safeguards against the last-minute blitz in political advertising.

We believe it is quite proper to refuse to accept *any* political advertising during the last 48 hours of a campaign.

We believe that other reasonable rules can be drawn by the media that will prevent heavy, saturation advertising placements by individual candidates during the final week of a campaign.

We are reluctant to recommend more stringent steps at this point. But we make this prediction: unless politicians begin to exercise more responsibility and restraint in their political ads, the day will come when the public will demand that political advertising be limited to such essentials as name, age, and educational background.

In this special presentation, we have tried to emphasize that the responsibility for the excesses and the evils of campaigning rests not only with broadcast stations but with the political candidates who use them—not only with television spending, but with overall spending in campaigns.

We opposed vigorously the spending limits bill which Congress directed at radio and TV, but mere opposition is not enough and that's why we have outlined here some constructive alternatives.

The President also opposed the bill. It is incumbent on the President, we believe, to propose and to work for substantive reforms in our political process.

Our 10 proposals have room for improvement, but we believe they point the way. Here again, briefly, is what we recommend:

Congress must deal with the problem of *overall* spending in campaigns by dealing with the availability of money to candidates.

Congress should enact the toughest possible disclosure law for campaign finances. The Ashmore-Goode bill is a proper model. Hidden money in politics has the potential to corrupt, and that's why the public has a need to know exactly who is bankrolling each candidate.

Congress should bar its members from using their official staffs and official privileges for direct political gain.

Congress ought to provide for at least one free mailing for each legally qualified candidate for the House and Senate.

Congress should amend Sec. 315 of the federal communications act to encourage more TV and radio exposure for serious candidates.

All media should adopt voluntarily substantial discounts for political advertising.

All media should provide some free time or free space at least to candidates in major races.

All media should aggressively support and give wide, continuing coverage to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and its activities.

All media should create more situations in which candidates *confront* each other.

All media should adopt rules that will prevent the last-minute blitz in political advertising.

If there is a central responsibility for reform, it belongs in Congress.

The fateful question for American politics is this: will Congress *deal* with this issue... or will it override the Nixon veto on a platform of pious platitudes which are as self-serving as they are dangerous to the free flow of information?

Thank you, and good night.

MR. COOK. I might also say that on Monday of this week, the distinguished minority leader put into the RECORD a speech that I made at the annual meeting of the Kentucky Broadcasters Association in Lexington, Ky., in which I set forth some of the problems and inequities in this bill.

MR. PRESIDENT, I stated, for instance, that the State of New Jersey has no television stations at all. A candidate for the U.S. Senate in New Jersey to be allotted 7 cents per voter, based on the last election, puts him at the mercy of going into the two richest broadcasting areas in the world, New York and Philadelphia. When he spends his 7 cents per voter in those two areas, he loses 65 percent of his 7 cents, because 65 percent of the listening audience do not even live in the State of New Jersey.

The situation is hardly any better in my State. To run for office in the State of Kentucky, one must not only utilize the broadcast facilities within the State, but must also utilize television facilities in Cincinnati, Ohio, Evansville, Ind., Huntington and Charleston, W. Va., Knoxville, Tenn., Nashville, Tenn., and Cape Girardeau, Mo.

I also pointed out, Mr. President, that 54 Members of Congress had no election in November at all, and that their real election is the primary. Yet this bill gives to a primary challenger of a congressional candidate 3.5 cents a voter, or \$10,000, whichever is the greater. Yet, that is the true election, not the election in November. There are no equitable provisions in this bill to handle such a situation.

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

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator

from Kentucky may have an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

I also ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD, Mr. President, an article which was published in the Washington Post on November 5, 1970, entitled "Election Blurs Image of TV Image Makers," written by Bernard B. Nossiter, in which he sets forth the won-lost record of the five best known image makers.

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

ELECTION BLURS IMAGE OF TV IMAGE MAKERS
(By Bernard B. Nossiter)

A few weeks ago, David Garth, the high pressure maker of TV political images, gruffly told a visitor to his mod New York office:

"We'll know who the geniuses are on Nov. 4."

Yesterday, the answer was available. It came from one of his chastened colleagues who said:

"I don't think there are any geniuses."

A glance at the efforts of five of the most famous media advisers, the producers and packagers of television political commercials, bears out this modest view.

The five managed media efforts for 26 clients in state-wide races. Twelve were winners, 11 were losers, and the results are still not in for two cliff-hanging races involving three customers.

Charles Guggenheim, a low-keyed maker of documentaries and leading exponent of the unrehearsed commercial, summed it up.

"Some people in my field think they are kingmakers. That is exaggerated."

Ever since the best selling book by Joe McGinnis, "The Selling of the President 1968," a popular cult has grown up around the image makers. They have been glorified as contemporary Pygmallions, breathing life into political Galateas.

Ironically, the printed media—newspapers, news magazines and research organs—have broadcast the myth most strenuously; many politicians (perhaps excluding Lawton Chiles, the new Democratic Senator-elect in Florida) have swallowed it whole, and the commissions (15 per cent of the ads' cost) have come in a golden stream to the practitioners.

As it happened, the central figure in the McGinnis book, Harry Treleaven, had one of the unhappiest election nights last Tuesday. Four of his five Republican clients lost, including William C. Cramer, who may have spent nearly \$1 million on television in an unsuccessful effort to defeat Chiles.

A lesser hero in the McGinnis epic, Roger Ailes, did somewhat better. His REA Productions handled four clients, came up with two winners and has another, Richard Roudebush (R), hanging by his teeth in the Senate race in Indiana.

But in yesterday's aftermath, Ailes' brother Robert, vice president of REA Productions, was modest about all this. He is the man who said that no geniuses were crowned on election night and he continued:

"There are no races where media (management) made the big difference. The ones that were going to win in this election year won without any help. I can't see any campaign that was turned around because of the (TV) media."

Apart from Roudebush, the Ailes brothers also advised Francis Sargent, re-elected governor in Massachusetts; Thomas Meskill, the gubernatorial winner in Connecticut, and Jack Olson, who lost the governor's race in Wisconsin.

Robert Ailes said: "Sargent was ahead all

the way. Meskill was the right man in the right place at the right time. This same phenomenon worked against Jack Olson."

Guggenheim, adviser to four winning and three losing Democrats, endorsed this. "The results," he said, "underline my view. Where it (television) really has a dramatic effect is in a primary, where there's no opposition (television campaign) and little press coverage."

At least one professional, however, sees no need for beating his breast. Joseph Napolitan, who handled two winners, one loser and one in an undecided contest, says flatly:

"For the most part, the candidates would have done worse than they did" without professional media aides.

"I've been running campaigns for 14 years," he says. "I'd have to be pretty dumb not to absorb knowledge about what works and what doesn't. It's almost like feeding stuff into a computer to find out whether something is useful or not. A guy who does this all the time has an advantage over one who doesn't."

Napolitan explains away losers by saying, "The favorite very seldom comes to us."

What about his man Mandel, a favorite from start to finish in the Maryland Governor's race?

"We constructed a big campaign that kept (Sargent) Shriver from running," he replies.

In any case, none of these witnesses, agnostic or true believer, is abandoning his business and none expects the demand for his services to decline.

Politicians, said Guggenheim, are "caught." Television "is a vital part of the arsenal. You need it to protect your flanks."

"It's like a civil war. The cavalry may break through, but it can't unless the infantry and artillery are holding the flanks."

Robert Ailes borrows his imagery from game theory to make the same point. "We're getting more and more into a defensive battle. If one candidate uses it, the other must."

The accompanying table records the 1970 record of five leading media managers, their party affiliation, clients, and the offices their clients sought. (Garth, something of a swinger, tends to take on Democrats although he first rose to prominence with Mayor John Lindsay of New York. This fall, Garth handled one Republican, Herbert DeSimone, seeking the governorship in Rhode Island.)

IMAGE MAKERS' RECORD

Joseph Napolitan (D) 2-1-1 (winners, losers, undecided). Winners: Burns, Gov., Hawaii; Mandel, Gov., Md. Loser: White, Gov., Mass. Undecided: Litch, Gov., R.I.

Roger Ailes (R) 2-1-1. Winners: Meskill, Gov., Conn.; Sargent, Gov., Mass. Loser: Olson, Gov., Wis. Undecided: Roudebush, Sen., Ind.

David Garth (D) 3-2-1. Winners: Stevenson, Sen., Ill.; Gilligan, Gov., Ohio; Tunney, Sen., Calif. Losers: Ottinger, Sen., N.Y.; Walinsky, Atty. Gen., N.Y. Undecided: DeSimone (R), Gov., R.I.

Charles Guggenheim (D) 4-3. Winners: Hart, Sen., Mich.; Lucey, Gov., Wis.; Kennedy, Sen., Mass.; Moss, Sen., Utah. Losers: Gore, Sen., Tenn.; Metzenbaum, Sen., Ohio; Dufey, Sen., Conn.

Harry Treleaven (R) 1-4. Winner: Brock, Sen., Tenn. Losers: Bush, Sen., Tex.; Romney, Sen., Mich.; Kleppe, Sen., N. Dak.; Cramer, Sen., Fla.

Totals—12 winners, 11 losers, 3 undecided.

Mr. COOK. On the basis of that record, only 12 of the 26 managed candidates won their elections. I think this greatly diminishes the agreement for this bill.

Mr. President, I am one who feels that one of the primary responsibilities of Congress is to write good legislation, not expedient legislation. I think the cost

of campaigning should be set forth at all levels and for every medium. To pick on one medium is almost, in essence, to take the first amendment of the Constitution and say that those freedoms apply to some advertising media, but not to this one.

So, Mr. President, I have put these items into the RECORD, in the hope that my colleagues will read them, and in the hope that they will fully appreciate the significance of this program legislation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. 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.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGOVERN:
S. 4509. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Patzia; and

S. 4510. A bill for the relief of Roger L. Oehler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT) (by request):

S. 4511. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands within the White Earth Reservation shall be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and for other purposes; and

S. 4512. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the bills appear below under the appropriate headings.)

By Mr. BAYH:
S. 4513. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Fahringer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:
S. 4514. A bill to amend the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 in order to terminate certain Federal financial assistance to institutions of higher education not carrying out the intent of section 504 of such act relating to eligibility for student assistance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the bill appear below under the appropriate heading.)

S. 4511—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DECLARE THAT CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS WITHIN THE WHITE EARTH RESERVATION SHALL BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare that certain federally owned lands within the White Earth Reservation shall be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and for other purposes.

This measure has been submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter accompanying the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4511) to declare that certain federally owned lands within the White Earth Reservation shall be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter, presented by Mr. JACKSON, is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1970.
Hon. SPIRO T. AGNEW,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill "To declare that certain federally owned lands within the White Earth Reservation shall be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted.

This proposed bill transfers the beneficial interest to approximately 28,700 acres of federally owned submarginal land within the White Earth Reservation to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe with the title to be held in trust by the United States. The bill also provides protection to any person who may have vested rights in the land. It further provides that the Indian Claims Commission will determine the extent to which the value of the beneficial interest conveyed should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States Government determined by the Commission.

These lands were originally tribally owned, but they were allotted under the allotment acts and subsequently passed from Indian ownership. They were acquired by the United States during the middle 1930's under Title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 200), and subsequent relief acts at a cost of \$175,664. The purchase of the submarginal land was but a small part of the submarginal land program undertaken by the Federal Government for the benefit of Indians.

In Circular No. 1, issue on June 7, 1934, by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, to govern the acquisition of submarginal lands, it is stated that the land acquisition program of the Federal Government

would be of three major types, the third type being "Demonstration Indian lands projects," which would include lands to be purchased primarily for the benefit of Indians. It was further stated that the objectives of the programs include "Improvements of the economic and social status of 'industrially stranded population groups,' occupying essentially rural areas, including readjustment and rehabilitation of Indian population by acquisition of lands to enable them to make appropriate and constructively planned use of combined land areas in units suited to their needs." The circular set forth the following five types of demonstration Indian areas to be included in the program: (1) checkerboarded areas; (2) watershed or water control areas; (3) additional lands to supplement inadequate reservations; (4) lands for homeless Indian bands or communities now forming acute relief problems; and (5) lands needed for proper control of grazing areas.

In a memorandum of understanding between the Federal Resettlement Administration and the Office of Indian Affairs, approved by the Administrator of Resettlement Administration on October 19, 1936, it is stated that:

"Whereas, the lands being acquired under this program are situated almost entirely within the existing Indian Reservations to which they are intended for addition for the purpose of providing subsistence farm sites and consolidated grazing areas for the exclusive use of Indians; and

* * * * *
"2. Pending the transfer of the lands within these projects to the Office of Indian Affairs for permanent administration for the exclusive benefit of Indians, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is hereby authorized to exercise, and hereby agrees to assume the responsibility for administration and maintenance of those projects, subject to the following stipulations:

* * * * *
"4. Upon the consummation of its land acquisition program in connection with the projects listed in paragraph 1, the Resettlement Administration will recommend to the President that the lands within those projects be transferred to the Office of Indian Affairs for permanent administration for the exclusive benefit of Indians."

The records disclose a complete understanding between the Federal agencies involved in the acquisition and administration of submarginal lands on or near Indian reservations. It was that the lands were being selected for acquisition in connection with demonstration Indian projects; that they were needed by the Indians; that they would be utilized by the Indians in connection with the use of Indian-owned lands; and that proper recommendations would be made at the appropriate time for the enactment of legislation to add these lands permanently to Indian reservations.

Jurisdiction over the White Earth submarginal land was transferred by Executive Order 7868, dated April 15, 1938, from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Indians, insofar as consistent with the conservation purposes for which the lands were acquired.

The full legal and equitable title to the lands is in the United States. The lands, technically, are not subject to the provisions of Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937 (50 Stat. 522), because they were transferred to the Department of the Interior about two months before most of the submarginal land projects were placed under the act. Nevertheless, that Act was intended to and did control all of the submarginal land projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture on that date, that is June 9, 1938, including the Indian projects that were trans-

ferred to the Department of the Interior after that date. Under that Act the lands are to be used for a program of land conservation and land utilization broadly described to correct maladjustments in land use, control erosion, further reforestation, preserve natural resources, mitigate floods, prevent the impairment of dams and reservoirs, conserve surface and subsurface moisture, protect watersheds, and protect the public lands, health, safety, and welfare. The lands may be sold or donated to public agencies on condition that they be used for public purposes, or the lands may be transferred by the President to any Federal or State agency for administration in a manner that will further the land conservation and land utilization program authorized by the Act.

As neither Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act nor the original recovery and relief Acts under which the lands were acquired contemplate transfer of program lands to private owners, the lands in question have been administered by the Department of the Interior for more than 25 years for the dual purpose of conservation and benefit to the Indians. The fact that the lands are interspersed with 25,380 acres of Indian tribal lands and 2,070 acres of allotted lands, makes that form of administration the only practical method of accomplishing the conservation purpose for which the lands were acquired. The maladjustments in land use were, to a large extent, caused by the allotment of tribal lands and subsequent sales in relatively small acreages. These maladjustments have, for the most part, been corrected by integrating the administration of the submarginal lands with the remaining Indian tribal holdings. If the land is transferred to the tribe, such administration will, of course, be continued.

About 24,258 acres of the submarginal land are in 16 fairly solid blocks of adjoining tracts, located in two townships in Mahnomen County. The other 4,437 acres consist of 38 scattered tracts in four townships in Becker County which adjoins Mahnomen County. The 54 tracts range in size from 20 to 14,319 acres. Their present estimated fair market value based not only on increasing land values, but primarily on increasing timber values and growth is \$745,500. This land is considered to be without value for minerals, either metalliferous or nonmetalliferous, although one permit has been issued for the removal of sand and gravel.

Improvements consist mainly of dwellings and farm buildings that were on the land when it was acquired by the Government. In addition, some improvements have been made on lakeshore lots by individuals who leased the lots from the Bureau of Indian Affairs under revocable permits.

Practically all of these submarginal lands are best suited to forestry production and should be managed with the tribal lands as a tribal unit. The cutting of timber on submarginal lands is presently limited to only that which is necessary to prevent the loss of fire-killed, wind-thrown or other damaged timber, and that which impairs productivity.

The Department has permitted the use of these lands by the tribe on a revocable permit basis. The tribe has in turn issued permits directly to individuals.

The White Earth Reservation Council, on December 2, 1961, adopted a provisional economic development plan which includes the use of submarginal and tribal lands. Tribal officers approved the plan on March 8, 1962. On August 13, 1962, this Department recommended to the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, the acceptance of the White Earth Overall Economic Development Program, which was subsequently approved by the Area Development Administration on September 8, 1962. Under this plan, one of the most urgent needs is for the White Earth Reservation to acquire title to the submarginal lands. In a letter

addressed to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Chairman of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe stresses that the lands have not been developed to their highest potential because of the limitations of the revocable permits. The goals of the program are to provide employment for residents of the reservation area; improve living standards with better housing, health and welfare facilities; full utilization of the natural resources; education and training of members to permit the earning of more adequate incomes; and cooperation with public agencies and individuals in economic development of the reservation area. The resources to be developed in accordance with this plan include cultivation of cranberry marshes, cultivation and harvesting of wild rice, mink farms, poultry raising, harvesting of maple syrup, dairying and agricultural pursuits, and greater utilization of recreational resources. A Job Corps Center was developed on tribal land contiguous to the submarginal land. These improvements could be used as a nucleus for development of the submarginal land in conjunction with the tribal program. These uses are consistent with those recommended by the Minnesota Conservation Department and Mahnomen County Conservation Needs Committee. The White Earth Overall Economic Program will have many lasting benefits for the Indians of the White Earth Reservation, and the acquisition of these submarginal lands by the tribe is essential to the full realization of this program.

Because of the limitation on revocable permits, tribal plans for campground development, lakeshore leasing, access road construction, individual home construction, and industrial development are in effect prohibited with respect to the submarginal land, since the tribe is unable to encumber leaseholds of up to 25 years with an option to renew for a like period as they can do on tribal lands. Thus proper economic utilization of the submarginal land is being stifled because industry cannot construct the improvements necessary to make full use of the property.

For these reasons, it is urged that these lands be donated in trust to the tribe by the enactment of this legislation. The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, by Resolution No. 50-67 dated January 13, 1967, has urged that this be accomplished.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON LOESCH,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands within the White Earth Reservation shall be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to valid existing rights, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the lands, and the improvements thereon, that were acquired under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and section 55 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), and that are now administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Reservation, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for said tribe, and the lands shall be a part of the reservation heretofore established for the tribe.

Sec. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to

which the value of the beneficial interest conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

S. 4512—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DECLARE THAT THE UNITED STATES HOLDS CERTAIN LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE, MINN.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation submitted by the Department of the Interior to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minn.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the Vice President from Assistant Secretary Loesch, dated November 3, 1970, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4512) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minn., introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter, presented by Mr. JACKSON, is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., November 3, 1970.
Hon. SPIRO T. AGNEW,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill "To declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

This bill provides that two tracts of government-owned land and certain town lots will be held in trust by the United States for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. It also provides that the government-owned tracts are subject to the right of the United States to use the tracts and improvements as fire tower sites for so long as there is need. Section 2 of the bill provides that the Indian Claims Commission will determine the extent to which the value of the beneficial interest conveyed should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States Government determined by the Commission.

The lands to be held in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe are comprised of one 79.15-acre tract located on the Grand Portage Reservation, a 5-acre parcel located on the Nett Lake Reservation, and 11 lots reserved for government purposes and one block reserved for school purposes in the White Earth Townsite, Minnesota.

Title to the 79.15-acre tract was acquired by the United States for use as a fire tower site under a declaration of taking filed in 1938, at a cost of \$395.75 which was paid from appropriated funds. This tract is still used as a fire tower site. However, we have determined that 2.5 acres are adequate for this purpose and the remaining land is surplus to our needs. The bill provides that the United States shall have the right to use the 2.5-acre parcel and improvements thereon as a fire tower site for so long as the need remains.

Improvements on this property at the present time consist of a cabin valued at \$900 and a fire tower valued at \$1,600. The present fair market value of the land is approximately \$1,200. The land is in a completely forested area and is one of the few remaining alienated tracts within the exterior boundaries of the reservation. The tract blocks in with solid Indian ownership and its acquisition by others would adversely affect the economy of the Indians. The area is included in the overall development program plan of the reservation and would be an asset to the tribe in the development of tourism and the recreational potential of the area.

The tract of 5 acres, more or less, located on the Nett Lake Reservation was purchased by the government for a fire tower site and is still used for this purpose and as a site for a radio repeater tower for the United States Border Patrol under a revocable permit. It has been included in this legislative proposal to eliminate piecemeal legislation, such as would otherwise result when the parcel is no longer needed by the Federal Government. The bill provides that this 5-acre site and improvements shall be subject to the right of the United States to use the same for so long as the need shall remain.

The original purchase price was \$25 which was paid from Indian Agency Buildings funds. Improvements consist of a cabin valued at \$900 and a fire tower valued at \$1,600. The land has a nominal value of \$50. This 5 acres, which is in a completely forested area bounded on the west and south by Minnesota Chippewa tribal land, blocks in nicely with tribal land. It is the only remaining government-owned land on the Nett Lake Reservation. At the termination of its present use it would have only a nuisance value to adjacent landowners and could adversely affect tribal land management if declared excess and disposed of to other than the Chippewa Tribe.

Certain scattered, unimproved lots within the White Earth townsite are also included in this bill. The White Earth townsite was established on the White Earth Reservation pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1032). Reserves were made for government and school purposes, and the reserved lots were dedicated to public uses by the Department on August 3, 1908. After the reserves were made most of the town lots were sold. The few remaining unsold lots in the townsite were temporarily withdrawn from disposal of any kind pursuant to Department Order of November 2, 1934. In 1966 the Department determined that the unsold town lots could be restored to tribal ownership under authority of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984; 25 U.S.C. 463), but the reserved lots that had been dedicated to public use before the townsite was put up for sale could not be restored except by express congressional authorization. The unsold town lots have since been restored to the tribe.

The present value of the reserved town lots is estimated at less than \$100. No improvements have ever been placed on these lots, and they are all excess to our needs. As the lots are situated in the vicinity of Indian land and Indian housing, the tribe has need for these lots.

So far as is known the lands included in this proposed bill are without value for minerals, either metalliferous or nonmetalliferous.

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe has submitted formal resolutions requesting the enactment of legislation to have the United States take these lands in trust for the tribe.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
HARRISON LOESCH,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, subject to all valid existing rights:

(1) Southeast quarter southwest quarter and lot 2, Section 8, Township 63 north, Range 5 east, fourth principal meridian, Minnesota, comprising 79.15 acres, subject to the right of the United States to use as a fire tower site for so long as the need shall remain a 2.5-acre parcel and improvements thereon, described as the northeast quarter southeast quarter of lot 2, Section 8, Township 63 north, Range 5 east, fourth principal meridian, Minnesota.

(2) All that portion of lot 5, Section 1, Township 64 north, Range 22 west, fourth principal meridian, Minnesota, described as commencing at a point on the line between Sections 1 and 2 located 1,402 feet south of the north section corner common to said sections, thence south along said line a distance of 660 feet, thence east a distance of 330 feet, thence north a distance of 660 feet (compass variation 6 degrees east of north), thence west a distance of 330 feet to the point of beginning, comprising 5 acres, more or less, subject to the right of the United States to use said tract and improvements for so long as the need shall remain.

(3) Lots 1 through 9 of Block 1, lot 1 of Block 15, lot 3 of Block 16, and all of Block 17 of the White Earth Townsite as shown on the townsite plat of survey approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on August 3, 1908, such townsite being located in Section 23, Township 142 north, Range 41 west, fifth principal meridian, Minnesota.

Sec. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of Section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the beneficial interest conveyed by this act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

S. 4514—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we are all concerned with the disruptions on the campuses of our colleges and universities throughout the United States. Riots and other disorders have hindered and in some cases ceased the orderly processes which are necessary in an educational environment. Colleges have been forced to close down, millions of dollars worth of property have been destroyed, and thousands of law-abiding students have been denied the educational opportunity for which they and their parents are paying.

The vast majority of students are fine law-abiding citizens who are diligently trying to better themselves with a formal education. However, there are always those few who have no concern for the rights of others and have no respect for the law. The problem with students who break the law on campus is especially acute because of the varying attitudes school administrators and faculty have toward such students. In some cases school officials have taken a firm attitude toward students convicted of campus disruptions. However, there are some

schools which almost encourage unlawful disruptions by their tolerable attitude toward those students who break the law on campus. This is evidenced by the fact that many school administrations have refused to comply with the Federal requirement that Federal aid be suspended from any student convicted of participating in campus disorders. If colleges which receive tremendous benefits from these Federal funds are not going to comply with the law, these benefits should be stopped.

Ideally, school officials who value the benefit of various Federal programs on their respective campuses would comply with the minimum requirements which now exist. In most cases it is highly preferable for local levels, whether governments or educational institutions, to administer their own affairs when Federal funds are involved. However, when local college administrators exhibit a totally irresponsible attitude toward the use and distribution of these funds, steps must be taken to rectify the situation.

A very necessary requirement has been placed on educational institutions which are recipients of Federal programs—that they must suspend Federal aid to any student convicted of participating in campus disorders. Unless this requirement is followed, it means that the American taxpayer is paying for the education of radicals, anarchists, and in some cases common criminals. This is intolerable. Since this requirement is not being complied with in too many cases, it is imperative that strict measures be imposed.

Mr. President, I introduce a bill which would require that Federal aid be suspended from those colleges and universities which refuse to comply with the existing requirement concerning the suspension of Federal aid to any student convicted of participating in campus disorders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4514) to amend the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 in order to terminate certain Federal financial assistance to institutions of higher education not carrying out the intent of section 504 of such act relating to eligibility for student assistance, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we have just listened to the words of the Senator from South Carolina with reference to the cost to the taxpayers—often large sums of money—for the repair of damages which have taken place on campuses, including the buildings which have been constructed with aid from the Federal Government.

I am wondering whether the Senator from South Carolina is familiar with the cost of \$582,000 at Stanford University in California to replace the broken windows in the buildings on that university campus, and to remove the obscenities which have been drawn or written on the walls of the buildings, including the residence of the president of the university.

The Senator from South Carolina has mentioned the cost to taxpayers. Would the Senator like to respond further as to where responsibility for the payment of that \$582,000 finally rests.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able Senator from West Virginia upon the pertinent remarks he has made. I appreciate what he has had to say. There is no question that when buildings of colleges are destroyed, when bombings take place that sometimes cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, that cost invariably rests upon the taxpayers.

I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, that was my understanding. In the final analysis, any costs incurred at Stanford University, or any other university or institution of learning, will probably be upon the shoulders of the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that an institution of learning, be it a public school or a university, is a place for study and understanding and debate, discussion, dissent, and decision. It is not a place for wanton destruction of property, often accompanied by violence.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A BILL

S. 4492

At the request of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), were added as cosponsors of S. 4492, the Agricultural Act of 1970.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 18, 1970, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

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

S. 882. An act for the relief of Capt. William O. Hanle;

S. 902. An act to amend section 1162 of title 18, United States Code, relating to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Donal E. McGonegal;

S. 2455. An act to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 3620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anastasia Pertsovitch;

S. 3853. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pang Tai Tai; and

S. 3858. An act for the relief of Bruce M. Smith.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1072

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by

MR. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, to the bill (H.R. 18515) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1073

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be printed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 1074

MR. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. SAXBE, and Mr. MATHIAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 18515, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1075

MR. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 18515, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1076

MR. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am submitting, for myself, Senator HARRIS and 24 other Senators, an amendment to delete section 208 from H.R. 18515, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee. This amendment, which would eliminate the 115-percent limitation on Federal grants to States for administration, training, and social services for all public welfare programs and restore the open-ended nature of the Federal share authorized by the Congress in the Social Security Act, is intended to supersede Amendment No. 1070, submitted by Senators HARRIS and RIBICOFF yesterday. I will outline the reasons for this amendment when we call it up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment, submitted for Senators HARRIS, TALMADGE, RIBICOFF, BROOKE, MONDALE, JAVITS, BAYH, EAGLETON, GORE, GRAVEL, GOODELL, HART, HATFIELD, HUGHES, INOUYE, KENNEDY, McCARTHY, MCINTYRE, McGOVERN, NELSON, PELL, PERCY, RANPOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 1076) is as follows:

On page 38, beginning with line 12, strike out through line 18.

On page 38, line 19, redesignate section 209 as section 208.

SOCIAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMS IN JEOPARDY

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the troublesome features of the

pending Labor-HEW appropriations bill is section 208 which would curtail the ability of the various States to maintain and expand their programs for the disadvantaged. I am pleased to support my esteemed colleague, Senator CRANSTON, as a cosponsor of his amendment to delete section 208 from the bill.

If left in the bill and enacted into law, section 208 would place an arbitrary limit on Federal matching funds for State expenditures on administrative costs, training costs, and the cost of social services for such programs as old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, and aid to families with dependent children. During the current fiscal year, the administrative expenses under the section 208 provision would be subject to a 115-percent ceiling of the aggregate amount spent by each State for these purposes during fiscal year 1970.

The 115-percent limitation would constitute an inequitable financial burden on the majority of the 50 States, but the implications would be particularly severe for the State of Texas and its people. There has literally been a "caseload explosion" in my home State. For example the number of cases under the aid to families with dependent children has doubled during the past 2 years, and the number of recipients under the program is presently increasing at a rate of 8,000 persons per month.

There are those who will argue that section 208 is merely aimed at cutting unnecessary "administrative costs." While this is a commendable goal, it must be recognized that it is the people in need of expanded programs of social service who would suffer the most from the "penny wise and pound foolish" ceiling on Federal matching funds.

Under section 208, the State of Texas stands to lose \$6.1 million in Federal money which is required to finance administrative, training, and social service programs in fiscal year 1971. This financial burden would force the elimination or substantial curtailment of day care education programs for children, family planning programs, and consumer education programs throughout the State. Many of these programs in Texas are still in their infancy, and must not be left to perish for lack of Federal support.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this proposed amendment which would delete section 208 from the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. We cannot turn our backs on States which are making a bona fide effort to provide and expand programs of social rehabilitation for their people.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1068 TO H.R. 18515

At the request of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) was added as a cosponsor of H.R. 18515, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1069 TO H.R. 18515

At the request of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 1069 to H.R. 18515, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

UNITED STATES SECURITY AND "RUSSIA'S BIG RED FLEET"

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, much has been published about the rising sea power of Soviet imperialism and much more will be published in the future. The latest contribution as to the relative strengths of the United States and Soviet Navies is a highly informative article in the November 1970 issue of the Reader's Digest by Hanson W. Baldwin, the noted former military editor of the New York Times, on the subject of "Russia's Big Red Fleet."

In this article, Mr. Baldwin emphasizes some very important facts affecting the security of the United States and, indeed, of the entire free world, among them the following:

First. That vessels in the Soviet Navy are relatively new while many U.S. vessels are over age.

Second. That Russia has a total of 1,500 naval vessels in commission whereas the United States has about 550 vessels.

Third. That in range and firepower most new Soviet naval vessels outmatch ours and have a 1- to 3-knot superiority in speed.

Fourth. That the Soviet Navy is superior to ours in submarines.

Fifth. That the United States is superior in giant aircraft carriers but that these are a "wasting asset" which someday will be superseded.

Sixth. That the Soviets are preparing to "leapfrog" the carrier stage of naval development.

Seventh. That unless the United States strengthens our Navy rapidly the Soviets will be in a position to challenge us successfully on the high seas; and that it has already conducted globewide naval maneuvers—something that the United States has never attempted.

Published shortly before the report of the current interoceanic canal investigation under Public Law 88-609 is due to be submitted, the article is most timely in countering some of the misleading propaganda for the construction of a vast sea level project at Panama to accommodate huge aircraft carriers that will eventually have the same fate as battleships.

Mr. President, because the indicated article is illuminating and should be helpful to Congress, 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:

RUSSIA'S BIG RED FLEET

(In range and firepower, most new Soviet naval vessels now outmatch ours, and they have a one- to three-knot advantage in speed. A military expert issues a warning.)

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Two recent incidents, though very different in scale, typify the newfound confidence and audacity of the fast-growing Soviet navy.

Last summer, just a few miles off the Florida coast, a Soviet electronic trawler, monitoring the first underwater firing of our new Poseidon missile, almost rammed a U.S. destroyer. The Russian spy ship, which constantly patrols off the missile range at Cape Kennedy, made determined (but abortive) attempts to pick up remnants of the submarine's missile-tube cover, which is ruptured by the launch.

Last spring, Moscow conducted a type of naval exercise that we have never attempted—the first coordinated maritime global war game in history, Exercise Okean (Ocean). Red fleet headquarters in Russia controlled more than 200 ships deployed around the world. Hundreds of other ships and planes participated in waters nearer Russian shores. Land-based aircraft, armed with anti-shipping missiles and torpedoes, crisscrossed the North Sea and overflew the Mediterranean. Long-range reconnaissance planes, with many kinds of monitoring equipment and air-to-ship missiles, ranged over virtually the entire North Atlantic, utilizing Cuban fields as advance bases.

Russian fleet activity in the open seas is today five times greater than it was four years ago. To emphasize the giant strides the Soviet navy has made, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who helped to father the nuclear submarine, told a Congressional committee almost two years ago that he would "rather command" the Soviet submarine force than our own. Today the overall naval comparison would be far more disquieting:

Gun for gun and ship for ship, most Soviet naval vessels outrange ours, and they have a one- to three-knot advantage in speed. Moreover, the Russian ships are new; much of our fleet dates from World War II.

Russian winged missiles for use against other ships, and airborne anti-ship homing missiles with ranges of 20 to 450 nautical miles, are unmatched by any missile now in operation in the U.S. Navy.

The United States has no counterpart to Moscow's small, high-speed, missile-armed motorboats of the type which, under the Egyptian flag, sank the Israeli destroyer *Elath*.

The Russians maintain some 1500 naval vessels in commission; in the next fiscal year the active operational fleet of the United States may drop to about 550 vessels.

The Soviet submarine fleet, the world's largest, will soon operate more nuclear submarines than the United States. And in three to four years, the *only* advantage the United States now enjoys in strategic weapons will be neutralized: by then, the Soviets will have more ballistic missiles at sea than the United States.

In short, the Soviet navy, which was solely a defensive coastal force in World War II, then for 15 years a submarine navy, is now fast becoming a well-rounded fleet, able to fight on the surface, under the surface and in the air, to escort and attack convoys, to land troops on foreign shores and, above all, to project Moscow's power far beyond the borders of the "heartland."

The Russian submarine fleet is still in many ways the most important element of the Soviet navy, not only because of its great size (395 submarines, as against Germany's 57 when World War II started) but also because of the new role of the nuclear-powered submarine as a missile platform, with the capability of launching a knockout punch against any land target on earth.

U.S. submarine experts have been surprised—indeed, astonished—by the capabilities of Soviet submarines. We got a real shock when a Russian submarine trailed the nuclear powered carrier *Enterprise* across much of the Pacific at submerged speeds of 25 knots.

The new Soviet Y-class subs, like our Polaris submarines, carry 16 missiles each, and the Soviet building program may produce a fleet of 50 of these by 1974 or 1975—nine larger than our total of 41. Their other class of submarine, the attack type, is fast, agile and equipped with numerous kinds of sensing apparatus. So many of these craft are being launched that our experts believe the Soviet admirals hope to "saturate" our Polaris fleet—follow Polaris subs to their patrol stations and thus neutralize their importance as a deterrent.

The Soviet surface fleet is, in some ways, even more modern and impressive than its submarine flotillas. Many of the new ships are powered with gas turbine engines—one of the latest developments in marine power plants.

In one important element of modern power—ship-based aircraft—Moscow is still clearly unequal to the U.S. Navy. The Soviet fleet has, as yet, no aircraft carriers (as we know them) in commission. The U.S. Navy is able with its floating landing fields to project tactical air power—fighters, reconnaissance and attack aircraft—to any part of the world's oceans, and to provide air cover over nearly any portion of the world's coast line.

Today this is a powerful advantage. But technologically it is a wasting asset. The huge flat-top will someday be superseded. It is quite possible that the Soviets are preparing to leapfrog the traditional carrier stage.

The first step in this direction appears to have been the construction of two 23,000-ton ships unique in design—the *Moscow* and the *Leningrad*. They have broad flight decks aft, used thus far for launching helicopters; anti-aircraft, anti-submarine and sophisticated electronic systems are located forward. Their primary role today is anti-submarine warfare. But they have secondary roles in amphibious warfare—helicopter-borne ship-to-shore troop movements. Some experts believe that the next step is the fitting fixed-wing fighters aboard the *Moscow* utilization of very-short-takeoff-and-landing class and other ships that are now under construction.

These are all formidable strengths, which few Americans have adequately appreciated. Yet the Soviet navy also has many weaknesses. Its logistic support is a composite of the very old and the very new. On the one hand, the Russians have apparently accomplished a re-supply feat that we have not even attempted—replacement of missiles in a missile submarine in mid-ocean. On the other hand, most Soviet support vessels are slow commercial or semicommercial types utilized temporarily for naval auxiliary service. Soviet ship replenishment is usually done at anchor; the Russians have not mastered the massive, mobile floating-base techniques which have enabled U.S. combat ships to remain under way for long periods.

Further, some of the Soviet navy's fighting ships are unkempt, and close inspection reveals rust on the missile launchers and scant evidence that their weapons have ever been fired in practice. And though the Soviets now utilize most of the instrumentation familiar to the West in anti-submarine warfare—sound and magnetic and infrared detection devices—they have not yet shown any consistent capability in locating and tracking submerged submarines. Similarly, Moscow's attempts to develop a long-range amphibious capability are still in their infancy.

The Russian navy's greatest weakness is probably its staying power. Many U.S. experts think that today it is a "one-shot

navy," or "firststrike navy," with no good way to provide re-loads of missiles or ammunition, replenishment or spare parts for ships operating far from home waters.

But the great question mark of the Soviet navy today is: What about the men? Is Ivan really a sailor?

The Soviet sailor has the spirit and the love of fatherland that is essential to any *esprit de corps*. He does not need, or expect, the luxuries and permissiveness to which the young American is accustomed. A background of decades of experience in modern naval science and technology is lacking. But the Russians are making major efforts to compensate for this. The Soviet Naval Academy, dating back to Czarist days, is now supplemented by at least ten newer naval "colleges."

Virtually all Soviet naval officers and all except about 150,000 of the 465,000 enlisted men are permanent professionals. Pay by our standards is relatively low, but the economic lot of the Russian naval professional is better than that of the average man in the U.S.S.R. Above all, he enjoys a psychological reward now lacking in the U.S. Navy: his profession is highly regarded by his countrymen; he is a defender of the fatherland, and for many Russians there can be no higher calling.

Adm. Sergei Gorshkov, the five-star head of the Russian navy has presided over the renaissance of the Red fleet, and many other Soviet spokesmen have made Moscow's naval goals absolutely clear: first, a navy second to none; then, one superior to all, to dominate the world of water, which is seven tenths of the globe.

Today, Moscow cannot turn blueprint into actually. It cannot yet challenge successfully on all the high seas the might of the United States. But tomorrow, unless we strengthen our Navy rapidly, could tell a different tale.

UNIVERSITIES AND POLITICS: A QUESTIONABLE MIXTURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the educational institutions of the Nation—I speak particularly of those involved in the process of higher learning—as a body have long been considered one of the main foundation stones of this Republic. Benjamin Franklin said nothing brought forth such good interest as the investment in education. A man might empty his purse into his head, Franklin said, and thus insure that he could never be robbed of his most prized possession.

Since before the founding of our Nation, great educational institutions have been a part of the American way of life. Harvard was founded in 1636; Yale in 1701; Columbia in 1754. Even in the comparatively young Western States, higher education dates back 100 years and more.

I say all that to make the point that it has been well established that the American people, through their history and tradition, have indicated the greatest of interest in helping provide places where one may continue learning, may continue the educational process to the limit of one's ability. This is fairly basic—fundamental—with us. We are appreciative that the value, the need, the scope, the benefits of education—particularly higher education—have been recognized and taken into account in our official and legal acts within the Republic.

The legislation that brought many of our State-supported institutions into ex-

istence is evidence that the Senate, as well as the people of this great Nation, has long recognized and valued the educational process.

AN ENDANGERED HERITAGE

Now, unfortunately, Mr. President, we have those among us who would abandon that heritage, tear down a tradition that stretches back into history, across to Europe and into the cradles of civilization. There are those in the educational community who would, it appears, willingly bring down the entire structure of our higher education system with the argument that it has become irrelevant and must be destroyed before we can progress further.

Mr. President, I do not propose to take the Senate's time with a refutation of that argument. I believe it falls of its own weight. Certainly the actions of those radical elements, and the barbarism which they exhibit, wins them few friends and a host of disapproving enemies.

What concerns me far more than the Jerry Rubins, and the William Kuntlers, and the other recognized anarchistic elements, Mr. President, is those who—from within—would pull down the educational house while all the time wrapping themselves in the robes of academic freedom and educational immunity.

The far more dangerous proposition, Mr. President, is that which springs from within the colleges and universities themselves, in the form of either weak administrations, or militantly destructive faculty and students.

The principles of law and their application with relationship to academic freedom, came together for me recently in an old speech by Charles Evans Hughes, one of the most noted legal minds ever to sit on the highest tribunal of our land. Mr. Chief Justice Hughes told the American Law Institute in 1936:

In the highest ranges of thought, in theology, philosophy, and science, we find differences of view on the part of the most distinguished experts—theologians, philosophers and scientists. The history of scholarship is a record of disagreements. And when we deal with questions relating to principles of law and their applications, we do not suddenly rise into a stratosphere of icy certainty.

Mr. President, I think that that paragraph displays the even-handed judicial temperament which made the late Chief Justice so revered. He recognized that the Court, the Congress and the people, may each, from time to time, be wrong. But he also recognized that the disagreements within these sectors were not licenses to tear down the established system, for in a decision he wrote the following year, he spoke of the importance of retaining the rights of free speech and the opportunity for free political discussion—

... to the end that the government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes, if desired may be obtained by *peaceful* means. (Emphasis added.) Therein lies the security of the Republic, the very foundation of constitutional government.

It concerns me when some of our leading educators are willing to risk the destruction of the educational system to

which we owe so much, because they either do not have the vision to discern the dangers bearing down upon them, or the backbone to resist those dangers.

A CLEAR AND BALANCED ANALYSIS

I was pleased to see recently an analysis published by the American Enterprise Institute, which calls attention in a most scholarly and collected way, to the dangers facing some of our most prominent educational institutions if they continue to follow the popular course urged on them by some elements.

The book to which I refer is a special analysis of "Political Activities of Colleges and Universities—Some Policy and Legal Implications." It is the product of a distinguished team of writers, who are authorities in their respective fields. They are: Robert Bork, professor of law, Yale University; Howard G. Krane, attorney at law, Chicago, Ill.; and George D. Webster, attorney at law, Washington, D.C.

These gentlemen have done a magnificent job in putting together some astounding legal aspects of tax law that relate to the political activities that have been so loudly and vociferously proposed on many campuses.

Many in this Chamber are lawyers. Many enjoy, as I do, exploring the possible implications and the effects of certain laws which we are considering. It is not only an intellectual exercise, but, of course, it is also a matter of tremendous concern for all Americans.

Here are some concepts which I am sure most of us have not considered. Yet here we have three distinguished attorneys who have carefully worked out most of the legal factors that can be brought to bear in these issues. I think they have not only uncovered a fascinating area of law, but also a vital one that is likely to come into play in the future.

The gist of the matter is this: Colleges and universities that engage in political activities, including recesses to permit students and faculty to campaign in the public elections, expose themselves to serious legal penalties.

This is a fascinating concept and if I were a college president today, faced with some of the very hot, and very delicate, political demands being put before the academic world today—I think I would surely want my legal counsel to have the benefit of this study and analysis.

TWO LEGAL ASPECTS

A brief summary of the material should be of general interest to the Senate, since most of us are, at one time or another, quite concerned with the working of the two major sections of the law here presented.

Schools engaging in political activities—and I will discuss what might constitute such activities in just a moment or two—face the extreme danger of losing their tax exemptions under the Internal Revenue Code. In fact, university officials could expose themselves to criminal sanctions for violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Let us consider the Internal Revenue Code first.

The book states:

Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that an exempt organization, including an educational institution, shall lose its exemption from federal income taxes if any "substantial part" of its activities "carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation," or if it should "participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distribution of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office." A parallel provision, Section 170(c), denies a deduction from income taxes for donors to institutions that violate these proscriptions.

The writers take note of the possible "out" in that the IRS could take the position that the penalties are too severe, and on its own motion elect not to proceed administratively to enforce the law. But even though the IRS might not act against a university, the analysis points out that a private citizen, perhaps an alumnus who finds himself in disagreement with the current policies of the administration of the school, may have the right to bring a "mandamus" suit to force the IRS to perform its administrative function.

The authors say:

The law may well be developing in such a way as to permit a private citizen to compel the Internal Revenue Service to act in the face of a clear violation of the statute if the Internal Revenue Service refuses to take the initiative itself.

The authors base their interpretation on recent civil rights cases in which the Government was ordered to stop issuing exemption rulings and approving deductions to private schools in Mississippi without first ascertaining that the schools were not operated on a segregated basis.

The authors also cover advice given to schools by the American Council on Education which suggests a university might rearrange its schedule to permit faculty and students to participate in political campaigns. They conclude that there might not be a problem only if in the rearrangement of the university calendar, it is done as a permanent matter without regard for a particular political race, and particular issues. But that does not appear to be the case—at least in most instances of which I am aware.

The study concludes in this regard:

In such circumstances, arguably, the university may be contributing to the campaign just as much as if it ran a voter registration drive that it knew would substantially aid one candidate over another. The authors note that the plan for students who actually drop out of the university calendar to take part in the campaign, or if the calendar is rearranged for that purpose, the university may still be liable even if the missed or rescheduled classes are actually held. Such an action might avoid the charge that the university indirectly financed candidates, but "it does not avoid the reality of a dramatic intervention in the campaign."

The study notes, however, that campus newspapers are more or less free to support the candidates of their choice, or the issues they choose.

It is interesting to me that the authors have gone into the question of what might be the reasons of Congress for establishing these laws. It is a more difficult task, since the legislative history

of these bills contains little or no reference to such questions as these. Apparently, the framers of the tax code did not think the problems of such magnitude involving the academic community would ever come up.

The authors deal with the "tax equity" rationale, and a "social policy" rationale. I shall not attempt to duplicate their efforts here, Mr. President. Suffice it to say that they concluded that both rationale probably underlie the statute to some degree. I suspect that if we ever see a great deal of action in this area, then we—the Congress—will have to come back at some future time and lay down some legislative guidelines and rules that will pertain to these situations.

The degree to which university facilities, in addition to university professors, students and other personnel have been involved in these questionable areas is most revealing.

For instance the study notes:

After the Cambodian intervention political groups were frequently given access to university computers, research facilities, office buildings, classrooms, and auditoriums . . . mailing lists were used to send leaflets opposing Congressmen up for re-election to alumni.

Mr. President, I think it does not take too much reasoning on the part of Congress to see just how such tax exemption could easily be abused—in fact it appears that there may already have been substantial violations of the IRS code in this area.

There are many other aspects of this part of the law that are discussed. For instance, what constitutes "attempting to influence legislation?" We are all familiar with the fact that the Sierra Club lost its tax exemption because its attempts to influence Congress were interpreted as "too substantial" to maintain its tax exemption.

There are Gordian knots here to be untangled as to how much time "belongs" to a college professor, and how much belongs to the institution. The same holds true for students, but for different reasons.

The question of what is "substantial" is a complex one, but it is treated in a most lucid manner in the book to which I have been referring.

THE CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

To turn for a moment to the other aspect of the law: the criminal sanctions that could possibly be imposed on university officials under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Section 610 of title 18 of the Criminal Code makes it a crime:

For any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in Congress are to be voted for.

The fines for violating this act are very stiff, but have seldom been imposed.

Since most educational institutions are corporations—the "any corporation whatever" phrase would seem definitely to apply. The violations bring a "fine of not more than \$5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation who consents to any contribution or expenditure

by the corporation, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both."

Incidentally the "anything of value" rule that applies in this case includes . . . "a gift, loan, or advance of money, or 'anything of value.'" The terms also include any promise or agreements to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with an election. Salaries and wages of corporate or labor union officers and regular employees, while engaged in political activities of supporting a candidate for nomination or election to a Federal office, would constitute expenditures within the meaning of section 610 of the FCP act.

This is not dead law, for the analysis shows some 18 cases prosecuted under this act since 1968.

This is a most complete study. Yet for all its thoroughness, it is neither bulky, nor written in such legal jargon as to make one put it back on the shelf. I should think it reasonably easy for the average layman, and even the bright high school student to understand and grasp.

Included in the volume are two statements of policy for university presidents in the light of the campus disorders of last year, and the years before.

They make interesting reading, too; and they appear to be sound and safe policy statements. In fact, one wonders why they have not been carried out with more vigor.

In short, I have found this book on the current difficulties facing our college administrators to be fascinating reading. I commend it to all who have an interest in the continuing education of our young people. I commend it for its sound and reasoned approach. The authors apparently did not make up their minds and then set out to vindicate their convictions. Rather, their work strikes me more like that of a well-informed debater, explaining his side of the question as well as that of the "other" side.

The fact remains that many of our institutions of higher learning have edged closer and closer to the edge of political involvement. What this means for our total system is significant. It is crucial to the future of the system. For if by involving the universities actively in partisan politics the extremists succeed in destroying the universities, then they will have indeed done irreparable harm to our country.

I think the time has come that someone sounded an alert, a warning bell, in this arena, for I do not feel comfortable knowing that tax money which I have helped contribute and raise may be used against me or against anyone in any future election. These issues should be aired. The implications, dangers, risks, and involvements should be subjected to the sunlight of public scrutiny. College officials have responsibilities to their trustees, alumni, students, and faculties. They, and we as taxpayers, should be paying more attention to these vital and important questions.

Again, Mr. President, I commend this

analysis to the Members of the Senate for its study and for your own enlightenment. This is a serious question, and we are allowing our institutions of higher learning to walk along the edge of a morass which may so damage the whole system that it will be years, even decades in recovering. I do not think we can afford such a loss.

EXCUSES, EXCUSES, EXCUSES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the index of industrial production dropped by 2.3 percent. That is indeed a gloomy fact only partially explained by the loss of production occasioned by the General Motors strike.

But on a news program today, Herbert Stein of the Council of Economic Advisers parried the bad news by stating that we should not be taking the temperature of the economy every hour. But the administration and Mr. Stein have a double standard. They have greeted every minor increase in the favorable economic indicators or decreases in the unfavorable ones with unprecedented joy. When the price indexes declined in August, the administration was exultant. But when it went up in September by almost precisely the same amount, they largely ignored it.

But what one does need to do is to look at the basic facts. Unemployment is at 5.6 percent, with 2 million more men and women out of work than in January 1969.

The price indexes continue to rise. Industrial production is down. Retail sales are off. Commercial bank credit is down. And interest rates remain very, very high. While housing starts have edged up, they are still 1 million units below the number needed on an annual basis to meet the Nation's housing goals and housing needs.

The economic game plan was to reduce prices from a 4.5 percent rate of annual increase to a 3 percent rate without increasing unemployment. But now the rate of increase is at 6 percent per year and unemployment is at 5.6 percent and going up.

The economic facts are that the economy is still in great difficulty. The game plan has failed. An incomes policy is needed. We need to stimulate housing where both the need is great, the resources are idle. There small amounts of Federal stimulus can bring forward very large resources from the private sector.

The basic facts about the economic situation are given by the Federal Reserve Board. Yesterday they issued their report entitled "National Summary of Business Conditions." I hope the administration economists will read it and act on it.

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

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

NATIONAL SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONDITIONS

Industrial production, nonfarm employment, and retail sales declined in October reflecting in part the General Motors strike. The unemployment rate edged up. Com-

mercial bank credit declined, the money supply changed little, and the expansion in time and savings deposits slowed. Between mid-October and mid-November, yields on U.S. Government and municipal bonds declined and yields on corporate securities changed little on balance.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Industrial production in October was 162.3 per cent of the 1957-59 average, down 2.3 per cent from September and 7.0 per cent below the July 1969 peak. The auto strike accounted—for about one-half of the 3.8 point decline in the total index in October, with the balance reflecting further curtailments in output of consumer durable goods other than autos, business and defense equipment, and industrial materials.

With the strike continuing through October, auto assemblies dropped sharply further and were at an annual rate of 4.0 million units, compared with 5.7 million units in September and 8.4 million in August. Production of television sets increased in October but output of most other household goods declined. Production of industrial, commercial, and freight and passenger equipment was reduced further. Among materials, output of steel, construction materials, paper and some chemical and rubber products was down.

EMPLOYMENT

Nonfarm payroll employment declined in October with a large part of the drop attributable to the General Motors strike. Employment in manufacturing dropped sharply but increased in services, trade, and State and local government. The average workweek in manufacturing rose 0.1 hour to 39.4 hours in October, from the reduced September level. The unemployment rate edged up slightly further to 5.6 per cent.

RETAIL SALES

The value of retail sales declined about 1.5 per cent from September to October as sales at automotive stores declined sharply. Excluding the automotive component, sales at durable goods stores were unchanged and at nondurable goods stores rose 1 per cent.

AGRICULTURE

Farm output in 1970 is now estimated to be about the same as last year. Livestock output is expected to be up about 5 per cent reflecting gains in meat and poultry production. Crops, however, will be down about 2 per cent because of planned cuts in food grains and a 10 per cent reduction in corn because of blight.

WHOLESALE AND CONSUMER PRICES

Wholesale prices rose 0.2 per cent from mid-September to mid-October after seasonal adjustment. A sharp increase of 0.6 per cent in prices of industrial commodities, led by increases for 1971-model passenger cars, more than offset a decline of 1.4 per cent in prices of farm and food products.

Consumer prices rose 0.5 per cent in September, seasonally adjusted; a reversal of the August decline in food and gasoline prices, and increases in new car and house prices contributed to the faster pace.

BANK CREDIT, DEPOSITS, AND RESERVES

Commercial bank credit, after adjustment for changes in loans sold to affiliates, declined \$600 million in October compared with an average monthly increase of almost \$5 billion during the third quarter. Total loans and holdings of U.S. Treasury securities both declined following substantial expansion over the third quarter. Holdings of other securities, however, continued to increase rapidly reflecting acquisitions of both municipals and Federal agency issues.

The money supply declined nominally in October following a slight increase in September. For the third quarter, growth in the money supply was at an annual rate of 5.1 per cent. Expansion in time and savings de-

posits slowed somewhat in October—\$4 billion compared with over \$5 billion per month during the third quarter. At large commercial banks, both acquisitions of large negotiable CD's and inflows of consumer-type time and savings deposits were smaller than in other recent months. "Other" time deposits declined. At country banks, however, growth in time and savings deposits continued strong.

Net borrowed reserves of member banks averaged about \$285 million over the four weeks ending October 28 compared with \$375 million in September. Member bank borrowings declined further but excess reserves also dropped somewhat.

SECURITY MARKETS

Yields on U.S. Government securities continued to decline sharply from mid-October to mid-November. Treasury bill rates fell about 40 to 60 basis points on average, with the 3-month bill bid at around 5.45 per cent in the middle of November. Yields on most notes and bonds declined some 20 to 35 basis points.

Yields on new and seasoned corporate securities increased slightly in late October on heavy volume but by mid-November had fallen to the month earlier levels. Municipal bond yields fluctuated mildly but on balance were over 20 basis points lower at the end of the four week period.

Common stock prices changed little on balance with volume declining slightly over the period.

LT. SIDNEY A. MOHSBERG III, AWARDED BRONZE STAR

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I have recently learned that the heroism of Lt. Sidney A. Mohsberg III has been rewarded by the presentation of the Bronze Star. Lieutenant Mohsberg received the medal for his gallant action on the night of February 16 last in attempting to rescue a wounded Vietnamese trainee from a stricken river Monitor, which was burning, in danger of sinking, and under fire at the time.

Lieutenant Mohsberg is to be commended as much for the humanitarian motives of his deed as for the bravery of the deed itself. He is exemplary of the American combat soldier and of the role that the United States would like to play in the world.

We, as a Nation, have been criticized for our involvement in Vietnam. There have been many Americans, including myself, who have questioned whether our policies in Southeast Asia are in the long-term best interest of this Nation. But when confronted with the acts of such men as Lieutenant Mohsberg we can all take some comfort in knowing that whatever our diplomatic or military policy may be, it is our men in the field who will always make the quality of our motives known to the world.

I wish to extend my congratulations to Lieutenant Mohsberg and ask unanimous consent that the text of his citation be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITATION TO LT. SIDNEY AUGUSTUS MOHSBERG III

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to Lieutenant (junior grade) Sidney Augustus Mohsberg III, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following:

"CITATION

"For heroic achievement in connection with operations against the enemy while serving with River Assault Division One Five One in the Republic of Vietnam on the night of 16 February 1970. As the Division Chief Staff Officer, Lieutenant (junior grade) Mohsberg was at his general quarters station in the coxswain's flat when Armored Troop Carrier Three Eight came under heavy enemy rocket and automatic weapons fire while proceeding in column with Monitor Five and Armored Troop Carrier Three Seven on the Vam Co Dong River. Two enemy rockets exploded in the water. One enemy rocket struck the starboard quarter of Monitor Five, penetrated the engine room bulkhead, produced holes in the starboard engine and imbedded shrapnel in equipment throughout the engine room. A sea suction valve jammed open causing flooding while a large oil fire started in the bilges and engulfed the engine room. Simultaneously, a fourth enemy rocket struck the fifty caliber machine gun in the starboard side of the mortar pit, wounding several crewmen and starting a fire among the mortar increment bags, ammunition boxes and grenade containers lying on the mortar pit deck. Lieutenant (junior grade) Mohsberg directed Armored Troop Carrier Three Seven to provide suppressing fire against the enemy positions while Armored Troop Carrier Three Eight maneuvered to aid the stricken Monitor; transferred all personnel to two river patrol boats which were scrambled to assist; positioned the two Armored Troop Carriers in midstream; and pounded the enemy fighting positions on the opposite bank. He was informed that a wounded Vietnamese trainee was still on board the Monitor whereupon he boarded Monitor Five on the port side at the mortar pit and with two volunteers entered the forty millimeter cannon mount and the mortar pit among smoldering fires and hot ammunition. He disposed of hot rounds in the forward spaces, then entered the smoke filled berthing and ammunition stowage area in search of the Vietnamese and to check the condition of the ammunition. Under his direction the fires were extinguished, engine room flooding stopped and Monitor Five was towed to safety. By his daring actions and loyal devotion to duty in the face of personal risk, Lieutenant (junior grade) Mohsberg upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

Lieutenant (junior grade) Mohsberg is authorized to wear the Combat "V".

For the President

JOHN J. HYLAND,

Admiral, U.S. Navy,

Commander in Chief U.S. Pacific Fleet.

CITATION TO LT. SIDNEY AUGUSTUS MOHSBERG III

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to Sidney Augustus Mohsberg, III, Lieutenant (Junior Grade), United States Navy for service as set forth in the following:

"CITATION

"For meritorious service while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in armed conflict against the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong communist aggressors in the Republic of Vietnam from May 1969 to May 1970. While serving as Operations Officer of River Assault Division One Five One, Lieutenant (junior grade) Mohsberg participated in numerous water mobile operations which assaulted enemy strongholds in support of the Second Brigade, Ninth Infantry Division, United States Army. In November 1969, he was assigned as Chief Staff Officer of River Assault Division One Five One deployed in small units throughout Operation Giant Slingshot on the Vam Co Dong and Vam Co Tay rivers. He also served as a patrol officer of river assault support boats and achieved

significant success against the enemy during night patrols in Kien Tuong province. On 16 February 1970, three river assault craft came under heavy enemy rocket and automatic weapons attack while patrolling the Vam Co Dong river. One of the boats had taken numerous direct hits and was beached, burning and sinking. Lieutenant (junior grade) Mohsberg, accompanied by two volunteers, boarded the ammunition laden craft, then under his direction, extinguished the fires, controlled the flooding and disposed of the ammunition. His efforts were instrumental in saving the valuable craft. Lieutenant (junior grade) Mohsberg's exemplary professionalism, devotion to duty and courage under fire were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

The Combat Distinguishing Device is authorized.

For the President

E. R. ZUMWALT, Jr.,

Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy,

Commander U.S. Naval Forces, Vietnam.

GREAT SALT LAKE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the most widely known phenomena in my State of Utah—Great Salt Lake—is once again becoming a tourist magnet.

The history of the lake—its rise and fall as a resort area, and its recent partial restoration in this respect after years of neglect—was chronicled recently by Jack Goodman in the *New York Times*.

The north end of Antelope Island, in Great Salt Lake, is at present being developed into a State park, with camping and sanitary facilities and a road system linking them, but not yet paved. A road leading from the mainland in Davis County now provides access to the island. This means that, for the first time in many years, both Utahans and visitors to the State can visit a choice area of the lake and try floating like a cork in its salty waters.

I have a bill pending which would establish a Great Salt Lake National Monument on Antelope Island and provide for the development of the full scientific, scenic, and recreational potential of the area. This would be preferable to the limited development possible in a State park on the north end of the island, but I hail what has been done as an excellent first step.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article published in the *New York Times* of November 1 be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *New York Times*, Nov. 1, 1970]

UTAH'S "DEAD SEA"—ALIVE AND WELL AGAIN AFTER YEARS OF NEGLECT

(By Jack Goodman)

Great Salt Lake, Utah.—After three decades of neglect, the West's "dead sea" is alive and well once again, attracting bathers, boaters, campers and sightseers in force. To help effect the rehabilitation of Utah's Great Salt Lake, approximately \$1-million has been spent on land acquisition, road-building and beach reclamation, and a sizable state park has been opened on the Great Salt Lake's Antelope Island.

Other factors contributing to the revival of this salty inland sea as a vacationland:

A 60-passenger catamaran-hulled excursion craft has restored cruise service on the

lake where the last paddlewheel turned 90 years ago.

Shoreline communities, which once dumped raw waste into the lake, have been ordered to stop the practice.

Copper smelters upwind from beach areas are pledged to cut back emissions of gases that have periodically enraged bathers.

Entomologists have concentrated their efforts on finding a method of smiting the pesky brine flies that occasionally rout lake shore picknickers.

The lake level has stabilized and even risen a few inches in recent months, a fact of prime importance to bathers and boaters.

DOWN ON THE BRINY

Pointing to the renewal of the Great Salt Lake as a tribute to the persistence of tourists, Senator Frank E. Moss, Democrat of Utah, and Gov. Calvin E. Rampton said they had received a steady stream of letters over the years complaining about the briny sea.

"Everyone remembered those geography book pictures of bathers floating in the Great Salt Lake and refused explanations why they couldn't do likewise," Senator Moss noted.

"We found you could explain, explain and explain about lack of sanitation, lack of access and the shrinking lake and the growing mud flats," says Governor Rampton. "The visitors always had a final word—in spite of everything they wanted to visit the lake and try floating like a cork."

After an initial effort to establish a national park, a national monument or a national recreation area on the lake's islands, Senator Moss joined forces with the Governor and Utah's State Park Commission to obtain funds to purchase land and build an access road to Antelope Island, largest of the nine islands in the lake.

ROUTE TO THE CAUSEWAY

Earlier this year, I drove north 25 miles on Interstate 15 from Salt Lake City to the hamlet of Syracuse. Then I headed west half a dozen miles across green farmlands to the glittering hardpan bordering the lake and took Utah Route 127, the new 10-mile causeway linking the mainland with Antelope Island and Utah's new Great Salt Lake State Park.

The rock and gravel causeway extends in an arc to the island, rising a dozen feet above the surrounding marshland and the saline lake. Hopefully, when funds are available, the causeway will be surfaced with asphalt, but as of now, it is two lanes wide, rough in spots but easily negotiable, even by cars towing camper trailers.

Great Salt Lake State Park occupies the northern third of Antelope Island, which is 15 miles long and five miles wide. The park has been equipped with camping and sanitary facilities; a 10-mile road system links beaches at Bridger Bay on the northern tip with a second beach area at White Rock Bay on the western shore. Roads also extend to campgrounds, picnic sites and overlooks. None of the roads are paved as yet.

RWARDING OVERLOOK

First-time visitors to Antelope Island should drive to the Bridger Overlook, 800 feet above the lake, then climb the half-mile-long foot trail to a rocky picnic site atop the island summit. The view is one of the most rewarding in all the West.

Below the rocky crest lies rolling country reminiscent of the Scottish Highlands, but replete with Western sagebrush, sunflowers and range grasses. With luck, one may spot a herd of buffalo roaming the parkland or glimpse a mule deer. The antelope have gone, but south of the park fence cowboys still ride the range and periodically round up the island cattle.

Beyond the treeless peaks and shrub-dotted ranchland, the island shoreline, caked white with salt, looks precisely like the coral

strands of a Pacific island, a resemblance made more startling by the blue waters of the shallow lake extending off towards distant Carrington and Bird Islands on the western horizon.

Twenty miles due east is the lengthy mountain wall of the Wasatch Range, its 11,000-foot-high snowcapped peaks towering above green farms and the cities of the Salt Lake Valley. Off to the west, the snowy peaks of the Pilot and Stansbury ranges mark the Nevada border.

STRANGE ECOLOGY

Great Salt Lake State Park serves as an outdoor classroom for visitors intrigued by the strange geology and history of the region. From the island's summit, one can survey much of the area covered by prehistoric Lake Bonneville in Ice Age days.

"Benchmarks" on the island and on the distant mountains clearly mark the 5,135-foot altitude level of the fresh-water lake before it overflowed its northern barriers as the result of quakes or land subsidence.

Wading out from the lake shore camp-ground at Bridger Bay, today's bather must march nearly a quarter-mile across a sandbar before reaching water deep enough to float upon. It is due to this gentle slope that the lake can shrink a mile or more around its edges following a drop of just an inch or two in mean depth. Due to this same gradual shelving a half-dozen resorts gave way to lakeside mud flats in bygone years.

Like Jim Bridger and other mountain men who first tested the brine, today's bathers float easily on the water because of its 27 per cent salt content. The big lake, fed by the fresh-water Bear, Weber and Jordan Rivers, has no outlet, and salts deposited by the mountain streams are gradually concentrated.

Evaporation and streamflow maintain a close balance, but evaporation is gradually victorious over the years. Eventually, in some dim and distant future, the Great Salt Lake, itself a remnant of Lake Bonneville, will vanish, unless recurring plans to dike its shallows and retain water in its deeper arms are carried out.

Lying at an altitude of 4,200 feet above sea level, the lake has an average depth of 10 feet and is 35 deep at its deepest point, between Antelope and Carrington Islands. Scientists say that this is about four feet shallower than the average depth in 1850, when Capt. Howard Stansbury of the Army Engineers ran the first survey. By the 1880's, G. K. Gilbert, the geologist, predicted the shrinking lake would vanish in less than a century; however, in light of the recurring cycles of wet years, today's scientists are more optimistic and say the lake will be with us long enough for our great-grandchildren to enjoy.

SPECIAL SAILING

Aside from taking a junket to Antelope Island and its state park, the best way to get the "feel" of the Great Salt Lake is to sail on it, a diversion that was not possible until the recent advent of the catamaran-type cruiser.

Back in 1871 the 150-foot long paddlewheel steamer, "City of Corinne," carried ore, freight and passengers from Lake Point on the south shore to the rowdy junction town of Corinne on Bear River Bay, where connections were made with the new transcontinental railroad and freight wagon routes to the Montana mines.

When the mining venture failed, the three-deck steamer was renamed "General Garfield" in honor of the President, and the ship carried excursionists for a dozen years until she finally ended her run for lack of passengers.

For a long time after that, it was fashionable to "go to sea on the Great Salt Lake" aboard the Southern Pacific Railroad, which halted its transcontinental cars so that pas-

November 18, 1970

sengers could take snapshots or view the sunsets—but not bathe.

FADING GLAMOR

At the turn of the century, Saltair at the south end of the lake flourished as the area's largest resort. Featuring "the world's largest dance floor," a roller coaster, a seafood restaurant and a beachfront pavilion, Saltair drew crowds traveling by trolley car from Salt Lake City.

Saltair went into decline with the advance of the automobile and in the mid-1950's, after the lake again shrank considerably, the trolley line gave up the ghost and the resort closed its doors. With windows broken and floors warped, its major pavilions stand today as reminders of another era.

Sparking the present-day revival on the lake is a man with no less a nautical name than Long John Silver. For the past dozen years, Silver has been improving a beach and restoring boating facilities for excursionists. At his resort, called Silver Sands, he has installed a parking lot and food-service area and set up cabanas and showers to accommodate up to roughly 1,000 visitors a day.

For a \$1 parking fee, visitors can picnic at pavilion tables, slip into bathing suits in the beachfront cabanas, venture into the lake to test its flotation quotient and use the Silver Sands showers to wash away the salt that crusts the skin, hair and suit of every bather. (Bathers are warned against ducking under water because the salt stings the eyes for hours.)

AMPHIBIOUS TOUR

Silver first added a few canoes to his beach facilities, then purchased a trio of surplus Army landing craft that can trundle over mud flats before chugging out into deep water. Dubbing them "Sea Monsters," the proprietor has popularized amphibious half-hour rides into the lake for \$1. During the ride, passengers dip for "brine shrimp," tiny larva-like wrigglers that are the sole living creatures in the saline lake.

Salty as his namesake, Silver has long harbored a desire "to cruise the lake," and this year he acquired a 60-foot-long, 60-passenger cruiser. A far cry from the slow-moving paddlewheeler of yesteryear, the "Islander" can zip along the lake at 30 miles an hour.

The new queen of the lake, leaving from Silver Sands, makes three-and-one-half hour cruises to Antelope and White Rock islands each Monday, Tuesday and Thursday for \$5; one-and-one-half hour cruises each Monday, Tuesday and Thursday at 2 P.M., 4 P.M. and 6 P.M. for \$3.50; and a six-hour cruise on Sundays, leaving at 10 A.M., for \$8. Each Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday at 8:30 P.M., Silver skips a two-hour dinner cruise, something of a bargain affair, since it includes a slide show, a narrative of the lake's history and a roast beef dinner, all for \$5.95.

SUN AND MOON

Since the lake is rimmed by mountains and high desert country, sunsets are spectacular, and moonrise over the lake and its islands also rates superlatives.

Now that the "Islander" is carrying excursionists, other boatmen, especially sailboat aficionados, are beginning to return here. The state park on Antelope Island has two launching ramps and another is available at the Silver Sands harbor. Unfortunately, the saline content of the water can quickly damage the average outboard (the "Islander" has a non-corrosive hull and special shafting), so owners of small boats must hose off their craft after each trip. However, sailboat skippers are discussing a yacht club and regattas, and there is serious talk of a major land development on the lake's south shore, complete with a golf course, beach, boat-harbor, motel and condominiums.

SENATOR NORRIS COTTON SAYS "YES" TO QUOTAS

MR. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, my distinguished and able senior colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton) is participating in a most interesting and important debate in the pages of the current issue of the American Legion magazine.

The debate is on the question "Are Import Quotas Needed To Protect U.S. Industries?" The Senator takes the affirmative side.

Since my colleague is known as one of the most loyal devotees of our national pastime, may I borrow from baseball's language by saying he has hit another "grand slammer" in presenting his views in favor of the need for quotas. I compliment him on his succinct statement of the case.

Mr. President, so that all of us may have a chance to read his words in case we miss them in the Legion magazine, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

ARE IMPORT QUOTAS NEEDED TO PROTECT U.S. INDUSTRIES?—YES

If you play in a ball game where your competitor makes all of the rules, you're going to lose the ball game.

That's a fact of life the country faces in the matter of world trade. The situation can improve, but only if the United States takes steps to influence what is happening today.

We're a nation dedicated to free trade but we'll never see it so long as we sit idly by and permit every other nation to corner the market.

Every country with which we trade, without exception, places restrictions on the goods which we export. These restrictions take the form of export licenses, quotas, duties or sanitation laws. They're designed to penalize us . . . to make it more difficult to merchandise our goods on a competitive basis in foreign lands, or to force us to keep those goods at home.

Meanwhile, our foreign neighbors enjoy complete freedom to make the United States a "dumping ground." We're deluged with foreign automobiles, cameras, clothing, shoes . . . even ball bearings and electronic components, manufactured at far less cost than is possible in the United States.

It takes but a smattering of economic knowledge to visualize the certain result . . . and we see it too often. Thousand of Americans have lost jobs. Plants have closed and their owners have endured the agonies of bankruptcy.

We've learned, ironically, that when our own people have been driven to the wall, the price of foreign items inevitably goes up.

Some in our land today would have us adopt a "protectionist" philosophy to meet this situation on an "eye for an eye" basis. I disagree with that concept.

For my part, in advocating import quotas, I have called only for limitations on the growing volume of goods we're receiving from overseas so that our own plants and workers can remain in the thick of competition.

Last December, I offered an amendment which would have given the President a wedge in dealing with the sticky problem of foreign imports. It sought to authorize special U.S. restrictions until such time as our foreign neighbors ease the limitations they place on us. That done, it made it manda-

tory that the President remove those restrictions.

The amendment passed the Senate but was rejected by the House on the grounds that a tax bill was not its proper vehicle. Four months later, however, more than 250 House members joined in sponsoring the present Ways and Means foreign import bill.

Free trade must be a two-way street if it ever is to enjoy real meaning in the world. If the scales continue to be weighted in one direction only, it won't even reach the conception stage.

AUTUMN ATTRACTION IN WESTERN MARYLAND

MR. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I recommend to Senators a feature published in the Sunday supplement of the Washington Star of September 20. The subject of the feature is the migrations of predatory birds which may be seen passing through one of the most scenic areas in Maryland. I join Alice Weschke, the author of the feature in recommending the vantage point at Monument Knob on South Mountain. Not only is this a good spot for viewing passing birds in flight; it is also one of the few serene spots from which one can detachedly watch the scenario of life in the country unfolding below. It is the type of place which, for its beauty and its scope, can not help but give pause to reflect upon the fullest range of man's workings.

Visitors to western Maryland are struck by the placid quality of the valleys and by the timelessness of the world's oldest mountains. These scenic valleys are patterned with fields of corn and clover, punctuated by towns and church steeples. It is vision at any time of year, but when set off by the autumn foliage of the oaks and perhaps, with luck, given climax by a soaring hawk it is complete.

I ask unanimous consent that the feature by Alice Weschke be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE THE HAWKS FLY

(By Alice Weschke)

The technicians were working round the clock to ensure that all technical systems were in order. As in a spacecraft, everything must function with an efficiency greater than 99 percent.

I was there for only half an hour. But suppose I had been there, inescapably, not just for a few hours, or even a few weeks, but for months and years. Would I have grown used to it, as men grow used to so much; would I have adapted, and been able to live and work quite normally? Or would those narrow quarters have become more and more oppressive, my companions more and more irritating, the carpets and curtains an affront, and the darkness outside—whether of sea or space—intolerable?

I don't know. That is what the aquanauts are trying to find out. It is a strange thought that the road to Mars should lead through the waters of the Caribbean.

Appearing out of the cool mists of morning and the crystal heat of autumn afternoons, the majestic annual procession of the great hawk migrations south to warmer lands passes by our very doorstep. One of the more exciting concentrations comes to a climax this week.

Although hundreds of bird and nature lovers make a rewarding pilgrimage to Hawk Mountain Sanctuary near Dreiberville in eastern Pennsylvania for the finest of box seats for the hawk extravaganza, area residents have a nearer grandstand only one hour from the Capital Beltway at Monument Knob in the 108-acre Washington Monument State Park, halfway between Middletown and Boonsboro on Alternate Route 40 out of Frederick, Md.

Atop South Mountain at the 34-foot high cylindrical stone tower, the watcher finds a setting of stone seats along a parapet that gazes over the vast valley with its distant, toy-sized houses, barns, farms, schools and suburbia, interspersed with fields and woodland. Three states are visible: Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia.

The tower, which opens at 10 a.m., has an interior spiral staircase leading to the roof for a splendid survey of the flyway. Reputedly the first monument to George Washington, the original tower was erected by the citizens of Boonsboro in 1827. The current structure is a replica built in 1936 by the Civilian Conservation Corps under the direction of the National Park Service and the Maryland State Department of Forestry.

The valley of the hawks. Viewers atop a stone tower on South Mountain near Frederick, Md., will be treated to one of nature's finest spectacles this month as thousands of hawks fly on by their way south.

Despite a lack of impressive numbers, the South Mountain lookout offers a wide variety of migrant birds of prey. They glide below the tower just over the tree line halfway down the slope, or silently wash aloft by an air current from the northern approaches. At 1,500 feet, Monument Knob transports the earthbound mortal into the migrants' realm, with its interplay of light and air above an infinitely remote valley floor of highways, cars and artificial routine. Atop South Mountain the visitor senses the affinity of the great birds with the seasonal winds, the timelessness of their passage and the elegance of their maneuvers.

The great wall called South Mountain is part of a ridge which begins near the Hudson River, varying in height, which comprises the eastern face of the Appalachians. The long ridge was named Kittatinny, "Endless Mountain," by the Indians, and is termed Blue Mountain in Pennsylvania. "Our" South Mountain is actually a range made up of summits and ridges varying from 1,200 to 2,100 feet in elevation beginning as a rise in the plain about 25 miles southeast of Harrisburg, Pa., and extending over 60 miles in a southerly direction. Another mountain begins west of Boonsboro and is called Elk Ridge; in Virginia, the wall is the familiar Blue Ridge.

Monument Knob is edged with good—though limited—views. Autos leaving Alternate Rt. 40 halfway between Middletown and Boonsboro are driven up the highway to the state park and left 1,100 feet from the summit in a parking lot. The tower is reached through the forest, where migrations of smaller birds in the treetops can be observed. No pets are allowed.

The Appalachian Trail dribbles its way across the Knob and down the other side of the mountain, disappearing like a brook among the trees at the edge of the park.

The fall migrations are the most dramatic because they are concentrated as the birds take advantage of the winds that follow low pressure areas in Canada, New England and New York. The spring migrations in late April as the birds return north are spread out over a vaster area and in much smaller numbers.

Optimum flight conditions are created by approaching cold fronts from the north marked by major weather changes including clearing skies, lower temperatures, strong northwest winds. Washington Knob is an

ornithological observatory because, in addition to being accessible, it is on the windward side of the Kittatinny Ridge, where the air striking the flanks of the mountain is swept upward in powerful drafts, like spray hitting a rock. Upon these deflective currents and thermals the great birds soar.

One day last year (Sept. 20), 140 broad-winged hawks were seen at the Knob. And, if many of the larger flights pass unseen along or south of the Knob, one can hope for a small overflow at the tower. Some years ago on a September day 342 hawks were sighted at 3:15 p.m. headed south between the Knob and Catoctin Mountain. They were viewed from the Foxxville Fire Tower 10 miles northeast of the Knob, where only 21 of the concentration were reported.

Of the hawk species which one might see at the Knob, at least five are endangered or fast reaching that status: peregrine falcon, bald eagle, golden eagle, marsh hawk, osprey. DDT, which endangers all living tissue, has been gnawing at the great hawk populations. They feed principally upon rodents, insects and fish, which in turn have been thoroughly doused with pesticides. Consequently, one cannot expect to see the masses of birds blackening the sky that greeted observers prior to the 1930s and 1940s.

In Maryland, hawks and eagles—indeed, all birds of prey—are protected by state law. Deplored the day when these handsome and beneficial birds were shot willy-nilly, Roger Tory Peterson, whose field guides have educated innumerable nature lovers, notes: "Today we know how important the hawks and other predators are to the natural balance, guardians, as it were, of the health and vigor of the outdoor world."

There are three common types of hawks. With practice, one can identify them by their shape, and, with more practice, by species. The accipiters possess long tails and short, rounded wings and include: goshawk, Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk; the buteos, with broad wings and broad, rounded tails include: red-tailed hawk, red-shouldered hawk, broad-winged hawk, short-tailed hawk, rough-legged hawk, Swainson's hawk, and Harlan's hawk; falcons, with long tails and long, pointed wings include: the sparrow hawk, pigeon hawk, gyrfalcon, duck hawk.

The accipiters, with their short wings, do not soar in circles high in the air as much as the buteos. Their typical journey is marked by several short, quick beats and a sail. The buteos, or buzzard hawks, are the aerialists.

In addition, the visitor should be alert for occasional bald and golden eagles, the immense scions of cloud and light, which soar on flat wings spread six to seven feet. The bill of an eagle is nearly as long as the head and helps in identification. The blackish turkey vulture, with its six-foot wing span, hovers with wings dihedral (inclined upward at an angle to the body) or teeters off into space across the wide valley like a tight-rope walker. The osprey, a large, water-loving, eagle-like hawk, is black above and white below, and flies with a decided crook in the wings.

There has been one rule-of-thumb for hawk watches: no wind, no hawks. Then the experts turn around and cite fantastic migrations on calm or "bad" days. It is probably better not to set rules for bird watching, because Nature has her own logic; but the best wind for hawking is generally from the northwest, preferably after a low-pressure disturbance in the north. The worst is from the southeast.

There are other reasons why at the Knob one may not sight certain mass bird movements: poor timing by visitors, poor visibility due to weather (smog, low clouds, rain), and inattentiveness. Hawk watches require time and patience and are not for the person seeking novelty for its own sake.

In September the day's events often end about 4 p.m. (exceptions to be anticipated); October, sunset; November, about 2:30 p.m.

The hawk migrations are so spaced that from mid-August until December one can visit the Knob in hopes of seeing some of the great birds of prey. Broad-winged hawks, bald eagles and ospreys begin drifting along the Kittatinny Ridge in mid-August, buoyed by thermals from the valleys veiled in summer heat and smog. On a bright Saturday last month this watcher had all but given up hope after three hours of waiting when two turkey vultures swooped down upon the tower and performed an exquisite *pas de deux* overhead for fully 30 minutes. The vultures may have been resident birds but their *divertissement* was welcome and provided good camera practice for later migrant flights.

In September the turkey vultures, Cooper's hawk, red-tailed hawk, sparrow hawks, as well as more ospreys and eagles, glide past South Mountain along with the exciting numbers of broad-winged hawks in the third week of the month. In October, sharp-shinned hawks predominate. November brings goshawks, red-tailed hawks and occasional eagles.

Monument Knob isn't the only hawk-watching spot by any means. At the corner of 18th and R Streets NW on a busy spring evening, stalled by a traffic tangle, the writer glanced aloft to view five hawks plus a straggler calmly putting miles between themselves and Dixie, working northward for the summer. High-rise apartments, with their unobstructed views, are ideally situated for watching flights. Evidence of the ancient invisible avian trails is everywhere.

The glimpse of even one of these great birds gliding above South Mountain, flight plan folded tightly within the envelope of instinct, sailing freely over the plain, drifting with a slight adjustment of wing over the tower in silence and in beauty, can be the prize memory of an autumn day.

A UNIVERSITY VIEW OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in previous statements before the Senate, I have voiced concern over management practices in our national forests. This is a concern shared by other Senators who have also commented extensively on forest management in their respective States. We are increasingly brought to realize that this is an issue which is national in scope and it is an issue which directly involves the public, since what is at stake are public lands managed by public agencies.

I am pleased today to present an important new report on this problem. This is a report which was originated by concerned members of the public and produced by experts, at their own expense. Approximately a year ago I received a large number of letters from constituents in western Montana who were particularly worried about what they saw happening to their surroundings. Pictures, angry words, and news articles described logging practices which appeared to disregard every value of forest use except that of the cheapest removal of logs. In response to this, I expressed my concern to the Forest Service and, at the same time, requested Dean Bolle of the forestry school and the University of Montana to do an independent study of the problem.

The results have been most gratifying.

The Forest Service itself selected a group of its own well-qualified professionals to conduct an in-house analysis of the problem as it existed in the Bitterroot Valley. Their report was released in May of this year and represents a sincere attempt to provide an objective evaluation of the dilemmas of forest management in the area under study. Copies of this study are available from the Forest Service, Division of Information and Education, Missoula, Mont.

In the meantime, however, the select committee convened by Dean Bolle has produced an independent, more pervasive analysis of the larger problems of forest management and has suggested some fundamental methods of cure. The select committee considers not only the most immediate problem of clear cutting, but also the general issues of overcutting and of multiple use. And they critically analyze—a rare and valuable asset in any committee report—the decisionmaking procedures within the agency itself.

The possible dangers of clear cutting have been cited often before. These include soil disruption, ill effects on wildlife, scenic degradation, and water pollution, among others. The Federal Water Quality Administration, for example, warns that "logging operations all too frequently result in adverse impacts on many other multiple uses of Federal lands, as well as on the uses of the water of those streams far downstream from the logged areas—even to the estuaries where rivers enter the sea."

The select committee's report, however, goes further. It focuses upon what had been considered the primary defense of clear cutting: economic efficiency. The report disputes the common assumption that clear cutting, in the way it has been used in the past, is the most profitable method of timber harvesting. And beyond this, the report suggests a new look at land classification in terms of what it designates as "timber mining."

The report recognizes the difficult situation in which the Forest Service stands in regard to policy formulation. The Forest Service is constantly pressed by the administration for greater lumber output to meet national needs. Industry pressures for more cutting are enormous. But the agency may be too willing to accede to these pressures "from above." The report sums up this dilemma in its statement of findings:

It appears inconceivable and incongruous to us that at this time, with the great emphasis upon a broad multiple-use approach to our natural resources—especially those remaining in public ownership—that any representative group or institution in our society would advocate a dominant-use philosophy with respect to our natural resources. Yet it is our judgment that this is precisely what is occurring through the federal appropriation process, via executive order and in the Public Land Law Review Commission's Report. It would appear to us that at this time any approach to public land management which would de-emphasize a broad multiple-use philosophy, a broad environmental approach, a broad open-access approach, or which would reduce the production of our public lands resources in the long

run is completely out of step with the interests and desires of the American people. What is needed is a fully funded program of action for quality management of all of our public lands.

The conclusion is, then, that we are not just dealing with questions of natural beauty, wildlife, and pollution, however important these may be, but with the fundamental processes of forest economics. This is an important finding, and coming as it does from a committee composed of three professional foresters, a professor of wildlife, a political scientist, a sociologist, and an economist, it deserves to be heard.

I might add that this report embodies the finest example of public interest and involvement in an environmental issue. The people of Montana took the initiative in making their own concerns known; a local newspaper, the Missoulian, printed a series of outstanding articles on the problems; and the faculty members of the University of Montana devoted countless unpaid hours to the study, discussion, and analysis of the issue. On behalf of the other members of the Montana congressional delegation—Senator MANSFIELD, Representative OLSEN, Representative MELCHER, and myself—I want to thank the people of Montana who made this report possible. I ask unanimous consent that the select committee's report be printed in the RECORD, and commend it especially to members of the Interior, Agriculture, and Appropriations Committees, to the resource management agencies, and to the Office of Management and Budget. I ask unanimous consent that biographical information on the select committee also be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 2, 1969.

Dr. ARNOLD BOLLE,
Dean, School of Forestry, University of Montana, Missoula, Mont.

DEAR DEAN BOLLE: Enclosed are copies of letters I have received recently from constituents in the Bitterroot Valley.

These letters reflect the writers' and my growing concern over Forest Service management practices within the Bitterroot National Forest and elsewhere.

I am especially concerned, as are my constituents, over the long-range effects of clear-cutting, and the dominant role of timber production in Forest Service policy, to the detriment of other uses of these national resources.

I believe that a study of Forest Service policy in the Bitterroot by an outside professional group would be beneficial to the Montana Congressional delegation and to the entire Congress, especially the Senate and House Interior Committees. The Bitterroot is a typical mountain timbered valley and the results of such a study might well be extended to recommendations national in scope. I hope appropriate faculty members at the University of Montana will participate. If this is possible, I would welcome whatever policy recommendations such a committee would offer.

I look forward, as always, to receiving advice from the best School of Forestry in the nation.

Kindest regards.
Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF.

A SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA PRESENTS ITS REPORT ON THE BITTERROOT NATIONAL FOREST

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

1. Multiple use management, in fact, does not exist as the governing principle on the Bitterroot National Forest.

2. Quality timber management and harvest practices are missing. Consideration of recreation, watershed, wildlife and grazing appear as afterthoughts.

3. The management sequence of clear-cutting-terracing-planting cannot be justified as an investment for producing timber on the BNF. We doubt that the Bitterroot National Forest can continue to produce timber at the present harvest level.

4. Clearcutting and planting is an expensive operation. Its use should bear some relationship to the capability of the site to return the cost invested.

5. The practice of terracing on the BNF should be stopped. Existing terraced areas should be dedicated for research.

6. A clear distinction must be made between timber *management* and timber *mining*. Timber *management*, i.e. continuous production of timber crops, is rational only on highly productive sites, where an appropriate rate of return on invested capital can be expected. All other timber cutting activities must be considered as timber *mining*.

7. Where timber *mining*, i.e. removing residual old growth timber from sites uneconomical to manage, is to be practiced, all other onsite values must be retained. Hydrologic, habitat, and aesthetic values must be preserved by single-tree selection cutting, a minimum disturbance of all residual vegetation, and the use of a minimum standard, one-time, temporary road.

8. The research basis for management of the BNF is too weak to support the management practices used on the forest.

9. Unless the job of total quality management is recognized by the agency leadership, the necessary financing for the complete task will not be aggressively sought.

10. Manpower and budget limitations of public resource agencies do not at present allow for essential staffing and for integrated multiple-use planning.

11. Present manpower ceilings prevent adequate staffing on the BNF. Adequate staffing requires people professionally trained and qualified through experience.

12. The quantitative shortage of staff specialists will never be resolved unless the qualitative issue with respect to such specialists is first resolved.

13. We find the bureaucratic line structure as it operates, archaic, undesirable and subject to change. The manager on the ground should be much nearer the top of the career ladder.

14. The Forest Service as an effective and efficient bureaucracy needs to be reconstructed so that substantial, responsible, local public participation in the processes of policy-formation and decision-making can naturally take place.

15. It appears inconceivable and incongruous to us that at this time, with the great emphasis upon a broad multiple-use approach to our natural resources—especially those remaining in public ownership—that any representative group or institution in our society would advocate a dominant-use philosophy with respect to our natural resources. Yet it is our judgment that this is precisely what is occurring through the federal appropriation process, via executive order and in the Public Land Law Review Commission's Report. It would appear to us that at this time any approach to public land management which would de-emphasize a broad multiple-use philosophy, a broad environmental approach, a broad open-access

approach, or which would reduce the production of our public land resources in the long run is completely out of step with the interests and desires of the American people. What is needed is a fully funded program of action for quality management of all of our public lands.

THE PROBLEM

The problem arises from public dissatisfaction with the Bitterroot National Forest's overriding concern for sawtimber production. It is compounded by an apparent insensitivity to the related forest uses and to the local public's interest in environmental values.

In a federal agency which measures success primarily by the quantity of timber produced weekly, monthly and annually, the staff of the Bitterroot National Forest finds itself unable to change its course, to give anything but token recognition to related values, or to involve most of the local public in any way but as antagonists.

The heavy timber orientation is built in by legislative action and control, by executive direction and by budgetary restriction. It is further reinforced by the agency's own hiring and promotion policies and it is rationalized in the doctrines of its professional expertise.

This rigid system developed during the expanded effort to meet national housing needs during the post-war boom. It continues to exist in the face of a considerable change in our value system—a rising public concern with environmental quality. While the national demand for timber has abated considerably, the major emphasis on timber production continues.

The post-war production boom may have justified the single-minded emphasis on timber production. But the continued emphasis largely ignores the economics of regeneration; it ignores related forest values; it ignores local social concerns; and it is simply out of step with changes in our society since the post-war years. The needs of the post-war boom were met at considerable social as well as economic cost. While the rate and methods of cutting and regeneration can be defended on a purely technical basis, they are difficult to defend on either environmental or long-run economic grounds.

Many local people regard the timber production emphasis as an alien orientation, exploiting the local resource for non-local benefit. It is difficult for them to distinguish what they see from the older forest exploitation which we deplored in other regions. They feel left out of any policy formation or decision-making and so resort to protest as the only available means of being heard.

Many of the employees of the Forest Service are aware of the problems and are dissatisfied with the position of the agency. They recognize the agency is in trouble, but they find it impossible to change, or, at least, to change fast enough.

Multiple-use is stated as the guiding principle of the Forest Service. Given wide lip-service, it cannot be said to be operational on the Bitterroot National Forest at this time.

A change in funding to increase considerably the activities in nontimber uses would help, but could not be effective until legislative and executive emphasis changed.

But even with this modification the internal bureaucracy of the agency and the lack of public involvement in decision-making make real change unlikely.

As long as short-run emphasis on timber production overrides long-run (and short-run) concern for related uses and local environmental quality, real change is impossible and the outlook is for continued conflict and discontent.

PROBLEM ELEMENTS

The committee found that the controversy surrounding the Bitterroot is both substantial and legitimate. While it is true that in

a good many areas the conflict has been expressed in highly emotional and charged terms with many inaccuracies, still it is the opinion of the committee that the Bitterroot Controversy is a very real problem situation. It is a very serious local problem of the Bitterroot Valley and Western Montana, and for the United States as a society in general. The controversy contains many elements. A partial listing of these elements will help to elucidate the complexity of the controversy.

1. Over the past few years management decisions and policies have frequently resulted in situations that have disappointed virtually all the publics that make use of the Bitterroot National Forest. Frequently this has led to situations in which the land managers have found themselves isolated from these publics, and to situations in which their word with respect to land management policies was substantially discounted. This situation results, in our opinion, not necessarily because of poor local management or local inefficiencies, but because of policies laid down in Washington, in legislation and through the appropriations process as it is then implemented by the executive branch at its higher levels. This is especially true with respect to Congressional funding of the various program activities that would make the language of the Multiple-Use Act a set of realities instead of slogans.

2. Until relatively recently, timber management of the Bitterroot National Forest was handled entirely by nature, primarily through wild forest fires. Such management (accidentally) led to "even-aged" stands of timber particularly in the back country. Quite logically, Forest Service policy has developed to continue deliberately such even-aged timber management. Many of the practices of even-aged management are essential elements in the controversy (i.e., clear-cutting, regeneration practices, road construction for such sales, clean-up methods, and logging practices).

3. Much of the Bitterroot National Forest is fairly steep to rugged terrain. As a consequence, results of timber management practices are clearly visible from areas prized for recreational and aesthetic values and more recently by real estate development interests within the Bitterroot Valley.

4. An error in the calculations of the allowable cut for ponderosa pine occurred in the Bitterroot National Forest. As a result an over-cut of pine has taken place in recent years. Mills within the area attempted expansion on the basis of the anticipated cut and the change in sales patterns lead to public controversy and major skepticism over Bitterroot National Forest management in general.

5. As a result of change technology and changing markets, species not formerly salable from public lands have had markets develop. Consequently species not formerly cut, e.g., lodgepole pine, have been sold and cut. Harvesting lodgepole pine involves clear-cutting and to promote regeneration severe slash burning of the entire cut and exposure of the mineral soil. The severe land treatment involved in such harvest comes under increasing public condemnation not only in the Bitterroot, but quite generally throughout the United States.

6. A decision to stop clear-cutting as a cutting practice may be a decision not to cut most mature lodgepole pine on the Bitterroot National Forest. The lumber industry, together with some members of the Congress and elements of the executive branch oppose reducing the amount of merchantable timber harvested.

7. Throughout our society major changes are taking place with respect to public involvement in the decision, formulation and policy-making processes in all areas. The various groups involved locally (and across

the country) in the Bitterroot Controversy are a reflection of the nature of these changes. Traditional complex bureaucratic structures such as the Forest Service are only beginning to feel the tactics and devices employed by this new spirit of public involvement.

8. Local residents who are familiar with the systems of cutting used earlier are disturbed with the change, do not understand the reasons for the difference and doubt that the forest can continue to produce at the present level continuously.

9. There is a great deal of waste material left on the ground after clear-cutting. People see many logs that they consider merchantable. Brush is scattered throughout the area. The soil has been scarified by bulldozers, there are great windrows of material piled up. They protest both the ugliness of the area and the considerable waste they see in unused materials.

10. Bitterroot residents have a deep-seated love for their valley. Their view of the landscape is precious to them.

11. The population has and is being rapidly augmented by new residents who are attracted by the beauty of the valley. Many of these new residents are intelligent, vocal and well-informed in ramifications of the environmental movement. They feel strongly that the social and aesthetic values of the forest community are being given short shrift.

12. There is concern among some people in the logging industry and woods workers as well as other local people that the present rate of cut on the Bitterroot National Forest is too heavy and that future employment and income are threatened.

THE FOREST SERVICE TASK FORCE REPORT

As part of our study the committee carefully examined the report "Management Practices on the Bitterroot National Forest, A Task Force Appraisal May 1969—April 1970." In order to appraise fairly or to fairly understand our evaluation of that report the following background information is essential. Prior to May of 1969 the Bitterroot National Forest controversy began to receive substantial public and media attention, and developed into a major management problem for the Forest Service. In an effort to document the problems, to investigate them and to make recommendations with respect to the problems for management of the Bitterroot National Forest, Neal M. Rahm, Regional Forester, and Joseph F. Pechanec, Director of the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, appointed an "in-house" task force to provide them with a study and a report. The Task Force was instructed "to make a complete, impartial appraisal of (the) management practices." As a format for their study and report they chose letters to Mr. Rahm from two groups within the Bitterroot (pp. 3-7 of the Report).

The Task Force Report is basically an answer to the specific questions posed in those two letters.

Our evaluation of the Task Force Report will be broken into two parts. First we wish to comment on pp. 1-v, 1-69. Second we will comment separately on the final section, "What Challenges Do Wildlife, Aesthetics, Recreation, and Livestock Pose for Timber Management," pp. 70-76.

Comments with respect to pp. 1-v, 1-69: The Task Force, in our considered judgment, did a commendable job in analyzing and publicizing the results of its investigation of the charges relative to timber management. These pages of the Report are addressed to major issues relative to management in the Bitterroot National Forest; they examine the issues raised by the two letters and the Report used as a framework.

There are several minor errors in the Report. These errors were virtually unavoidable given the methodology pursued by the

Task Force in its examination. While it is an "in-house" report it was not subjected to agency editing and evaluation prior to publication or other protective devices that could have been employed by the Forest Service and that could have resulted in quibbling away its essential clarity and relevance. We wish to state, however, our belief that it is a psychological impossibility to evaluate one's own efforts objectively.

With respect to the specific recommendations of the Report our committee offers the following comments:

On page 9 the Task Force observes: "There is an implicit attitude among many people on the staff of the Bitterroot National Forest that resource production goals come first and that land management considerations take second place." We believe that this is so not merely with respect to the Bitterroot National Forest. It is widespread throughout the Forest Service, especially with respect to timber production in a sense that getting the logs out comes first. High quality, professional management of the timber resources is all too rare—growing the best possible trees, on the highest quality sites, and allocating the production dollar toward growing commercial stands of timber only on those sites. The pressures upon the Forest Service to get the logs out cannot be surmounted without the express assistance of the Congress. The pressures come not merely from private industry and from local communities dependent upon logs from public lands for their mills, *more importantly* the pressures come from (1) efforts to produce timber faster by legislative fiat; (2) efforts to produce timber faster by Presidential proclamation without corresponding increases in funds allocated to the Forest Service for reforestation and timber stand improvement; and, (3) efforts to produce timber faster or at least remove it faster in terms of the recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission. To our committee many of the recommendations of the Public Land and Law Review Commission appear totally insensitive to the general mood of the group within American society expressing their desires with respect to the disposition and use of our national forests and other public lands. The efforts of the Public Land Law Review Commission to erode the meaning and spirit of the Multiple-Use Act by making timber production the dominant use on suitable public lands can be found in many places within their report. (See specifically pp. 28, 93, 95-100.)

It appears inconceivable and incongruous to our committee that at this time, with the great emphasis upon a broad multiple-use approach to our natural resources—especially those remaining in public ownership—that any representative group or institution in our society would advocate a dominant-use philosophy with respect to our natural resources. Yet it is our judgment that this is precisely what is occurring through the federal appropriation process, via executive order and in the Public Land Law Review Commission's report. It would appear to us that at this time any approach to public land management which would de-emphasize a broad multiple-use philosophy, a broad environmental approach, a broad open-access approach, or which would reduce the production of our public land resources in the long run is completely out of step with the interests and desires of the American people. What is needed is a fully funded program of action for quality management of all of our public lands.

The Task Force observes on page 14: "Increased funds alone will not solve present problems." We concur. In order to provide quality management of our public lands—with due emphasis to considerations of environmental quality—the public agencies

providing the direction and management must be adequately staffed to do the task. Present manpower ceilings prevent adequate staffing. Additional staff is required in many areas, e.g. soils, landscape architecture, integrated management planning, wildlife, recreation, to mention only a few. In many, if not most of these areas the staff needed must be professionally trained and qualified through experience, not merely as the result of assignment. Such staff must be in a position to provide management direction, not merely advice.

A re-evaluation of lines of authority and career ladders of the Forest Service is essential. Today the land manager making basic management decisions on the ground is near the bottom of the career ladder. We find this situation archaic, undesirable, and subject to change. The position of the on the ground manager, the district ranger, should be substantially upgraded and be much nearer the top of the career ladder than at present.

In general terms our committee also concurs in the other major observations and recommendations up through page 69 of the Report. In places we would change the emphasis somewhat; in other instances we concur, upon the assumption that the technical information behind the recommendation is correct.

In one additional instance we wish to concur specifically in a recommendation of the Task Force and then amplify the recommendation. On page 15 the Task Force recommends: "Multiple-use plans on the Bitterroot National Forest must become the controlling documents in *fact as well as in principle*. This will require strengthening these multiple-use plans so they clearly establish goals and direction of management on individual areas." (Emphasis supplied.)

Multiple-use planning must precede management commitment of land to known or expected production goals. Multiple-use planning of public lands is a very special kind of planning, which must include effective public participation. Such special planning requires the availability and direct participation in the planning of well-qualified specialists in all relevant resource fields. Unless such specialists are a part of the planning process they are not in a position to influence the management decisions that must be made. It is not enough to bring the specialists in to review and notify the plan when initially completed. Such a process is at best a poor compromise within a poor process. *Manpower and budget limitations of public resource agencies, in our opinion, do not at the present time allow for this essential staffing and for this process of integrating multiple-use planning.* Needless to say specialists of all kinds that are required for such a planning process cannot be expected to arise as the result of in-line promotion within the present career ladders of public land-use agencies.

Comments on pp. 70-76 of the Bitterroot Report: The weakest section of the Bitterroot Report is the chapter entitled "What Challenges do Wildlife, Aesthetics, Recreation, and Livestock Pose for Timber Management." Perhaps it should have been left out completely, for in its present form it merely draws attention to its inadequacies and reinforces the public charge that the Forest Service is primarily oriented toward timber harvest as the dominant use of national forests.

Our main reaction is that the questions raised in the chapter title are not answered. In less than seven pages, four major resource areas are disposed of in a casual and general manner. Despite all the rhetoric in the rest of the report regarding multiple-use planning, no real commitment or expertise was demonstrated.

Wildlife—One very disturbing aspect of the Task Force Report, especially since it was

specifically singled out for special treatment by both the Ravalli County Resource Conservation and Development Committee (p. 5) and the Bitterroot Multiple-Use Association (p. 7), was the attitude toward wildlife management. They did conclude that "much more information was needed concerning the relation of elk to other resource management activities" and suggested future cooperative efforts with the Montana Fish and Game Department.

There are other big game species besides elk however, and other game species besides big game, and other wildlife than those species sought by hunters. Again we find the emphasis being placed on the dominant species with little feeling for the equally important, if less exploitable, faunal members of the forest ecosystem.

Aesthetics—Scattered throughout the report are references to aesthetics with the suggestion that a landscape architect be assigned to every sale. It is not clear whether such a person would have veto power over the sale and sale specifications, or whether he would be called upon, after the fact, to apply his skills toward a cosmetic treatment of an existing, or an about to be produced, eyesore.

If effective multiple-use planning were a reality, management plans would not always start with a timber sale which would later be negated by adverse reports from watershed experts or landscape architects. Long range timber industry plans are rudely interrupted when "areas are withdrawn from cutting: (p. 39 #2) and the worst kind of public relations is experienced."

Recreation—The fastest growing use of national forest lands is reputed to be recreation but if so, it went almost undetected in the Task Force Report. One general recommendation (p. 76 #4) and a page more or less devoted to a discussion of recreation needs and planning is grossly inadequate. The recreationist may enter the forest via a logging road but this cannot be attributed to recreation planning. Perhaps recreation needs should be determined by the public, not for the public.

Range—The coverage of range management and livestock activities on the Forest was so superficial that it is difficult to evaluate objectively. We get the impression that the Task Force was defending Forest Service practices as being of no harm to livestock operators. What is not covered, however, is the fact that neither have they been aided, and no data seems to be available to assess possible harmful or conflicting situations between livestock and tree regeneration, or livestock and wildlife.

Perhaps many of the short-comings of the non-timber oriented activities of the national forests can be remedied by increasing appropriations and lifting the man-power ceilings, but there are other considerations: (a) inadequate staffing may be a *qualitative* matter. The personnel director within the agency cannot be the final judge of "expertise" or "qualified professionals." This must be a matter for external evaluation. (b) The *quantitative* shortage in services of other disciplines (wildlife biologists, landscape architects, etc.) will never be resolved if the leadership does not recognize or is not sympathetic to the needs for other services than timber management.

The Task Force Report does recognize the latter possibility (p. 13) in part when it states that "The necessary funds for these services have not been included in the estimated costs."

Why haven't they been included? Perhaps in retrospect it can be said that unless the total management job is understood, the agency leadership will probably not aggressively (seek) the necessary finances."

ECONOMICS, CONVENTIONAL FORESTRY, AND
A SUGGESTED CHANGE

In the preceding section we have examined the Task Force Report, and we accepted the assumptions and institutions of both the agency and the forestry profession. In this section we relax those constraints to take a broad look at the assumptions and institutions. First, a simple economic analysis of the timber management practices we observed is made. The devastating consequences of such analysis should have been apparent on the Bitterroot; we will explain why they were overlooked. Finally we will suggest an alternative management process.

While the problem in the Bitterroot Valley is complex and many-faceted, in the final analysis it resolved into disaffection on the part of some elements of the public with the practice of "clear-cutting, terracing, and planting."

This problem has been examined, reviewed and debated from a dozen points of view—ecology, aesthetics, wildlife, water yield, timber production, and others. Curiously however, very little has been said about the *economic aspect* of the practice. One might explain this phenomenon on the grounds that economics is an inexact science and besides good input data doesn't exist—but these limitations apply equally or more so to the other facets of the entire controversy. The fact is that any consideration of the economic facts casts the problem in a whole new light. It helps to identify weak spots in past arguments. It points the way towards a more rational analysis of the problem. It helps to identify real issues in the controversy.

To make the maximum contribution, a whole series of sophisticated economic studies would be necessary. The industries in the Bitterroot Valley (timber, grazing, recreation) should be examined to determine their regional and national importance and to measure their interdependence and impact upon the resources of the Bitterroot National Forest. Social values and costs should be evaluated for alternative land uses in the area. And so on and on. These undertakings are beyond the scope of our report, but the utility of such economic studies can be demonstrated by taking a brief look at a narrow aspect of the problem: an example of economic analysis of clear-cutting and terracing in the Bitterroot Valley.

To demonstrate the economic irrationality of the practice of "clear-cutting, terracing, and planting," we indulge in simple mathematics.

Assume the following:

Establishment costs (Regeneration), \$50/acre (this is conservative).

Of her costs, none (an unrealistic, but simplifying assumption).

Rotation length, 120 years (close to the average reported for ponderosa pine, in the Task Force Report).

Yield at rotation age, 20 MBF* (optimistic for most sites on the Bitterroot).

Stumpage value, \$25/MBF* (in 1970 dollars).

Interest rate, 5% (this approximates the rate being paid on longterm government bonds—a conservative figure. See Appendix B).

If we invest the \$50 in stand establishment and charge no other costs through the 120-year period, the stand at harvest would have to be worth \$17,445 per acre, in order to return 5 percent on the initial public investment in regeneration. If the actual yield were 20 MBF per acre, the stumpage value would have to be \$872 per thousand board feet. If the stumpage value were actually \$25/MBF (in 1970 dollars) the yield would have to be 697,000 board feet per acre.

It would obviously be impossible to achieve yields of these magnitudes.

It is enlightening to work the problem in reverse. In order to earn 5 percent on the investment, with yield and stumpage assumptions given, the stand would have to be established at a cost of \$1.43 per acre. If we relax the conservative assumptions used in this illustration, and set more realistic values for costs, yields, and interest rates—the results become ludicrous. The only way to justify the practice is to *ignore* economic analysis as a tool of decision-making.

The conclusions are clear and incontestable. *Clear-cutting and terracing cannot be justified as an investment for producing timber on the Bitterroot National Forest.* There are better and much more economical ways to provide for the nation's timber needs.

If we eliminate timber as a justification for terracing, what is left? Not water. Terracing may not impair water yield or quality, but nobody has yet shown that it improves water production. Not grazing. The purpose of terracing is to eliminate grass and other vegetative competition, which hardly enhances the grazing potential. Not recreation or aesthetics. There seems little doubt that the original forest or a naturally regenerated forest is more pleasing to look at or recreate in. There seems to be no possible way of justifying these practices.

Then why have the practices been used?

The core of forestry professionalism, the central tenet of professional dogma, is sustained yield timber management. This concept was introduced into American forestry by early Chief Foresters Bernhard Fernow and Gifford Pinchot in the late 1800's, but it was developed and rationalized in the mercantile economies of Germany and France a century before that. These economies were characterized by stability, certainty, and, via the prohibition of imports, a selfimposed scarcity.

The scarcity of natural resources, though self-imposed, was no less real, and thus natural resources were "conserved." Labor and capital, relatively more abundant, were applied to timberlands. The management objective became the maximum biologically sustainable quantity of the physical product, wood.

With its implicit assumptions of scarcity, this dogma became the central dictum of professional forestry. As dogma it remains virtually unchallenged in American forestry education. The graduates of that education staff the Forest Service. We found much evidence that a major element in the Bitterroot Controversy was just this professional dogma. "Productivity" we learned time and again, meant maximum physical production of sawlogs. Much timberland was being harvested ostensibly to "get it into production." The idea that a scraggly stand of overmature timber could and does provide other values was alien and largely absent from the thinking of most of the professional foresters we encountered: this in spite of their lip service to "multiple-use."

If "productivity" is held to mean simply sawlogs at any cost then much of what we observed was wholly rational. We question seriously such a constrained definition. If "productivity" includes recreation, watershed, wildlife, and aesthetic values then much of what we saw cannot be rationalized at all. For certainly the idea that clear-cutting a forest to "get it into production" is similar to military rationale of destroying a town to save it. Clear-cutting and terracing, the technical means of regenerating timber stands, effectively eliminate a large number of alternatives or managerial options.

The first option that is foregone is the basic choice—whether to cut at all. Having decided to cut, the second option foregone is

the choice of how much to cut. By striving to meet an allowable cut set at the level of maximum sustainable volume yield, an inappropriate cutting program is almost guaranteed. It is unrealistic to assume that all the volume produced is suitable or properly available for cutting, or that it is economical to cut. It has already been noted that it may be uneconomical to regenerate and grow new stands of timber after clear-cutting. If economic parameters were built into the allowable cut calculations, it is clear that the annual cut on the Bitterroot Forest would be substantially reduced below current levels.

Consideration of economic factors also suggests that a variety of alternatives to clear-cutting and terracing should be evaluated. A partial list follows:

1. Removal of large timber by highgrading, leaving a residual stand that could be re-cut on a long cutting cycle of perhaps 40 or 50 years.

2. Cut the overstory but retain the under-story for advanced regeneration, even if this means a timber species conversion or the necessity of accepting a low quality or low vigor second growth stand.

3. Use an even-aged cutting system (clear-cut, seed tree, or shelterwood) but depend on natural regeneration, even if this means long regeneration periods and irregular stocking.

4. Make a more drastic distinction between high quality and poor quality sites. On the most productive and assessible sites, manage as intensively as economic conditions allow (even clear-cutting and artificial regeneration). On low quality sites minimize capital investments or postpone all cutting to some indefinite future date.

These, and similar alternatives, have one thing in common. They would reduce timber yields somewhat in both volume and value, but they would greatly reduce dollar investments (costs) in timber management and increase the yield of non-timber benefits. The improvement in economic efficiency (i.e. the benefit/cost ratio) would be substantial. Termination of the practice of clear-cutting and terracing would mean that public funds would no longer be invested in an uneconomical and unpopular program in the Bitterroot Valley. It would be consistent with the highest traditions of wise land management, and though it might be traumatic in the short run it would certainly be a credit to the agency.

Our Committee concludes that the practices of terracing on the Bitterroot National Forest be stopped as a general management tool. Further, we recommend that the existing terraced areas be carefully studied over the course of the next decade and that these existing examples be considered as primarily a research tool. Last, we recommend that where the decision is made to cut mature timber on sites of low value that the Forest Service defend the cutting not as timber management for sustained yield but as "mining" an existing natural resource.

What we seek here is a clear distinction between cutting timber as a step in timber management, and cutting timber as a *mining* activity. We do not categorically oppose such *mining* for reasons to be explained shortly; but to equate any timber cutting consistently and blindly with timber management is a gross professional error.

We see a need to reclassify timberland on an economic basis instead of on a physical, cellulose-quantitative basis. Land which is economic to manage for timber crops will return a decent rate of interest on capital invested. On this land, timber harvesting as a step in timber management is rational. But land which supports timber that is economic *only to cut* is not capable of earning a satisfactory return, in which case the harvest is tantamount to a mining operation. In other

*MBF=thousand board feet.

words, if we cannot afford economically to initiate, grow, and harvest a second stand of timber, then we are simply mining the first stand. At times this can be defended. But we must stop confusing cutting with management. We found a great deal of such confusion on the Bitterroot.

One consequence of distinguishing between management and mining has been referred to above: we recommend "managing" only the highest quality sites, investing in regeneration and protection costs where satisfactory rates of return can be demonstrated.

Another consequence of making the distinction would be to induce a very careful and deliberate sequence of choices on low quality growing sites. The initial decision, whether to cut at all, simply could not be made on the basis of "getting the land into production." By definition, there would be no intention whatsoever of investing in post-cutting regeneration costs. Thus, the initial choice of whether to cut at all would need to be an analytical, stand-by-stand decision, not a doctrinaire decision.

Given the decision to mine the timber on a low quality growing site, the next choice would be one of cutting methods. Since there would be no systematic concern for a subsequent crop of commercial timber, all silvicultural necessities could be ignored. If by clear-cutting and terracing we unwittingly sacrifice aesthetic values, game habitat, natural hydrology, and recreational values, the mining technique should be deliberately designed to protect or enhance these values. We mean, specifically, that the cutting method should protect or enhance the other values *on the site*. We heard many times that clear-cutting and terracing enhanced such other values on the adjacent hillside, or downstream, or over the ridge, and this is specifically what we do *not* mean. We believe that on-site, co-existing, simultaneous values need not be sacrificed. Sensitive, careful timber mining would avoid doing so. We recommend cutting on a single-tree selection basis. We would minimize the permanent road system, building low-standard, single-lane, one-time roads that would be seeded to grass and closed at the end of the timber mining activities. We would not terrace. We would not strip. We would not plant.

Such activity would rest very lightly on the land. Aesthetic values, natural hydrology, game habitat, and recreational values would remain virtually intact. Yet the residual timber value could be captured.

We see no reason to sacrifice non-timber values to silvicultural methods that have no economic rationale. Hence we suggest that a sensitive but deliberate timber mining activity be considered a legitimate alternative.

We heard many times that clear-cutting and terracing were necessary to control certain diseases—notably dwarf mistletoe—and to lessen the hazard of wildfire. Timber mining would not achieve either goal. But we are unconcerned, for the argument is unconvincing in the first place: existing, commercial timber has grown in the face of these environmental factors. We suspect subsequent, "unmanaged" stands can do the same. A stronger case can be made on the basis of "whole forest" management. We are becoming increasingly aware of the beneficial effects of fire, for example, on other, non-timber values in the forest. We do not yet, and may never, see a positive value in dwarf mistletoe; but in regard to wildlife, watershed, and aesthetic values, it is at least neutral. Timber mining, one aspect of "whole forest" management, can withstand the fire/disease criticism with relative ease.

We realize these suggestions are unorthodox. We realize they are clearly antithetical to professional dogma; but that dogma has contributed substantially to the Bitterroot problem. We realize that the ultimate adoption of these suggestions is a matter of pro-

fessional reorientation and may involve statutory modifications as well. We realize these things. Yet we propose these changes, convinced that superficial shifts in management practices will not suffice.

THE PROBLEM OF PUBLIC SERVICE BUREAUCRACY

Earlier we listed some of the sources of the conflict over management practices in the Bitterroot National Forest. The last item we listed referred to the changes taking place within our society. We would, at this point, like to comment in more depth on that point.

A large part of the Bitterroot Controversy results from the great disparity in values and objectives among the various groups involved in the Bitterroot. We doubt that the most carefully developed arguments will ever convince opponents of the appropriateness of some of the now practiced land management practices, e.g. clear-cutting lodgepole pine, terracing, or high standard road construction. Regardless of any developed fund of knowledge, research results, or even conditions of pure and simple fact, some of the groups involved in the Bitterroot National Forest are opposed to these land management practices under any and all circumstances; and nothing that can be said is likely to change their views, their positions or their unconditional opposition. At this point we must note that the crucial issue then becomes one of examining the process through which unpopular decisions involving public policy must be made.

The Forest Service like other complex organizations has developed a highly systematic, rational, routinized approach to problem-solving and decision-making based upon a programmatic definition of problems and solutions. While pragmatically quite defensible (it gets the job done) this approach overlooks many highly significant factors affecting the ultimate impact of policy and decision on people and groups not involved in policy formulation. Those most directly affected, in this instance the interest groups in the Bitterroot, have little reason to accept practices imposed upon them through bureaucratic decisions made elsewhere. They insist on being a part of the decision-making process, and their participation must be more meaningful than invitations to public hearings and briefing sessions.

Institutions and agencies currently are undergoing major changes in relationship between practitioners and clients, between purveyors of services and constituents. Resource management agencies in common with educational, religious, medical, and other service-oriented institutions are caught between the conventional, essentially conservative, bureaucratic structure of the past and the modernist conception of service as a two-way process. The patient today is insisting on being fully informed about the diagnosis and prognosis of his case by the physician. The recipient of social aid insists on being part of the decision that affects him. The modern parishioner demands a reciprocal interaction with his priest or his pastor. Clients no longer are willing to receive passively whatever good the dispensing person or agency chooses to dispense. We can expect to see the acceptors of services increasingly demanding a significant role in the processes that affect their interest. There is no reason to expect the Forest Service to be exempt from this trend toward a more democratic participation in policy formulation and decision-making. The Service must realize that all significant interests in the communities affected by its policies must be involved. Moreover, this involvement must comprehend more than formal, but frequently superficial, operation of an information and education apparatus. The Forest Service must develop techniques which will include the various publics in the policy, formulation, and decision-making processes as these processes evolve. Inevitably this must mean occasional,

if not frequent, modification of preconceived courses of action.

Bureaucratic structures such as the Forest Service not only alienate public support, they also inhibit effective exploitation of key personnel. In order to maximize local community resources and to attract local community support those persons in the Service most intimately associated with local community interests must be free to act. They require a latitude and a flexibility of operation which is denied them within the conventional bureaucratic structure. The person most sensitively located to relate constructively to local people is the district ranger. He represents the Forest Service. He makes administrative decisions within limits imposed by agency policy. By and large, the image he projects is likely to determine the way in which those within his district perceive the total organization. Yet his authority is severely limited and all too frequently his decisions and answers are bureaucratically determined. Despite reservations or frustrations that he may feel, his ultimate action is likely to be taken within the context of his supervisor's office and eventually of the regional forester's office. He is therefore denied the flexibility to meet issues and problems on an ad hoc basis. It might almost be said that his decisions are always predetermined, at least with respect to major issues and problems.

Since successful performance of bureaucratic roles, and therefore recognition and advancement, depends on definitions of performance that are bureaucratically determined, personnel at the district and forest level can scarcely be blamed for keeping this firmly in mind. That it acts as an impedance to public understanding and community participation is in a sense irrelevant. A ranger's future professional success is much more likely to be determined by judgments made within his organization than by judgments about the Forest Service and its management policies made within the community.

If our contentions are correct, and we believe that they are, then one aspect of the controversy involving the Bitterroot National Forest can be said to apply to the Forest Service more generally. The Forest Service as an effective and efficient bureaucracy needs to be reconstructed so that substantial, responsible, local public participation in the processes of policy-formulation and decision-making can naturally take place.

Last, it is our opinion that our comments in this final section come as no surprise to the Forest Service. It is our belief and opinion that the Service is engage in a serious process of self-examination. In that process of self-examination we urge consideration for the point of view that stresses the most efficiency in providing effective public involvement in public decision-making, even if internal bureaucratic efficiency must in some ways be sacrificed.

NEED FOR RESEARCH

The Bitterroot Valley, while unique in some specific ways, is really representative of a large part of the Rocky Mountain West. It is characterized by vast open space, low population density, an economy based on wildland resources, and a culture that is in transition from the "frontier" type with emphasis on exploitation to a more mature kind in which stability and environmental amenities are held in higher regard. Commodity resources (timber, minerals, grass, etc.) are increasing in value as the national economy continues to grow; but non-commodity resources (wildlife, aesthetics, recreation opportunities, etc.) are increasing even more rapidly in value as the national stock of these items dwindles and our affluent population puts more emphasis on the quality of life.

Thus we see the Bitterroot Valley faced with the same dilemma as so many other

areas in the Rocky Mountain West—the need for more economic growth and development, but a strong desire to maintain or preserve a high quality natural environment. We need more wood products, but we want clean air and beautiful vistas. Here lie the seeds of discontent, conflict, and controversy. But, here also is an opportunity and a challenge.

There is no reason to assume that economic development and environmental quality are mutually exclusive or irreconcilable. History and experience indicate that the problem is a difficult one—and we do not have the solution at hand. But, an objective appraisal of the situation leads to optimism, not pessimism. Trees can be cut without leaving an unsightly mess, roads can be built so that they complement the natural beauty of the countryside, disturbed areas can be rehabilitated, people can use the land for recreation without destroying it—and so on. We have failed in the past, not because the problem is unsolvable, but because we didn't recognize the scope of the problem, we didn't utilize enough ingenuity, and we just didn't try hard enough. In particular, we didn't invest sufficiently in research and we didn't make optimum use of the limited research information that was available.

The need for a more viable research program seems painfully obvious. For example, one can turn at random to almost any page in the Bitterroot Task Force Report and find either a statement of dubious validity, an admission of inadequate knowledge, or an overt plea for more reliable information. The writers of that report apparently feel that major improvements could be achieved by expanding the staff support available to decision-makers in the agency. But it is also clear that even staff experts would frequently be helpless because of the serious shortage of basic data concerning the resources and knowledge of the effects of man's activities. A vastly expanded research effort is ultimately the only solution to the fundamental question—how can we use these wildland resources without having a deleterious effect on the natural environment?

It also follows, of course, that the research must be well directed, competently performed, and effectively disseminated. It should concentrate on areas of critical importance or where existing knowledge is weakest . . . e.g. watersheds, wildlife, and recreation (including esthetic considerations). It should also examine certain managerial matters, such as procedures for formulating policy (e.g. how best to involve the public) and procedures for evaluating investment alternatives (e.g. economic analysis, systems analysis, etc.).

The Bitterroot Valley (and much of the Rocky Mountain West) is posing unprecedented problems, and we must have more and better knowledge if we expect to deal effectively with these new situations. This knowledge must come in large measure from organized research. Empirics, experience, and intuition will not suffice.

APPENDIX A—COMMITTEE ORIGIN AND ACTIVITIES

This report is addressed to the Montana Congressional delegation which requested a study of the Bitterroot conflict. Specifically, Senator Lee Metcalf asked the Dean of the University of Montana Forestry School to establish a study committee to examine the issues, the opinion, and the facts relative to the public controversy surrounding land management policies on the Bitterroot National Forest. To provide the basis for this report a number of things have been done during the past year.

1. A study committee was selected composed of the Dean of the School of Forestry, a wildlife research specialist, a quantitative forest economist, a forest policy specialist, a

sociologist with special interest in bureaucracy, a political scientist with a specialty in pressure groups, and a public policy economist. All members of the committee have substantial experience with the Forest Service and with most federal and state land management agencies, their past and current problems, and their personnel.

2. The committee made two major field trips to the Bitterroot National Forest and communities it encompasses, once accompanied by Bitterroot National Forest personnel and again by members of the Sleeping Child Water Users Association.

3. An aerial inspection of the Bitterroot National Forest was made by some members of the committee to examine the results of past and present management practices.

4. Individual visits to various portions of the Bitterroot National Forest were made by members of the committee.

5. The committee attended the Task Force presentation to the public and the Forest Service at Hamilton on May 11, 1970, and it

attended the Task Force presentation to the supervisory personnel of the Bitterroot National Forest.

6. The committee met with major groups and principals in the controversy.

7. The committee considered carefully the documents relating to timber and other resource supply and use for the Bitterroot National Forest.

8. The committee examined in depth and in detail the Task Force presentation, "Management Practices on the Bitterroot National Forest April 15, 1970."

9. The committee studied the current accounts of similar conflicts in West Virginia, Colorado, Wyoming and other areas.

10. In a substantial number of meetings the committee met and argued at length all aspects of the controversy at all stages in its examination of the problems relating to the Bitterroot National Forest.

11. All members of the committee served without special compensation and at personal expense to each member of the committee.

APPENDIX B—ALTERNATIVE INTEREST RATE CALCULATIONS

	Interest rate			
	3 percent	5 percent	6 percent	8 percent
Value at end of rotation (to earn indicated interest rate)	\$1,736	\$17,445	\$54,409	\$152,650
If yield were 20 MBF, stumpage would have to be (per MBF)	\$86.80	\$872	\$2,720	\$25,632
If stumpage were \$25/MBF, yield would have to be (MBF per acre)	69.4	697	2,176	20,506
To earn indicated interest rate, stand establishment would have to be accomplished with (per acre)	\$14.41	\$1.43	\$0.46	\$0.05

NOTES

(1) Actual rate of return on regeneration investment under indicated assumptions—1.9 percent.

(2) With modified but more realistic assumptions (establishment costs—\$75; annual cost for protection, administration, etc.—\$0.65 per acre per year; rotation—100 years; yield—15 MBF per acre; etc.): Rate of return—0.85 percent.

(3) No matter how the assumptions are relaxed (e.g. assuming large yields, etc.) the rate of return cannot be made to rise above 2.3 percent (unless nonsense assumptions are used).

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON THE SELECT COMMITTEE

The seven members of the Select Committee on the Bitterroot National Forest are members of the faculty of the University of Montana in Missoula. At the time the committee was established in December 1969 four members of the committee including the chairman were members of the School of Forestry and three members were from the College of Arts and Sciences. In July of 1970 one member of the committee, an economics professor, resigned from the College and accepted a position of Professor of Forestry in the School of Forestry.

1. ARNOLD W. BOLLE

Arnold W. Bolle has been Dean of the School of Forestry and Director of the Forest and Conservation Experiment Station at the University of Montana since 1962. He has served on the faculty since 1955. Research and publications have spanned the natural resources area including forestry, wildlife, watershed, outdoor recreation and product manufacturing. Primary area of interest has been in multiple use management and the development of plans and programs to meet changing future need.

He was awarded his doctorate in public administration from Harvard University in 1960 and also has a master's degree from Harvard in 1955, a B.S. in forestry from the University of Montana in 1937 and a B.A. in Liberal Arts from Northwestern College in 1934. He is acting Director of the Environment and Resources Analysis Center, serves on two committees for the National Academy of Sciences, is past president of the National Council of Forestry School Executives, is a member of the Executive Board of the Association of State College and University Forest Research Organizations, is director and past president of several Montana resource organizations, and has served as advisor and consultant to several federal and

state resource agencies. He is a member of many professional and scientific organizations: AAAS, Society of American Foresters, Wildlife Federation, American Forestry Association, Soil Conservation Society, Wilderness Society, Range Management Society, Phi Kappa Phi, Xi Sigma Phi, and others.

2. R. W. BEHAN

R. W. Behan, Associate Professor of natural resource policy and administration, joined the School of Forestry faculty in 1963. He had previously served six years with the U.S. Forest Service in the Alaska Region. At the time of his resignation, he was functional staff assistant to the Forest Supervisor of the Chugach National Forest, in charge of timber management, wildlife management, fire control, and multiple use planning.

Behan holds B.S.F. and M.S.F. degrees from the University of Montana, and has recently submitted his Ph.D. thesis to the University of California at Berkeley. It is entitled "Wilderness Decisions in Region I, U.S. Forest Service: A Case Study of Professional Bureau Policy Making," and reflects Behan's interest in the processes of public policy making. He has published other research in journals of both the fields of natural resource management and of public administration.

He is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Forestry Association, the Forest History Society, the American Society for Public Administration, the Society of American Foresters, and is a director and president of the Montana Conservation Council, Inc.

Behan, his wife Ann, and their three children live near the campus in Missoula.

3. W. LESLIE PENGELLY

W. Leslie "Les" Pengelly is Professor of Wildlife Management at the University of Montana. He was appointed to the University of Montana School of Forestry staff in 1963, after serving (1954-63) as University of Montana wildlife extension specialist. His time is

divided between the School of Forestry where he teaches wildlife management courses and the School of Education where he teaches general conservation courses. He was recently appointed Coordinator of Environmental Studies Program for the University.

Prior to 1954, he was a research biologist for the Idaho Fish and Game Department, instructor at the University of Idaho, Moscow, instructor at Utah State University, and a high school teacher in Michigan. He also taught at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks (1968-69).

He earned his B.A. in biology from Northern Michigan College in 1939. He received his M.S. in wildlife management from the University of Michigan in 1948 and his Ph.D. from Utah State in 1961.

Dr. Pengelly has published several publications on ecology and wildlife. His research includes projects on fire ecology, wilderness ecology and the history of the Yellowstone elk herd. He has presented many papers on conservation issues at national conferences.

In 1967 he earned a national professional conservation award presented by the American Motor Company. He is a member of four national honor societies: Phi Sigma, Sigma Xi, Xi Sigma Pi and Phi Kappa Phi.

Active in public service, Dr. Pengelly gives many conservation talks at schools, service organizations, clubs and professional societies. He is nationally known for his ability as a speaker. He serves on many campus and forestry school committees.

His professional association memberships include the Wildlife Society, the Northwest section of the Wildlife Society and its Montana chapter, the Wilderness Society, Michigan Foresters' Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the Montana Wilderness Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Dr. Pengelly was born in Negaunee, Michigan in 1918. He and his wife Mary, have six children.

4. ROBERT F. WAMBACH

Dr. Robert F. Wambach, a 1957 graduate of the University of Montana School of Forestry, returned to his alma mater in 1967 as an associate professor of forest economics. He also serves as Associate Dean of the School of Forestry and Director of the Montana Forest and Conservation Experiment Station. Prior to his arrival at the University of Montana he was a Research Project Leader for the U.S. Forest Service (1959-67) in Minnesota and Michigan; and before that he spent five years in the U.S. Air Force as a Russian linguist.

Dr. Wambach studied forestry at the University of Michigan (1948-50). He attended Syracuse University (1952-53) and received a certificate in Russian Area Studies. Returning to forestry, he attended the University of Montana (1955-57) and received his B.S. in forestry. He received his M.F. in forest management from the University of Michigan (1959) and his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota (1966).

He is the author of numerous technical bulletins and articles which have appeared in scientific journals. He is considered an authority in the fields of forest economics and management science, and is called upon frequently to lecture on these topics at other universities and at regional and national meetings.

He belongs to several professional, honorary, and scientific societies, including the Society of American Foresters, American Economic Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Xi Sigma Pi, Gamma Sigma Delta, etc. Dr. Wambach serves on numerous professional, academic, and civic committees, including the Montana Environmental Coordinating Council, the Montana Water Resources Research Council,

the University Faculty Senate, and the Intermountain Fire Research Council.

Robert Wambach was born in 1930. He and his wife Carla, have three children. They make their home in Missoula's Rattlesnake Valley.

5. GORDON BROWDER

Gordon Browder is Professor of Sociology and Executive Director of the Institute for Social Science Research. He was the first chairman of the University's Department of Sociology serving from 1948 through 1967. During the past 22 years Professor Browder has served on virtually every significant University committee including being chairman of the faculty's governing body the Faculty Senate.

His education and experience prior to joining the University of Montana in 1948 include graduation from the public schools of Dinwiddie County, Virginia; receiving the B.A. in English from the University of Virginia in 1936, and the M.A. in Sociology from the University of North Carolina in 1941. Further graduate work in sociology led to his receiving the Ph. D. in Sociology from the University of North Carolina in 1943. He has served as Research Associate for the Bureau of Research in the Social Sciences at the University of Texas as well as Instructor of Sociology at Texas, instructor in sociology for the U.S. Army University at Shrivenham, England following his service during the war in the Infantry, and taught sociology at the University of Florida during 1946-48.

Browder has published regularly and widely during the past 30 years. His publications center around his interests in criminology, demography and conservation of human and natural resources. He is a member of the American Sociological Association of which he is a Fellow, the Pacific Sociological Association, the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Montana Academy of Sciences.

He is a member of the Region 1 Advisory Council, the Governor's Crime Control Commission, the Governor's Task Force on Indiana Problems, and serves on the Board of Directors of the United Givers of Missoula. He is also a member of Alpha Kappa Delta, the national sociology honorary, Pi Mu Alpha, the national social science honorary, is listed in *Who's Who in America*, *Who's Who in the West* and in *American Men of Science*.

Browder was born in Petersburg, Virginia in 1914. He and his wife, Alice, have three sons.

6. THOMAS PAYNE

Thomas Payne joined the University of Montana faculty in 1951 as a member of the Political Science Department. He is a graduate of Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri (A.B. 1941), and received his graduate education in political science at the University of Chicago (A.M. 1948, Ph. D. 1951). In recent years he has been President of the Northwest Political Science Association as well as Vice President. He is a member of the Executive Council of the Western Political Association and a member of the board of editors of *The Western Political Quarterly*.

At the present time Professor Payne is on a sabbatical leave in Washington, D.C. He is continuing his research in pressure groups and their impact on Montana. His research and publications during the past twenty years have centered upon the political processes in the West, especially within Montana.

Thomas Payne was born in 1920 in Fulton, Missouri. He and his wife, Katie, reside with their two sons in Missoula.

7. RICHARD E. SHANNON

Richard E. Shannon has been a professor of economics at the University of Montana for the past 14 years. On July 1, 1970 he be-

came Professor of Forestry and Director of the School of Forestry's Master of Resource Administration program. He is the chairman of the School for Administrative Leadership which celebrated its Silver Anniversary during 1970.

Professor Shannon received his undergraduate degree in economics from William Jewell College in Liberty, Missouri. His graduate degrees were conferred by the Ohio State University in 1950 and 1955. Prior to joining the faculty of the University of Montana he taught at Ohio State, Michigan State and Kenyon College. He is a member of The American Economic Association, The Royal Economic Society, regional associations, and American Forestry Association.

He is the author of several economic monographs involving public finance, economic growth, state and local planning efforts and similar topics.

Shannon was born at Hardin, Montana in 1926. He has lived in various parts of Montana. He and his wife, Gerry, have three daughters.

JOHN HANSON: FIRST PRESIDENT?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, it is the nature of this age to cast many things into doubt but it is unusual when the basic tenets of history find themselves open to question. Every schoolboy in the United States knows that George Washington was the first President under our Constitution, but may I suggest to Senators that not even this widespread belief is exempt from the scrutiny and debate of historians. Indeed, there are those who would challenge George Washington's priority in the American Presidency, though not, of course, his primary role in American history.

There is carefully documented evidence that, in fact, the first President was John Hanson of Maryland. John Hanson, a planter in southern Maryland and a member of the colonial legislature, moved to Frederick in 1773. Within a year he was chairman of a meeting at which Frederick County was the first colonial county to place an embargo on British goods. Later he almost single-handedly held out for a definition of the boundaries of colonies which were chartered by the Crown for almost unlimited tracts of Western territory. It is now generally agreed that without this definition the United States today would be dominated by four vast States. Still later, on November 5, 1781, John Hanson took office on the first day of the first Federal year under the Articles of Confederation as the President of the United States.

It is hardly fitting to attempt to summarize the arguments and the documentation of John Hanson's claim to a place in history; they are much better presented in a feature by James D. Snyder. Rather, let me express my gratitude both to Mr. Snyder for his distinguished scholarship and to Judge Edward S. Delaplaine, of Frederick, who has contributed so much through his extensive collection of historical documents. Let me recommend to Senators this feature which appeared in the September issue of *Valleys of History*, published by the Potomac Edison Co., of Hagerstown. 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:

JOHN HANSON—THE FIRST PRESIDENT?
(By James D. Snyder)

For nearly two centuries, Americans have been taking it for granted that George Washington was our first President. But it may not be true.

While no one would dispute Washington's greatness, a small vocal group of historians insists that the *real* first President's birthdate was not Feb. 22, but April 3. Or April 15.

On one of those dates in 1715 (the records conflict) a son named John was born to the Swedish-descended Hanson family on their "Mulberry Grove" plantation in Southern Maryland. In manhood, John Hanson became a fixture in the colonial Maryland legislature, a crusader for independence, and finally, our first President under the Articles of Confederation. Hansonites say that since the United States was a functioning, independent nation under the Articles, Hanson was indeed our first Chief Executive in every sense.

Historical fact makes their case intriguing, if not compelling. In 1777, in the midst of the Revolutionary War, the Continental Congress drew up Articles of Confederation by which the new Union would be governed if the war were won. By March 1781 the last of the 13 rebel colonies ratified the agreement. When the British surrendered at Yorktown in October, Congress proclaimed that the new nation's first "federal year" under the new articles would begin Nov. 5. And on that day, John Hanson, then 66, took office as "President of the United States in Congress Assembled."

Some skeptical historians have dismissed the Hansonites' claim on grounds that the Articles of Confederation "cannot be considered a Constitution at all, but merely an agreement between the states to meet and discuss mutual problems." But writings of prominent Early Americans indicate otherwise. Hansonites point out that George Washington and other contemporaries like Benjamin Harrison and LaFayette, referred variously to the Articles as "the constitution," and the "Federal constitution." Nearly 80 years later, President Abraham Lincoln declared in his first Inaugural Address that "The Union is much older than the Constitution. The faith of all 13 states," he said, "was expressly plighted, and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of the Confederation."

But Hanson detractors argue, too, that he was merely a presiding officer—a figure-head. Again, the record doesn't agree. Both Hanson and George Washington carried the titles of "President" and "Excellency," while in office. Washington himself wrote to congratulate Hanson on his "appointment to fill the most important seat in the United States." In 1783, when Foreign Affairs Secretary Arthur Lee was asked for advice on how to receive dignitaries from abroad, he gave this reply: "The President of Congress, being at the head of the Sovereignty of the United States, takes precedence of all and every person in the United States."

Moreover, Hanson's term was hardly a passive one. Under his Presidency the new nation for the first time won recognition from foreign governments, exchanged ambassadors, signed treaties of alliance, and floated a foreign loan—one that bore the signature of "President John Hanson."

Hanson and Congress also created many national institutions which endure today. Among them:

Proclamation of the last Thursday in November as a national day of Thanksgiving.

Adoption of the Great Seal, with the eagle, olive branch, and motto: *E Pluribus Unum* (one out of many).

Establishment of a uniform federal currency.

Creation of several federal offices, including a post office, a judiciary system, a Department of Foreign Affairs (today's State Department), and Superintendent of Finance (Treasury Secretary).

The meager official record on Hanson indicates he was probably both forceful and daring. At age 58, by then a leading citizen of Southern Maryland and a 16-year member of the colonial legislature, Hanson suddenly left the comfortable plantation life and settled 150 miles northwest in Frederick County.

One can only guess why. Ways were slow and set in rural Southern Maryland. Frederick, a gateway to the unsettled West and hotbed of rebellion to the English Crown, was wild, exciting, and full of opportunity.

Almost as soon as he arrived, Hanson was a driving force for independence. In 1774, when other colonists were only muttering about revolt, Hanson chaired a meeting at which Frederick became the first colonial county to vote a blockade on all trade with England. The following summer, he played a big role in forming the Association of Free-men of Maryland—the first state-wide group approving the use of force to repel British troops. And when war broke out, Hanson chaired a county committee to mobilize men and supplies.

Some also contend that if it hadn't been for John Hanson, America might still consist of just 13 states—four of them with huge boundaries.

The scene: 1779. The war is all but over. Hanson is elected to Congress from Maryland. The Articles of Confederation have already been submitted to the 13 states—and all appear ready to ratify it.

But Hanson, as newly-elected chairman of the Maryland delegation, refuses. The reason: the Articles do not contest the claim of four states to vast areas westward. Virginia, for example, had been given a charter from James I to all lands outside the 13 colonies "from sea to sea north and northwest." Similar grants from later English monarchs assigned New York, Connecticut and Massachusetts rights to vast areas in the Western frontier.

Hanson announces that Maryland will not ratify the articles until they include a new provision. It reads: "The United States in Congress Assembled shall have the sole and exclusive right . . . to ascertain and fix the western boundaries of such states . . . as the numbers and circumstances of the people may require."

At first Hanson and Maryland were labeled obstructionists. But within eight months his perseverance had brought all 12 other state delegations around to his view. All four contenders finally dropped this "for the good of the Union."

Historians now agree that without such a provision, the nation today might be dominated by four vast, sprawling states.

What was Hanson like personally? Unfortunately, history leaves even fewer footnotes about the man himself than of his official acts. It is known that he had a wife named Jane, that they raised nine children, and that a son named Alexander served as a wartime private secretary to General Washington. And it is likely that since the Hanson plantation in Southern Maryland was just a few miles across the Potomac River from Washington's Mount Vernon, the two saw each other often socially.

Perhaps the best source is retired Judge Edward S. Delaplaine, a devotee of Maryland's history, who claims "one of the largest files anywhere" on Hanson. "I would describe him as portly, a man of action—a true patriot who was much respected," says the Frederick resident. "I think he must have been extremely popular to have been named President of Congress in his first year there."

But how strange that so few Americans

have ever heard of Hanson. Contemporary histories list only his official acts. The Encyclopedia Britannica did not see fit to mention him until 1940—and then only briefly. And while Hanson's large three-story house still stands in downtown Frederick, you wouldn't recognize it from the other old office buildings on the street except for a small wall plaque noting the name of its former owner.

Even Hanson's death is a mystery. According to most accounts, he succumbed suddenly at age 68 on November 22, 1783 while visiting relatives on their Oxon Hill, Md., plantation not far from Mulberry Grove, his birthplace. Presumably, he was buried in the owner's family plot, but no one knows where.

In 1938 citizens of Frederick sought to solve the riddle by writing to Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles, who had since purchased the old Oxon Hill manor. Replied Welles: "Unless some record can be found establishing the fact that John Hanson was actually interred in the . . . family graveyard . . . there is no way I know of to find out other than a careful examination of all the remains in the graveyard." This he refused to permit.

Thus, both the life and remains of John Hanson are covered by the sands of time. But not completely. If you should have a chance to tour Capitol Building, make a point of visiting Statuary Hall near the Great Rotunda. There, representing Maryland among the greatest Americans is perhaps the life-sized statue of the man who may one day be recognized as our first President. Ironically, he stands across the hall from his one-time friend and neighbor, George Washington.

THERE IS A DESPERATE NEED FOR WORLD LAW AND GREATER CO-OPERATION AMONG ALL NATIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the last third of the 20th century the need for world law and greater international cooperation is becoming more apparent every day.

The tremendous population explosion, the worldwide environmental crisis, the food shortage in certain areas of the world, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons, just to mention a few, all point to the need for more international cooperation. None of these problems can be solved by one nation. They obviously will not be resolved until all the nations of the world are willing to work together on these crucial problems.

Where can we in the United States begin to further the cause of world law and international cooperation?

The most obvious place to begin is by ratification of the three major Human Rights Conventions of the United Nations. Specifically, I am referring to the Convention on the Political Rights for Women, the Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor, and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. By ratifying these conventions we could make our support for world law and greater international cooperation unequivocally clear.

It is obvious to everyone concerned with the problems confronting man that we must face our responsibility to all men, regardless of nationality.

I am reminded of a statement made by Ambassador Charles W. Yost, the U.S. representative to the United Nations, before hearings on the genocide convention of the Subcommittee of the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in the spring of this year. Mr. Yost said, in part:

This Genocide Convention is an assertion by the community of nations that a certain particularly heinous act, perpetrated against any national, or ethnic, or racial, or religious group whatsoever, is wrong—wrong not only in the domestic law of this or that State, but wrong also in the law and opinion of the community of nations itself.

This is a very great statement of principle for the community of nations to have made. I strongly believe that the formal acceptance of that principle by the United States of America with our position of power and our historic commitment to justice, will not only be helpful to our reputation in the world. It will, in addition, serve that basic purpose which President Nixon, in his message to the Senate on this subject, called "the building of international order based on law and justice."

I think all of us should give some thought to this fine statement by our U.N. Ambassador. International order is essential. We can move in that direction by ratifying the Genocide convention which is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

CANADA LEADS THE WAY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Canada, our neighbor to the north, has now officially recognized mainland China as a nation and will profit by increased trade. In recent years, Canada has exported 500 million bushels of wheat to China receiving in payment cash on the barrelhead in gold. China has one-fourth of the people of the entire world. We should recognize that government and maintain an embassy in Peking instead of depending on Hong Kong as our only open window to the Orient. Americans would prosper by the sale of billions of dollars of nonstrategic goods by opening trade with mainland China. We could sell billions of dollars of products of American farms and factories to this new customer and at the same time we would no doubt import millions of dollars of handicraft, furs, and other products of China. Why should we continue to stand on the sidelines while the United Kingdom, France, and now Canada have recognized China with its 800 million people, and profited by major trade relations now greatly increasing in volume month after month? Furthermore, nations like individuals do not usually fight with their best customers.

IMPORT CONTROLS AND DOMESTIC INFLATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, a most distinguished analysis of the impact of trade policy on the American consumer was recently presented to the economics seminar of the University of Maryland. It is a comprehensive paper, treating in great depth the problems facing the textile and shoe industries. It was prepared by Mr. Andrew H. Brimmer, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, who may be considered to be a preeminent authority in this field.

Mr. Brimmer concludes that the trade legislation before us will be very costly

to the average American, will have an unmistakably inflationary effect and, what is more, will certainly not be a cure-all for the textile and shoe industries. In fact, Mr. Brimmer makes a very strong case that this legislation will be detrimental to those industries in the long run.

I urge Senators to be aware of this study as the debate on the Trade Act approaches. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brimmer's paper be printed in the RECORD.

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

IMPORT CONTROLS AND DOMESTIC INFLATION

(By Andrew F. Brimmer)

The new drive for protection, epitomized in the proposals to impose quotas on imports of shoes and textiles, could have serious adverse effects on U.S. consumers, on workers generally, and on the economy as a whole. At the same time, the imposition of import quotas on shoes and textiles would do little to solve the basic problems plaguing those two industries. This is the lesson we should have learned from the experience of the petroleum and sugar industries which are already protected by quotas.

This latest campaign to erect barriers against imports has sparked a new round of arguments about the merits of free trade vs. protectionism, and a phalanx of industry and labor organizations has been arrayed on the side of protection. Opposition to the proposals has also been vigorous, most of it coming from importers, academic economists, and communications media. Spokesmen for the Federal Government have been heard on both sides of the issue—and with varying degrees of support for quotas on particular commodities.

However, one crucial voice—that of the American consumer—has been scarcely heard. Few questions have been raised about the costs to consumers of import quotas on shoes and textiles. Yet, it is the American consumer who ultimately would bear the burden of such restrictions: his range of choice would be limited, his costs of clothing would rise appreciably, and further pressure would be exerted on the general level of consumer prices. Moreover, among consumers, the burden would fall most heavily on those low income groups that can least afford to bear it.

These are among the main conclusions emerging from an assessment of the probable effects of import quotas on shoes and textiles which I have had underway—from time to time—since last spring. Essentially, the assessment is based on an analysis of domestic consumption and foreign trade patterns during the 1960's and a projection of demand and supply conditions to 1975. The main provisions of the proposed trade legislation (H.R. 18970) serve as the framework for the inquiry. The assumptions (and limitations) of the analysis are spelled out below, but the most important results can be summarized briefly at this point:

If quotas on footwear stipulated in the proposed bill were adopted, the extra cost to consumers would be in the neighborhood of \$1.9 billion in 1975, compared with the level of expenditures that might be expected in the absence of quotas.

In the case of textiles (where apparel would be the main item affected), the extra cost to consumers might be about \$1.8 billion in 1975.

In the absence of quotas on footwear and apparel, domestic prices of these commodities would probably decline by an amount large enough to result in a modest decrease in the general level of consumer prices. However, with quotas imposed, the total consumer price index in 1975 (using a base of

1969 = 100) would be almost 1 percentage point higher—and the index excluding foods and services would be about 1½ percentage points higher—than might be expected in the absence of quotas.

These estimates are obviously tentative and should be interpreted with considerable caution. Nevertheless, they do suggest the general direction and rough magnitude of the additional burdens consumers would have to sustain if the legislation is adopted and if quotas on imports of shoes and textiles were imposed as specified. Moreover, these costs would probably be close to the minimum, since quotas on other types of consumer goods might soon follow.

The evidence on which these estimates are based is presented below. First, however, it might be helpful to summarize those provisions of the proposed legislation that are most relevant to the first part of the present discussion. Other provisions are referred to at later points in this paper.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO IMPOSE IMPORT QUOTAS

Under H.R. 18970, proposed as amendments to existing tariff and trade laws of the United States,¹ the President's authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries would be extended until July 1, 1973. This authority was granted originally under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; but with the expiration of this Act three years ago, the President has not had such authority.

The President would be able to reduce the rates of duty to which the U.S. was committed on July 1, 1967² by not more than 20 percent or 2 percentage points, whichever is lower. Such tariff reductions must take place in at least two stages with one year intervening between each reduction. The intention of this provision is apparently to give the President authority to compensate our trading partners for actions the U.S. may take to restrict imports under the proposed legislation.

The bill strengthens the President's powers to retaliate against foreign countries which "unreasonably" or "unjustifiably" restrict U.S. exports. Under the bill, the President would be able to impose tariff duties or other import restrictions on the products of a foreign country which is discriminating against U.S. products—whether agricultural or non-agricultural—whereas previously he could do so only in the case of agricultural products.³ In addition, subsidies provided by a foreign country on its exports to foreign markets which unfairly affect U.S. exports to those same markets are specifically listed as "unjustifiable" discriminatory acts and as such would be grounds for U.S. retaliation.

The bill outlaws the use of tariff duties to limit imports for national security reasons; only quantitative controls can be used. This provision would prevent the President from abolishing the oil import quotas and imposing tariffs instead.

Quotas would be imposed on textiles and footwear, by country and by category. In 1971, imports of each category of textile and footwear articles in each country would be limited to the average annual quantity of such articles imported from that country during the years 1967, 1968, and 1969. Beginning in 1972, the quantities permitted by this base level formula may be increased by not more than 5 per cent of the amount authorized in the preceding year. Cotton textiles already covered by quotas under the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement will be exempt from the proposed quotas.

Also, specific textile or footwear articles may be exempted if they cause no market disruption, if it is in the national interest to do so, if total supply from domestic and foreign sources is inadequate, or if voluntary quotas with exporting countries are negotiated. The import quotas on textiles and footwear may

Footnotes at end of article.

be extended by the President but for no more than 5 years at a time. If they are extended, the quotas will expire on July 1, 1976.

QUOTAS VERSUS STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

As I stressed above, the imposition of import quotas will do little to correct the basic problems with which textile producers are confronted. The textile industry is undergoing a major structural adjustment of which the rise in imports in recent years is only one symptom—despite the attempts to associate all the difficulties of the industry with imports. In fact, curtailing imports will only delay and distort the adjustment process which is necessary for the viability of the industry in the long run.

The adjustment problems faced by an individual textile firm are determined partly by the extent to which it concentrates on a particular sector of the industry. The scope of the textile industry can be defined in at least two ways. In terms of materials, textiles include all products of cotton, man-made fibers, wool, and silk—and combinations and mixtures of these and other fibers and substances. In terms of stage of processing, textiles encompass fiber (but not the raw material in its natural state), fabrics and apparel. Fabrics may be finished materials (capable of being made into final products) or "gray goods" (requiring further processing before final use). The proposed quotas would have their heaviest impact on imports of man-made materials and manufactures—especially on apparel and fabrics.

The rise in market penetration of imported textiles reflects in part the slowness with which a traditionally small unit industry adapts to new technology. Even in industries where the average unit of production is large, the adaptation to technological change may be slow. This is illustrated dramatically by the time it took the steel industry to convert its facilities to the new oxygen process—partly under the spur of competition from rising imports. The lag is even more pronounced for a small unit industry such as textiles. However, that the process is underway is demonstrated by the continuing trend toward concentration in the industry and by the rate of profitability of the larger corporations.

Between 1958 and 1967, the number of firms manufacturing textiles declined sharply. For example, during this period, the number of companies producing woven cotton fabrics declined by 30 per cent; the number making synthetic fabrics dropped by 17 per cent, and the number producing items of apparel such as men's suits and shirts and women's suits and underwear decreased between 20 per cent and 35 per cent. The result was that by 1967 the 50 largest companies accounted for about two-thirds of the industry's output.

Yet, as suggested by statistics relating to the 500 largest industrial corporations in the United States, even the largest firms in the textile industry—on the average—appear to be smaller than their counterparts in other industries. (Source: *Fortune* magazine, as reported in U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract*, 1963 and 1970).

	1961	1969
Assets per employee:		
All corporations	\$16,264	\$21,545
Textile manufacturers	11,035	14,609
Apparel manufacturers	7,982	10,204
Sales per employee:		
All corporations	20,506	27,986
Textile manufacturers	14,572	20,195
Apparel manufacturers	12,234	15,799

In general, the largest textile firms appear to be about two-thirds to three-quarters as large as the top industrial firms in the economy as a whole. The typical large apparel manufacturers appear to be roughly one-half

to three-fifths the size of their counterparts in other industrial sectors. Moreover, while the gap in terms of sales per employee was closed somewhat for apparel firms during the 1960's, the overall lag for both textile and apparel firms remains large.

In terms of profitability, the largest firms in the textile industry have continued to improve their position, compared with their counterparts in other manufacturing industries. Again, this conclusion is supported by statistical information relating to the 500 largest industrial corporations:

	1961	1969
Sales per dollar of invested capital:		
All corporations	\$1.92	\$2.41
Textile manufacturers	1.93	2.66
Apparel manufacturers	2.44	3.30
Return on invested capital (percent):		
All corporations	8.3	11.3
Textile manufacturers	6.1	7.9
Apparel manufacturers	8.8	11.9

Sales by textile firms per dollar of invested capital were roughly the same as those for all large corporations in 1961, and they were moderately higher in 1969. For apparel firms, reflecting the relatively smaller investment required to enter the field, sales per dollar of investment were one-quarter to one-third higher in both years. Partly for the same reason, net profits of apparel firms as a percentage of invested capital were slightly higher in both years than for large manufacturers generally—and considerably higher than for firms producing textiles, for whom the rate of return was more than one-quarter below that for all large industrial corporations.

For textile and apparel manufacturers, data on net profits after taxes as a percentage of sales give an even clearer picture of the divergent trends among large and small firms within these industries:

	1961	1969		
	All corporations	Largest firms	All corporations	Largest firms
All manufacturing	4.30	4.20	4.79	4.60
Textile manufacturing	2.09	3.00	2.85	3.20
Apparel manufacturing	1.27	3.00	2.31	3.60

For all textile and apparel manufacturers in 1961, net profits in relation to sales were about one-half to seven-tenths below the rate for all industrial firms combined. But for the largest firms in both segments of the industry, the short-fall was only 30 per cent. During the 1960's, the rate of return on sales for all textile and apparel firms rose much faster between 1961 and 1969 than for manufacturing as a whole. For the largest textile and apparel producers, the rate of advance was less than that for all firms in these sectors—partly reflecting the fact that only the most successful smaller units remained active over the decade. Nevertheless, the largest textile and apparel producers in 1969 were still substantially more profitable per dollar of sales than was the average firm in the industry.

The general conclusion to be reached from an analysis of the above information seems clear: the textile industry in the United States is in the process of consolidating into larger, more profitable units. The largest firms in the industry (and the number of such firms remains large enough to assure vigorous competition) have been maintaining their profitability compared with manufacturing as a whole. Given the economies of scale afforded by a rapidly changing technology, they should achieve further improvement.

Competition from imports is only an added feature—not the major cause—of the prob-

lems currently facing the weaker units in the industry. Protection from imports will not preserve the smaller firms facing competition from the larger, more adaptable and efficient domestic enterprises. Instead, the burden of quotas designed to provide such protection will be borne primarily by the American consumer. Let me make it perfectly clear—as I will explain later—I would like to see the businesses and workers who suffer in this rapid technological shift helped by the Federal Government to make an adjustment—we cannot be indifferent to their problems.

IMPORT QUOTAS VS. STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS IN THE SHOE INDUSTRY

The shoe industry is also suffering from serious structural problems, and the imposition of import quotas would contribute little toward their solution. As is generally known, the shoe industry is a labor-intensive industry, with low wages, low productivity, a relatively low rate of investment, and with a large portion of its output concentrated in small plants.

For example, in 1967, there were about 1090 establishments in the United States producing leather footwear. Employment per establishment averaged about 200 workers. With so many producers, no single firm—or small group of firms—controlled a large enough share of the market to serve as a focal point for the industry. It is estimated that, in 1967, the largest producer accounted for about 6½ per cent of domestic output; the four largest accounted for 25 per cent, and the top eight accounted for 34 per cent.

Within the industry—even among the larger firms—factories are usually highly specialized. Not only is production capacity likely to be geared to a particular segment of the market—such as women's vs. men's shoes—but it may be even further subdivided within these categories. This lack of diversification means that individual firms are highly exposed to short-run shifts in demand for products which are themselves subject to sharp changes in fashion. The smaller firms in particular have great difficulty in coping with such changes in styles. Moreover, the purely seasonal variation in output is also considerable.

The production process in the shoe industry necessitates great reliance on labor. In fact, a substantial number of processes in shoe manufacturing are essentially handicraft operations. The reasons for this center mainly in the unevenness of the materials employed (e.g., no two pieces of leather are identical) and the considerable variety of widths and lengths required for each shoe model. Thus, because of these constraints, technological advances have been slow, and automation has made little progress in the shoe industry.

The entry of new firms into the shoe industry is fairly easy. The amount of capital investment required is fairly modest. By long-standing trade practices, a considerable part of the machinery needed for shoe manufacturing is leased—rather than purchased—from equipment producers. The lease arrangement also normally provides for the payment of a fixed monthly rent and a payment based on the rate of production. The result is that a new firm avoids both a large initial capital investment and the high fixed overhead cost of idle equipment during periods of low seasonal activity. Consequently, while failures are frequent, new entry is also frequent, and the industry remains populated by a large number of small, high-cost firms.

Partly reflecting these characteristics, the profitability of the shoe industry historically has been low. This remains true today, but the industry did improve its relative position during the 1960's. This improving trend is evident in the following figures (source: Securities Exchange Commission—Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Reserve Board):

Year	Net profits after taxes				
	As percent of sales		As percent of net worth		
	Manufacturing total	Nondurable goods	Leather and leather products ¹	Nondurable goods	Leather and leather products ¹
1961	4.3	4.7	1.1	9.6	4.4
1962	4.6	4.7	1.7	9.9	6.9
1963	4.7	4.9	1.8	10.4	6.9
1964	5.2	5.3	2.6	11.5	10.5
1965	5.6	5.5	3.8	12.2	11.6
1966	5.6	5.6	3.0	12.7	12.9
1967	5.0	5.3	2.9	11.8	11.3
1968	5.1	5.3	3.3	11.9	13.0
1969	4.8	5.0	2.6	11.5	9.3

¹ Nonrubber footwear accounts for approximately two-thirds of the value of output in the industry.

In the early 1960's net profits after taxes as a percentage of sales in the shoe industry averaged about one-third of the profit rate in nondurable goods industries and in manufacturing generally. But since the mid-1960's the relative rate for the industry has been one-half or higher. When net profits after taxes are compared with net worth, the profitability of the shoe industry is shown to have improved even more markedly. While the rate of return on this basis in the shoe industry was about two-thirds that for all nondurable goods producers in the early 1960's, it was roughly on par with the rate for the group as a whole through 1968. Last year, the ratio declined to about four-fifths, but this was well above the proportion recorded in the early years of the last decade.

From this brief survey of the shoe industry, I conclude that—rather than adopting import quotas—efforts should be made to cope with some of the basic structural problems facing the industry. I will return to this point in a later section of this paper.

DEMAND FOR AND SUPPLY OF TEXTILES AND FOOTWEAR

To estimate the costs of the proposed quotas to the American consumer, it is necessary to make a judgment about the conditions that may govern the future demand for and supply of the commodities that would be subject to the restrictions. This is an extremely difficult task, and only the roughest kind of quantitative estimate can be made. And even to do this requires one to make several highly simplified assumptions about consumer behavior and other factors that will influence the market. But even though the estimates derived below are highly tentative and show only the direction and rough magnitude of the cost to consumers of imposing import quotas on textiles and shoes, I believe it is important at least to attempt to quantify what this issue means to consumers.

The statistical information used in the analysis and the method of deriving the estimates are shown in Table 1, attached.

The analysis turns on a set of simplified and consumption of textiles and footwear assumptions about the pattern of imports in 1975. In carrying out the analysis an examination was made of data on consumption, imports, the relationship of imports to consumption, prices of the domestically produced commodity, and prices of the corresponding import. The behavior of these variables during the decade of the 1960's was studied. But trends in the period 1965-69 were used as benchmarks for the projection of the demand for and supply of nonrubber footwear and apparel (the most important consumer goods component of the textile category) to 1975.

The tasks to be performed were (1) to estimate the domestic demand for each type of commodity in 1975, (2) to estimate the division of the supply of each type of commodity between domestic production and imports, and (3) to estimate the difference

(in dollars) of meeting a larger share of demand from domestic suppliers rather than from importers.

In estimating consumption in 1975, it was assumed that per capita consumption will continue to increase between 1969 and 1975 at the same rate recorded between 1965 and 1969. As shown in Table 1, for apparel, the average annual rate of growth in the 1965-69 period was 3.2 per cent, and for footwear it was 1.0 per cent. Extending these rates of change in per capita consumption to 1975, and given the Census Bureau's projection of U.S. population in 1975, total volume of consumption of apparel and footwear in 1975 was derived. This volume was then converted to dollar terms.

It was further assumed that—in the absence of the quota—the ratio of imports to consumption in 1969-75 would maintain the same annual average rate of increase that occurred in the 1965-69 period. For apparel, the rate of increase in that ratio was 10.5 per cent, and for footwear it was 18.0 per cent. By extending the rates of change in the import/consumption ratio to 1975 and applying the resulting ratio for 1975 to total estimated consumption in that year, the volume of imports, without quota, was obtained. In converting consumption and imports from volume to value terms, it was assumed that prices of both domestically produced and imported goods would remain the same in 1975 as they were in 1969. Such prices in themselves are only very rough estimates. (In other words, expenditures were expressed in 1969 prices.) It was also assumed that there were no supply constraints, either foreign or domestic.

It was assumed that—if quotas were imposed—the amount of imports authorized would be that stipulated under H.R. 18970; in 1971, imports would be held to the 1967-69 average; then, beginning in 1972, the amount authorized would be increased by 5 per cent of the amount authorized in the immediately preceding year.

Given the 1975 consumption level, it remained to determine what the dollar cost to the consumer would be if he had to shift his purchases from the cheaper foreign to the more expensive domestic product as a result of the imposition of a quota.

COST OF QUOTAS TO CONSUMERS

The above assumptions and calculations provided very rough estimates of the dollar cost to consumers of imposing quotas on apparel and footwear. For apparel, the extra cost might be in the neighborhood of \$1.8 billion in 1975. In the case of footwear, it might approximate \$1.9 billion. As stressed several times, these are only tentative estimates, and they should be interpreted with considerable caution. However, even if they were cut in half, they suggest that the adverse impact on consumers of putting quotas on these commodities would be considerable.

A brief discussion of recent trends in demand and supply in the two industries might help place the estimates in perspective.

*The Case of Apparel:*⁴ In 1969, consumer expenditures on apparel amounted to about \$42.3 billion, an increase of 39 per cent—or an annual average rate of about 8 1/2 per cent—since 1965. Measured in physical volume (measured in pounds, raw fiber equivalent) the annual average rate of increase was about 4 per cent. In 1969, imports represented 7.8 per cent of total consumption (by volume), compared with 5.2 per cent in 1965. In the 1965-69 period, imports rose at an annual average rate of 15 per cent—far outstripping the 4 per cent rate of expansion of domestic production. As indicated above, the ratio of imports to total consumption rose at an annual average rate of 10.5 per cent between 1965 and 1969.

This sharp swing to imports was due to

several factors, but the differential in prices between the imported and domestically produced items undoubtedly played a major role. For example, in 1969, the unit value of apparel of all kinds consumed (which can be interpreted as an average price) was \$10 compared with just over \$6 for the unit value of imports, adjusted to a retail basis.

Given this evidence of a strong demand for imported apparel, it seems reasonable to assume that consumers would continue to turn in the direction of foreign suppliers. If the projected rise in per capita consumption in 1975 were to be achieved—despite the imposition of a quota—the greater demand would have to be satisfied by domestic producers.

This could only be done at higher prices than would be the case if imports are not subject to a quota. As indicated in Table 1, the unit value of apparel consumption in 1975 was estimated at \$9.74 without a quota and at \$10.08 with a quota. In other words, prices probably would decline slightly without a quota, but the imposition of restrictions would prevent this and perhaps cause a small rise in the average price. Since it was assumed that the physical volume of consumption would remain unchanged—with or without a quota—the higher unit value resulting from a quota is translated into a higher level of consumer expenditures.

Without a quota, consumer outlays for apparel in 1975 were estimated at \$52.7 billion; with a quota, outlays were estimated at \$54.5 billion. This difference of \$1.8 billion is the cost of the quota to consumers. This is an extra cost of about 3 1/2 per cent.

The Case of Footwear: Imports of nonrubber footwear have grown much more rapidly than domestic output in recent years. However, the growth has been concentrated in certain types.

In 1965, domestic purchases of nonrubber footwear totaled 720,000 pairs; by 1969, the total had risen to 781,000 pairs. This was an increase of 8 1/2 per cent, or an annual average rate of 2.1 per cent. Imports rose at an annual average rate of 20 per cent in these years and accounted for 26 per cent of total consumption (by volume) in 1969 compared with 13 per cent in 1965.

Whether consumers would have increased their purchases to this extent if less expensive imported shoes were not available is very doubtful. The recently released report of the Presidential Task Force on nonrubber footwear concluded that 'from the consumer point of view, imports have opened up important new options. The extremely low-priced imports, priced often far below any comparable domestic footwear except canvas-upper, rubber soled footwear, have provided entire new lines of basic foot coverings. At the other end, there can be little doubt that styles developed abroad in the higher price ranges have also provided new consumer choices.'

The imposition of quotas on imports of footwear would be highly regressive, since it would be concentrated on imports of inexpensive types. For example, in 1969, the unit value of imports (estimated at \$5.32 retail) was about three-fifths the unit value of all domestic footwear consumed in that year (\$8.77). In 1965, the price differential in favor of imports had been even greater, since the price of imported shoes rose much faster than the domestic product in the 1965-69 period.⁵

In the face of this experience with shoes—as in the case of apparel—it seemed reasonable to assume that consumers would continue to rely heavily on imports in the years ahead. In fact, if the rate of increase in the import/consumption ratio that prevailed in the 1965-69 period were to persist through 1975, imports could account for about 70

Footnotes at end of article.

per cent of the domestic market for shoes in the latter year. The imposition of the quotas stipulated in the proposed legislation would hold the ratio to 24 per cent in 1975.

Thus, the public would have to meet the growth in demand from higher priced domestic sources. Without a quota, the unit value for total consumption of footwear was estimated at \$6.72 in 1975—about 23 per cent below that for 1969. With a quota, the figure was estimated at \$8.87—or 32 per cent higher than would be the case without a quota.

Using the estimates of the volume of consumption and unit values, the value of consumer outlays for footwear was determined. In 1969, this amounted to \$6.9 billion. Without a quota, the level was estimated at \$5.9 billion in 1975—despite an estimated increase of 12½ per cent in the physical volume of consumption—and reflecting the lower unit price of imports. However, with the quota imposed, domestic production would supply over 70 per cent of the total demand at unit prices almost one-third higher than the prices for imports.

Under these circumstances, the level of consumer expenditures is estimated at \$7.8 billion in 1975. This is an extra cost of \$1.9 billion—or a premium of about 30 per cent—that can be assigned as the burden of a quota on footwear.

IMPACT OF QUOTAS ON THE DOMESTIC PRICE LEVEL

If quotas were applied to imports of apparel and footwear along the lines discussed above, they would add significantly to domestic inflationary pressures. This result stems from the fact that the domestically produced article—shoes or apparel—is more expensive than the equivalent imported article. In the absence of quotas, consumers are expected to increase the proportion of their total consumption devoted to cheaper imported shoes and apparel so that the average unit cost of these items would decline over the 1969–75 period. The proposed quotas, however, if imposed, would effectively freeze the import share of total consumption of footwear and apparel at about the present level, rather than allowing it to increase. Thus, the quotas would prevent the average unit cost to the consumer from declining as it would do if consumers were permitted to buy imports without restraint.

The higher unit prices resulting from the imposition of the quotas can be translated roughly into increases in the consumer price index (CPI). Using the same assumptions about the pattern of consumer demand and supply conditions discussed above—along with data on the relative importance of apparel and footwear in total consumer expenditures, the effects of quotas on the CPI were estimated. The calculations are shown in Table 2.²

If imports of apparel and footwear are permitted to grow freely without quotas, and if the behavior of other components of the index are held constant, under the assumptions specified above, it is estimated that the total consumer price index would decline by 0.6 per cent, and the CPI excluding foods and services would decline by 1.4 per cent, between 1969 and 1975 (1969=100). On the other hand, the imposition of quotas on imports of apparel and footwear is estimated to result in a small increase from 1969 to 1975 of approximately 0.1 per cent in the total CPI and of around 0.2 per cent in the CPI excluding foods and services (1969=100). Thus, on an index base of 1969=100, the total CPI would be 0.7 percentage points higher, and the CPI excluding foods and services would be 1.6 percentage points higher, in 1975, with a quota than without a quota, assuming no change in other items of the CPI.

Thus, it appears that the adoption of quotas, aside from their other adverse effects,

would aggravate inflationary pressures as well. This general conclusion seems evident—although again it is necessary to interpret the above estimates of the effects on the CPI with considerable caution.

Looking beyond the apparel and footwear industries, there can be no doubt that protectionist devices hurt our efforts to fight inflation and undermine our efforts to raise exports. In fact, many countries have used trade policy to induce greater imports as an effective way to combat rising domestic prices, and to induce their industries to operate more efficiently. Our own experience has been that the greatest increase in our overall imports has come since 1965—and has coincided with our failure to control inflation. Excess demand with rising prices is the basic cause of our trade problem, and we cannot expect to get relief from measures that will keep prices high.

Moreover, in their concern with rising imports, proponents of quotas forget that we are still a great and effective exporting country. We have succeeded in raising exports to an annual rate of \$42 billion—double the 1960–65 rate. At this rate, exports are greater than total domestic expenditures on residential structures or on automobiles and parts. When exports are so important to many sectors of our economy, especially agriculture, it would be a tragic mistake to start a round of retaliatory trade restrictions such as darkened the depression years. And if we are to make genuine progress in export expansion, we will need to achieve—and maintain—a much greater degree of domestic price stability than we have attained in recent years.

If we can achieve this objective, I would hope that at some point, perhaps before 1975, our competitive position for shoes and textiles—and certainly overall—would improve so that the sharp uptrend in imports would be moderated.

I do not believe the threat of imposing quotas would be effective in getting other countries to lower their barriers to U.S. exports. In my view, the only policy that will achieve this in the long run is a policy that encourages greater trade flows under free competitive conditions.

AN ALTERNATIVE COURSE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

In commenting on the adverse effects of quotas on consumers, I am not suggesting that the textile and shoe industries face no problems. Quite the contrary, as indicated above, they are confronted with serious structural problems, and the sharp rise in imports in recent years has added to these. Both workers and businesses (especially the smaller firms) are being affected adversely.

For example, in the case of footwear (which must be considered a low-wage industry in the United States), foreign producers enjoy a sizable cost advantage. In mid-1969, the average wage of shoe production workers in the United States was about \$2.29 per hour. In Italy, their counterparts received about \$1.04 per hour, and the corresponding figures were \$0.58 and \$0.56, respectively, in Japan and Spain. The low foreign wages more than offset the higher output per manhour of the U.S. workers. Consequently, foreign producers of footwear could land shoes in the United States at prices well below U.S. production costs.

A similar story can be told for textiles. So, the competitive impact of imports in both industries is severe. Those employed in the industry—both workers and business enterprises—do need help. However, in my judgment, quotas are simply the wrong way to help them. Instead of pursuing that course, I think it is far preferable to adopt more effective programs to provide retraining and transitional benefits or financial assistance for those who are displaced by competitive forces over which they have no control—whether the forces originate at home or abroad.

In this connection, the provisions for adjustment assistance in the proposed quota bill point in the right direction, but they could be improved considerably. The criteria to be met in granting assistance to industries, firms, or workers hurt by increased imports are liberalized by the bill. In general, the increase in imports would no longer have to be the "major factor" causing or threatening to cause serious injury; it would only have to "contribute substantially" to the injury. In determining whether serious injury to an industry has occurred, moreover, fairly rigid rules would be established: the imported article must constitute over 15 per cent of apparent U.S. consumption, and the ratio of imports to consumption must have increased by at least 3 percentage points in the year immediately prior to the investigation and by at least 5 percentage points in the year before that; or domestic production, jobs, man-hours worked, or wages must be declining substantially; and the imported articles are sold at prices substantially below those of comparable domestic products, and foreign unit labor costs are substantially below U.S. unit labor costs.

Under these rules, many industries—which previously could not obtain relief—might qualify for assistance. While some liberalization of the criteria for assistance would be helpful, there is a real danger that the grant of protection might go too far. Under the umbrella of adjustment assistance, even some of the strongest or least efficient industries might find shelter. Moreover, it would also be preferable to consider the need for adjustment assistance apart from any proposal to impose quotas.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In addressing myself to the question of the effects of quotas on shoes and textiles, I have attempted to show the adverse impact on consumers. The direction and rough magnitude of that impact have been indicated at several points in this discussion. But before concluding this presentation, it might be well to remind ourselves of the bad experience we have already had with quotas.

There are several items on which mandatory import quotas have been in effect for an extended period—principally petroleum and sugar—and these provide some clues to the cost of import quotas. The situation on oil imports have been intensively studied by a Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control, whose report was released early this year. The Task Force found that, "In 1969 consumers paid \$5 billion more for oil products than they would have paid in the absence of import restrictions. By 1980 the annual cost to consumers would approximate \$8.4 billion. Without import controls the domestic wellhead price would fall from \$3.30 per barrel to about \$2.00, which would correspond to the world price. Although we cannot exclude the possibility, we do not predict a substantial price rise in world oil markets over the coming decade." A majority of the Task Force recommended that the present quotas be replaced by a system of tariffs involving a lesser degree of protection. It seems to me that this would move us some distance in the right direction.

In the case of sugar, the policy of controlling supplies goes back to the mid-1930's and is intended to maintain stable prices and support the domestic sugar industry. The sugar control program has many complexities, but one clear result is that the U.S. sugar price averages considerably higher than the world price. One of the reasons that the quoted world price is so low—currently about 4 cents per pound compared with a domestic equivalent price of about 8 cents per pound—is that foreign producers, after supplying their U.S. quota amount at very favorable prices, can afford to sell their residual supplies on world markets at very

low prices and realize a reasonable overall profit margin. If the United States were to remove its controls on sugar imports, the price to U.S. consumers would tend to fall, the world price would rise, and a single effective price would be established at some level between the two.

In the meantime, however, quotas on oil are in effect, and consumers are paying the cost. And, sadly, the new quota and its replacement with a tariff, which at least would have the virtue of allowing the total supply to rise—although at higher prices.

So, although we may have to live with the existing quotas for some time, I wonder how many of us—as consumers—would like to add others?

FOOTNOTES

¹ The bill was drafted and adopted by the House Ways and Means Committee in mid-August, and it cleared the House Rules Committee in early September. The full House of Representatives is expected to vote on the measure soon after the end of the election recess in mid-November. The Senate Finance Committee has adopted a bill sim-

ilar to that approved by the two House Committees. The Senate as a whole is also expected to vote on the matter before the end of the year.

² In effect, this means the rates of duty which will exist when the final stage of the Kennedy Round tariff reductions takes place on January 1, 1972.

³ As before, the President can also prevent a foreign country who unreasonably or unjustifiably restricts U.S. exports from receiving the benefits of U.S. trade agreement concessions.

⁴ This part of the discussion was restricted to apparel—and fabrics were excluded—for several reasons. In the case of cotton and man-made materials (particularly finished goods), import prices exceed domestic prices, so a small net saving might result if a quota were adopted. In the case of wool, no cost would be incurred because the quota would not be restrictive. In each of these cases, the estimates were calculated but not included because of lack of space.

⁵ It has been estimated by the Tariff Com-

mission that domestically produced nonrubber footwear is approximately twice as expensive as imported footwear. This is in the aggregate, covering all types. We have assumed, as indicated by the Tariff Commission study, that the retail markup is the same for both imported and domestic shoes, i.e., 50 per cent. This assumption is under heavy attack by the Tanners' Council which has charged that the markup on imported shoes is 75 per cent to 130 per cent compared with 50 per cent for shoes made in the U.S. Therefore, says the Council, the consumer is not really benefitting from the import of low-priced shoes. There may be some validity to this although the Tariff Commission has not been able to confirm it.

⁶ In making these estimates, the data on consumption and unit values presented in Table 1 were used along with information showing the approximate weights for footwear and apparel in the total CPI and in the CPI excluding foods and services. The percentage changes in the CPI, which would occur from 1969 to 1975 with and without the quotas, were thus estimated.

TABLE 1.—DEMAND AND SUPPLY OF APPAREL AND FOOTWEAR, 1965-75

Commodity	Average rate of growth 1965-69 (percent)		Projected 1975		Commodity	Average rate of growth 1965-69 (percent)		Projected 1975		
	1965	1969	Without quota	With quota		1965	1969	Without quota	With quota	
APPAREL										
Domestic demand:										
Value of consumption (dollars in millions)	\$30,505	\$42,302	8.5	\$52,725	\$54,528	\$5,273	\$6,850	6.8	\$5,906	\$7,793
Volume of consumption (millions of pounds)	3,568	4,226	4.3	5,412	5,412	719,729	780,741	2.1	878,697	878,697
Unit value (dollars per pound)	\$8.55	\$10.01	4.0	\$9.74	\$10.08	\$7.33	\$8.77	4.6	\$6.72	\$8.87
Per capita consumption (pounds)	18.34	20.80	3.2			3.70	3.84	1.0		
Cost of quota (dollars in millions)					\$1,803					\$1,887
Sources of supply (volume, millions of pounds)	3,568	4,226	4.3	5,412	5,412	719,729	780,741	2.1	878,697	878,697
Domestic production (millions of pounds)	3,382	3,898	3.6	4,647	5,077	623,738	578,533	-1.9	264,312	669,301
Imports (millions of pounds)	186	328	15.2	765	335	95,991	202,208	20.5	614,385	209,396
Unit value of imports, retail (dollars per pound)	(*)	\$6.14		\$6.14	\$6.14	\$3.08	\$5.32	14.7	\$5.32	\$5.32
Imports as percent of total	5.21	7.76	10.5	14.13	6.18	13.34	25.90	18.0	69.92	23.83

¹ Not available.

TABLE 2.—THE EFFECT ON THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX IN 1975 OF IMPOSING IMPORT QUOTAS ON FOOTWEAR AND APPAREL

	1975			1975		
	1969	Without quota	With quota	1969	Without quota	With quota
Apparel:						
Footwear:						
Value of consumption (millions of dollars) ¹	\$42,302	\$52,725	\$54,528	\$6,850	\$5,906	\$7,793
Volume of consumption (millions of pounds)	4,226	5,412	5,412	780,741	878,697	878,697
Unit value (dollar per pound)	\$10.01	\$9.74	\$10.08	\$8.77	\$6.72	\$8.87
Change in unit value from 1969 (percent)	0	-2.70	+7.70	0	-23.38	+1.14
Weight in consumer price index (percent):						
Total	7.03	7.03	7.03	1.60	1.60	1.60
Excluding food and services	17.10	17.10	17.10	3.89	3.89	3.89
Change in CPI from 1969 to 1975 (1969=100 percent) ² :						
Total	0	-1.19	+0.05	0	-0.37	+0.02
Excluding food and services	0	-0.46	+0.12	0	-0.91	+0.04

¹ Assumes prices of both domestically produced goods and imports are same in 1975 as in 1969. Changes in unit value thus reflects changes in the quantity of imports or domestically produced goods consumed.

² Assuming that the behavior of all other components of the CPI are held constant between 1969 and 1975.

PULLOUT PRICE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, now our good Uncle Sam is being blackmailed by our "friends and allies" of Southeast Asia for pulling out our troops from Vietnam, South Korea, and other areas. Thieu and Ky of South Vietnam are demanding \$4.5 billion a year in military and economic aid over the next 5 years. That is not the worst. South Korea demands \$3 billion for military modernization of its army and navy.

Also, assurance of no withdrawal of American troops before 1975. Although fighting ended in Korea more than 20 years ago, unfortunately we still have 56,000 troops in South Korea. We should have pulled them out years ago. South Korea has more than twice the population of North Korea and an army, air force, and navy superior to that of North Korea. Thailand, in addition to 6 huge air bases which cost our taxpayers nearly \$1 billion, demands \$50 million each year in addition to what we have been paying

to employ her soldiers as mercenaries to fight in Cambodia and against Thailanders who oppose the monarchy there. Also, that corrupt old warlord Chiang Kai-shek, who has been maintained by us in Formosa, demands millions in submarines, planes, tanks, and self-propelled artillery. Apparently, President Nixon believes our Nation has a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world. He proposes to substitute taxpayers' billions for American manpower.

A. AUBREY BODINE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, every visitor to my office is struck with the beauty of Maryland as seen through the lens of Aubrey Bodine's camera and preserved by him in photographs of artistry and integrity. Over the decade I have served in Congress, Aubrey Bodine has given to the people of Maryland, through me, a collection of pictures of the State that are not only the principal ornament of the office, but also testimony that his generosity was equal to his genius. His last gift, a prize-winning scene of oyster-men on Chesapeake Bay, was only recently added to the collection.

But now Aubrey Bodine is dead, and Maryland and the Nation have lost a unique artist. Mr. Bodine died at the Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore on October 28 after being taken ill in his darkroom at the Baltimore Sun, where he was photographic director of the Baltimore Sun Magazine.

Born in Elkridge in 1906, Mr. Bodine was the preeminent photographer of his beloved State of Maryland, capturing in his meticulous work the countless faces and vistas of the Free State, from the wetlands and watermen of the Eastern Shore to the mountains and valleys of Western Maryland. His remarkable photographs were published in 4 books and were a frequent feature of the Baltimore Sun, on whose staff he served for a full half-century.

During his distinguished career, Mr. Bodine was awarded hundreds of prizes in national and international competitions. His photographs were purchased by the Smithsonian Institution and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and exhibited in one-man shows in Baltimore and in Moscow. Equally significant as a measure of his art are the countless copies of various Bodine photographs which his friends and admirers throughout Maryland have clipped from the Sunpapers and saved for years, in appreciation of the evocative beauty and calm of his work.

Aubrey Bodine was a true artist with a camera, often waiting many hours or returning to a scene many times to catch the precise angle of shadow or touch of sunlight which he sought. Equally painstaking in the darkroom, he never altered his patient, respectful approach to his craft. His perfection and perceptive eye established a new standard of quality for his profession, and he captured the beauty of Maryland as no other man has.

Mr. President, all photographers and all Marylanders mourn the passing of this great artist. I wish to express my personal sympathy to his family, and to include in the RECORD, in tribute, three articles which, together, summarize the extraordinary quality of A. Aubrey Bodine and the legacy of his lifetime of work in his chosen profession.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sun of October 29, an article from the Washington Post of October 30, and a letter to the editor which was published in the Sun of November 5.

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

A. AUBREY BODINE DIES AT 64

A. Aubrey Bodine, photographic director of *The Sun Magazine* and a *Sunpapers* photographer for nearly 50 years, died yesterday afternoon at the Johns Hopkins Hospital.

He was internationally known for his pictorial photographs of Maryland, most of which originated on his newspaper assignments.

Mr. Bodine, who was 64, was taken ill in his darkroom at the newspaper yesterday morning.

CONTINUED TO WORK

Though in poor health in recent years, he continued to work. He had just finished a major assignment for *The Sun Magazine*, photographing his favorite scenes throughout Maryland. In August he celebrated his 50th anniversary with the *Sunpapers*.

Mr. Bodine was born in Elkridge, the son of Joel Goode and Louise A. Wilson Bodine. After a few years in the public schools of Elkridge he switched to St. Paul's School.

He started working for the *Sunpapers* August 29, 1920, while still attending St. Paul's, which was then on Franklin Street. He was 14. His first job was in the business department but within a year he was transferred to the advertising art department.

Because of an interest in photography developed at St. Paul's, he was soon making pictures of ice boxes, console radios and furniture suites for newspaper advertisements.

ROTOGRAVURE SECTION

On weekends he began taking pictures of the harbor and the Patapsco River and submitting them to Mark Watson, the Sunday editor, who used them in the rotogravure section then known popularly as the "brown section." The pictures were so outstanding that in 1927 Mr. Bodine was transferred to the Sunday Department. At night he studied design at the Maryland Institute.

Every Sunday the brown section would have one or more pages of Bodine photographs of Maryland scenes—spring plowing, the Charles street Easter parade, oyster dredging, the mountains of Western Maryland. Those pictures were made on glass plate negatives.

In 1941 Mr. Bodine was appointed head of the Sunday *Sun* photographic department. In January, 1946, he became photographic director of the Sunday *Sun Magazine* when it replaced the rotogravure section.

CRITIC'S VIEW

One critic once observed of Mr. Bodine's work: "Bodine the artist is most seen in his pictures of the landscape. There is a wonderful communion between nature and this man, enabling him miraculously to present the essence of a particular site in photographic form."

The Middletown Valley, not far from his mother's family home in Boonsboro, was one of his favorite subjects. He thought Frederick was the prettiest town in Maryland. The most interesting and scenic country of the Eastern Shore, he felt, was Dorchester because of its vast marshes.

Contrary to what many believed, Mr. Bodine did not use a wide variety of cameras or a great deal of expensive equipment. His favorite camera was a 5-by-7 Linhof so battered and worn that it looked like it might have been abandoned on a battlefield by Mathew Brady.

On at least one occasion, as if to prove his point that expensive equipment was not necessary, Mr. Bodine published full-page layouts of pictures taken with a simple Brownie box camera.

The pictures, printed in the *Sun Magazine* in 1957, showed the same attention to detail and the same quality of his other prints and served as models for a special "snapshot contest" the newspaper was running at the time.

Mr. Bodine was famous for his use of sunlight and shadows in his pictures. Many were made near daybreak, on rainy evenings or frosty mornings. To get sunlight, mist or shadow precisely the way he wanted them, he would wait for hours, go back—even great distances—and, if necessary, postpone taking the picture for months. This would often drive his editor to distraction.

One editor wrote of him, "He has a deep appreciation of beauty in all its forms and moods. Heart and mind create the photograph that is distinguished by its beauty, clarity and air of tranquillity. In looking at one of his pictures I am usually struck first by its beauty, then by its simplicity of form. I think that what he leaves out of a picture is almost as important as what he allows into it. He has a gift for isolating and dramatizing beauty, and of hiding or subduing anything that detracts from it. If I come upon a view that I have first seen in a Bodine picture, I am often disappointed. Actually it is seldom as beautiful as Bodine's portrayal."

WON FELLOWSHIP

For his work in bringing a new concept of artistic expression to newspaper photography he was awarded a Fellowship in the Photographic Society of America. This is the highest honor bestowed by the largest photographic group. He was also named a fellow in the National Press Photographers Association, the first photographer to achieve both honors. In 1957 the National Photographers Association named him Newspaper Magazine Photographer of the Year.

For many years he exhibited his work in national and international competition and won hundreds of trophies, medals and ribbons.

He has had a one-man show at the Baltimore Museum of Art and another in Moscow. His work has been purchased by the Smithsonian Institution and the Metropolitan Museum of New York. His pictures clipped from the Sun Magazine have been used in schools, treasured in scrapbooks and tacked up in crossroad garages.

His picture, "oyster dredgers" snapped while he clung with one arm to a rocking boat, won a \$5,000 savings bond, first prize in a national contest which drew 50,000 entrees. The following year he entered the same contest and won second prize, which he regarded as a greater feat.

He has produced four picture books, "My Maryland" (1952) "Chesapeake Bay and Tide-water" (1954), "The Face of Maryland" (1961) and "The Face of Virginia" (1963). All have been reprinted. He also provided pictures for two guide books on Baltimore and Annapolis. The books were published by Bodine & Associates which has also published other local books.

Mr. Bodine had sorrel-colored hair which he wore close-cropped. He dressed nattily and in a colorful manner and always smoked a corn cob pipe. He often used the pipe as a signature when taking a picture of the interior of a home, leaving it on a table or desk so it would be visible in the photograph.

He prevailed upon government officials, even the Governor, to have branches trimmed, signs removed, or in one instance a tree removed if these things interfered with his best camera angle. When he couldn't get a sign removed he would sometimes make his own sign and hang it over the offending one while he made the picture.

In addition to his wife, Mrs. Nancy Tate Bodine, he is survived by a daughter, Jennifer Beaty Culver, a step-daughter, Mrs. Michael Moore, of Pittsburgh, a brother, Seiber K. Bodine, of Baltimore and a sister, Mrs. Charles Walter, of Randallstown.

Funeral services will be held at 10 A.M. Saturday at the Jenkins funeral establishment, 4905 York road. Burial will be in Greenmount Cemetery.

PHOTOGRAPHER A. AUBREY BODINE DIES

A. Aubrey Bodine, the prize-winning photographic director of the Baltimore Sun Magazine and a staff member of that paper for 50 years, died Wednesday in Baltimore following a stroke at the age of 64.

Mr. Bodine, who had been in ill health for the past few years, became sick in the newsroom Wednesday morning. He was taken to the Johns Hopkins Hospital, where he died a few hours later.

Internationally known for his photographs of Maryland scenes, Mr. Bodine specialized in the distinctive uses of sunlight, shadows and clouds.

His photographs were distinguished by their clarity and tranquility. He often placed his photographs in competition and during his career won hundreds of trophies and medals.

Norman Driscoll, secretary of the White House Press Photographers Association and a former co-worker of Mr. Bodine's, remembers him as "a master at printing."

According to Driscoll, Mr. Bodine would spend a whole day making one print. "He could come back with a lousy negative," said Driscoll, "and turn it into the best picture you'd ever seen."

Mr. Bodine has had one-man shows in both Baltimore and Moscow. His photographs have been purchased by the Smithsonian Institute here and the Metropolitan Museum of New York.

Four of his books have been published: "My Maryland" in 1952; "Chesapeake Bay and Tidewater" in 1954; "The Face of Maryland" in 1961, and "The Face of Virginia" in 1963.

A native of Elkridge, Md., Mr. Bodine began working for The Sun in 1920, at the age of 14. He began in the paper's business section, then switched to the advertising art department and, finally, because he kept submitting pictures taken on his own time, was assigned to the photography staff.

A habitual pipe smoker who carried as many as six pipes around in his pockets, Mr. Bodine always used a 5-by-7-inch view camera mounted on a tripod. Though the camera was conspicuous, a former colleague remembers that Mr. Bodine had a way of making himself obscure.

"Mr. Bodine could make himself invisible," he said. "Nobody would pay any attention to him, and the result was great candid pictures."

Driscoll remembers him as a man who was abrupt and straightforward, but at the same time generous to a fault.

He showed his generosity to other photographers by dropping out of the annual National Press Photographers Association competition relatively early in his career to give someone else a chance. His own explanation was that he had more sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica (the first prize) than he would ever need.

Mr. Bodine is survived by his wife, Nancy, and a daughter, Jennifer Culver, both of Baltimore; stepdaughter, Mrs. Michael Moore, of Pittsburgh, and a brother, Seeger K. Bodine, and a sister, Mrs. Charles Walter, both of Baltimore.

A. AUBREY BODINE

Sir: In 1934 A. Aubrey Bodine came to the Rinehart School of Sculpture to photograph my *Prix de Rome* entry.

The pains and delicate care he took in carrying out this photographic project was amazing to me and of course greatly appreciated. Because of the size of the sculpture he insisted on distance—which he alone took the time to arrange. One of the photographs appeared in *The Sun* on May 1, 1934.

Thirty-two years later, on an assignment to *The Sunday Sun Magazine* Mr. Bodine came to photograph my new studio. During this series of picture-taking he wanted to

photograph the dome. In order to get the result he wanted he lay flat on his back in the right spot on the floor and as a result took a fantastic shot—with the same care he took in 1934.

His fame and success in no way altered his endless search for perfection.

REUBEN KRAMER.

Baltimore.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

THE FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE AND DRUG DEPENDENCE PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1970

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand that S. 3562 is the unfinished business. Am I correct in that understanding?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the business before the Senate to be disposed of.

MR. KENNEDY. Am I also correct in understanding that House Joint Resolution 264, Equal Rights, has been laid aside until the completion of S. 3562?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct in that understanding.

MR. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent that S. 3562, the Drug Abuse Act, be temporarily laid aside.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1970

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I also would like to ask—would like to move that S. 3201 be laid before the Senate.

MR. COOK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I may not object—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold and let the clerk report?

MR. COOK. Mr. President, if the Senator is asking unanimous consent—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator did not ask unanimous consent. He moved that the clerk report the bill.

MR. COOK. May I ask whether unanimous consent should be asked to bring up that bill?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, and such a motion is in order.

MR. COOK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill first, and then the Senator may take such action as he wishes.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3201) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide increased protection for consumers, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

MR. COOK. Mr. President, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 386 Leg.]

Aiken	Hart	Montoya
Allen	Holland	Moss
Baker	Hruska	Packwood
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Saxbe
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy	Schweiker
Church	Mansfield	Scott
Cook	Mathias	Sparkman
Cotton	McClellan	Spong
Dole	McGee	Stevens
Ervin	McGovern	Stevenson
Gravel	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

MR. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) is absent on official business.

MR. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After some delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott	Goodell	Pearson
Anderson	Gore	Pell
Bayh	Harris	Prouty
Bellmon	Hartke	Proxmire
Bennett	Hughes	Randolph
Bible	Inouye	Ribicoff
Brooke	Jackson	Russell
Burdick	Javits	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cannon	Long	Symington
Cooper	Magnuson	Talmadge
Cranston	McCarthy	Thurmond
Curtis	Miller	Tower
Dominick	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Eagleton	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Muskie	Yarborough
Fulbright	Nelson	
Goldwater	Pastore	

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I withdraw my previous motion.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 264, which I understand would automatically have come down, be carried over, under the same stipulation, until tomorrow.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

MR. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not expect to object—let me make a brief statement.

I understand and appreciate the difficulties—

MR. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator allow me to lay another measure before the Senate?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar—

MR. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I reserve my right to object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

MR. GRIFFIN. I realize the difficulties of scheduling, and I do not particularly envy the problem that the majority leadership has under the circumstances. But I would like to make it abundantly clear that particularly when it comes to controversial measures, the minority expects and wants some notice about the scheduling.

I want to acknowledge to the distinguished majority leader that, generally, that has been the case in the past.

We have just completed a live quorum call. The call obviously had something to do with the fact that a very controversial bill was suddenly about to be called up without adequate notice. Some of our Members—I am sure this would apply to some on the majority side—are out of the city—some who are very interested in the bill. They want to be here. In some cases, they wish to present amendments.

While I would not want to object to laying aside temporarily the equal rights amendment in order to take up other matters, we do expect to have some reasonable notice about the matters to be brought. Accordingly, I would feel constrained to object to the unanimous-consent request unless there is some reasonable notice to our side as to what the legislative schedule is going to be.

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

MR. GRIFFIN. Yes; I am glad to yield.

MR. MANSFIELD. May I say that I must apologize for what happened on this bill, but that the bill I would like to lay before the Senate now has been cleared with the other side, and, to the best of my knowledge, there is no objection to it. I must take the blame for what happened.

MR. GRIFFIN. Further reserving the right to object, I want to make it very

clear that, generally, the majority leader is very, very considerate in this regard, and I do not wish to be critical of him.

Could the majority leader give us some further indication of the schedule beyond the bill which he is about to lay before the Senate?

MR. MANSFIELD. Yes.

May I say, first, that calling up the class consumer bill was done after notifying staff on the minority side, though interested Senators were apparently not consulted, and for that I apologize. It should have been done. Second, it should be said that the measure appeared on the minority leader's list of legislation which would be considered before an adjournment sine die. It appeared also in the list of items to be passed submitted for the RECORD last October 7. It was reported to the Senate last October 5.

What I would like to do now is to take up H.R. 8298, the so-called barge bill, which has been cleared on both sides, and follow that, possibly, by the joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment; then to get started this evening, just for the kickoff, so to speak, with the opening statements on the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

Tomorrow, of course, there will be the conference report on the farm bill, which will take at least a day and perhaps longer. If we get bogged down on that, because it is a privileged matter, we will then go back to the HEW bill, and that could take us into Friday.

On Monday, the Senate will face up to the question of overriding or not overriding the President's veto of the TV bill, so-called.

MR. GRIFFIN. I thank the majority leader.

I want to make it clear that we expect the class action bill to be called up. It is on the Calendar. No one expects that it will not be called up. But we only would like to have some reasonable notice.

MR. MANSFIELD. Perhaps some time next week. All sides are so notified and it is hoped that every effort will be made to be prepared.

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the one who made the motion to call up the class action measure, in consultation with my leader, I do think it is appropriate, in terms of the response to my good friend, the able assistant leader of the minority, to observe that it is my understanding this class action measure was placed on the minority leader's list of important pieces of legislation on Monday last. And I further understand that the majority leader did indicate that there was a strong possibility that this measure would be called up this week, in fact that it was so indicated in the RECORD. I do distinctly recall that the majority leader's list of items, presented to the Senate on October 7, before the recess, indicated this bill should be called up before any sine die adjournment.

The President, so I understand, has indicated strong support for this meas-

ure, so bringing this matter up now is consistent with trying to expedite the President's priorities.

I understand the concerns that have been expressed by the minority leader and the Senator from Kentucky. But I think it is appropriate, to note that inasmuch as all of us are impressed by the importance of this kind of legislation, including the President, that the leadership is trying to see that there would be due consideration of this measure on the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

MR. MANSFIELD. In view of a situation which has begun—

MR. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. MANSFIELD. I yield.

MR. COTTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he will yield me one moment to try to clear the record on one point he has made.

The Senator from Massachusetts, both now and in conversation with me earlier, when the Senate was not in session, has indicated—and he undoubtedly has every reason to believe it—that the President is enthusiastically behind the class action bill. I think there is some mistake there, and I do not want this to pass without at least setting the record straight so far as the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business—

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, under the previous stipulation, the unfinished business be laid aside under the same arrangements as requested earlier.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was that the unfinished business be laid aside until the end of morning business tomorrow—or the morning hour?

MR. MANSFIELD. The morning hour tomorrow, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The unfinished business will not be laid before the Senate until the end of the morning hour on the next legislative day.

The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

MR. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, as the ranking Republican member of the Commerce Committee, has the understanding that the President originally favored a class action bill. The Senator from New Hampshire has a clear understanding from the White House—not directly from the President but from those who represent him—that the class action bill in its present form is highly objectionable to the administration.

The Senator from New Hampshire also understands, and he wishes to be corrected if he is mistaken, that the class action bill was originally on the list of "must" legislation as presented by

the majority leader prior to recess. When we reconvened, that list was submitted to the minority leader, the able Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott), who made several additions.

I am sure it is not intentional on the part of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), but I think it is erroneous to suggest that the President is pressing for the passage of this particular bill in its present form.

It is the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire that although the President wants a class action bill, he would prefer no bill at all to the class action bill in its present form.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I may make a comment about that. There are three factors: First, that the President did want a class action legislation, and I think that statement still remains unrefuted; second, that this was a priority item agreed to by the minority leader; and, third, the majority leader indicated there was every indication it would be called up this week.

Personally, Mr. President, I feel that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation pending on the legislative calendar.

The record indicates, I think, strong support by the administration for this kind of legislation. The report of the Commerce Committee, on this bill, on page 2, represents remarks by Mrs. Virginia Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs. Her testimony was some of the most compelling to be heard by the committee.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, there is a point on which the record should be made clear and about which we should have no doubt. I have a statement in my hand that the distinguished majority leader made in the Senate, on October 7, 1970, and attached to it is a list of what he considered to be the matters to be brought before the Senate and for the remainder of this session.

The first one is the social security amendments and the second one is the consumer class action bill, S. 3201.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield there?

Mr. COOK. Apparently, Mr. President, if I may continue, the minority leader did also accept this list and added the trade bill, the hijacking, and the tax bills.

Mr. SCOTT. That is right.

Mr. COOK. So that it was a decision of the majority that this action be taken and not a matter of priority in regard to the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think this is a minor point. I do not want to be involved in this. There is something to be said on both sides.

Mr. COOK. I only want to put the minor point to rest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did say that on October 7—there is no question about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is not a minor point. I say to the majority leader that this is a little like the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) and I being coaches and having a

game called without being notified to be there. It is not minor; we should pass a class action bill in this session. The members of the Commerce Committee are ready to face up to it regardless of what side they are on. There are several amendments which will be highly controversial. I think administration and Commerce Committee action show that everyone wants to pass some kind of class action bill this session. We are ready to get at it. But it was my understanding—I checked last night—that we would bring up the agricultural conference report and then we would take up HEW which the Senator from New Hampshire and I are involved in, and then we would follow that, maybe, with the class action bill, if the schedule looks right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems now that the agricultural conference report cannot be brought up at this time—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not until tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not until tomorrow. But we are ready to face the issue of class action and I am sure every one of the members of the Commerce Committee knows what he wants to do. There will be several amendments—

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield there briefly, what I was referring to as a minor point was the question of the listing and not the legislation.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Another thing I want to mention; there is the mixing bill on the calendar—it seems that the Commerce Committee is involved in just about everything here these past 4 or 5 days—and both the majority and minority leaders and the members of the Commerce Committee are interested in the mixing bill. We are perfectly willing to have that brought up. The Senator from South Carolina is the man who held the hearings and he knows the subject. He asked me last night on the telephone about all this, and I said I did not think the mixing bill would come up today. So he is not here. I can handle the mixing bill, but I would rather not do it until he shows up.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from South Carolina wants the bill passed, does he not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Surely.

Mr. SCOTT. So far as I know, there is no opposition to its passage. The Senator would not object to that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is a little opposition to it from some of the people on the lower Mississippi River. They want to be heard. They will be heard. It should not take us over a half an hour to do it. We are in that position. The big thing is we have got to get HEW out of the way. We are ready to move on that as fast as we can settle these windups.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will yield further, I want to say that all that concerns me in this matter—and I am sure the distinguished majority leader as well—is that we have some order and some understanding that there is no controversy here about bringing up and disposing of all matters. If we can include

the consumer legislation, we want to do it. The objection was raised, and I was one of those who raised it, that at least those involved should be notified. Through an unfortunate situation, on which the minority leader will take the blame—

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, the Senator from Montana is to blame. It is my fault.

Mr. SCOTT. It was not necessary that the members of the Judiciary and Commerce Committees be notified because there is some incomplete action in the Judiciary Committee on this still. So that any attempt on the part of anyone to fix the blame on a partisan basis would be in error. Any attempt to pre-judge who is for or who is against a consumer bill would be entirely in error. But the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, has done yeoman work in attempting to work out an excellent bill. So has the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), as well as other Members on the other side of the aisle. We want something workable done here.

But we want to know when things are coming up. If we do not know when things are coming up, we are going to assert our prerogative to see that the Senate operates in a manner which protects the interests of all persons concerned. Let us not draw any conclusions that anyone is against the bill until the roll is called down here. When the roll is called down here, a lot of us will answer to our constituents without fear or favor. That is the time to make a political issue if anyone wants to do so.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, is it the understanding that we will take up the HEW bill some time later in the day, and that it will be laid aside tomorrow for the agricultural conference report?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. It is a privileged matter.

Mr. COTTON. I happen to know, or think I know, of quite a few amendments that will be offered to the HEW bill. We usually have them and know we are going to have them.

It is also my understanding that on Monday we will take up the Presidential veto.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that it would be possible to work out with the Republican leadership a time limitation so that we can have a definite time as to when the vote will take place. There will be plenty of time in the meantime to argue the matter.

Mr. COTTON. I think it is unfortunate that the HEW bill, which is an extremely important issue, will probably go over until Monday. I do not believe that if we are interrupted tomorrow by the agricultural bill we can get it out of the way by Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think we can. But I would like to keep the Senate working as far as we can. The cupboard is pretty bare as far as the calendar is concerned. It will depend upon the Senate as a whole in view of the box that the joint leadership finds itself in.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I think we can get agreement to vote on the tele-

vision bill if we can do it on Monday. A lot of Senators cannot get here until 4 or quarter after 4 in the afternoon on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be all right.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the question of the overriding of the Presidential veto begin at 1 o'clock on Monday and that the vote occur at 4 o'clock.

Mr. SCOTT. The planes get in at 4 o'clock. Would the distinguished majority leader agree to 5 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I forgot to add to the unanimous-consent agreement for the vote on the President's veto of S. 3637, the proviso that the time be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or whomever they may designate.

I ask unanimous consent to have that included in the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I designate the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) to represent me.

I will make that 2 o'clock and 5 o'clock rather than 1 o'clock and 4 o'clock.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we can get through with the HEW bill if we put some time limitation on amendments. Even if the agricultural bill takes a long time, we could be through by Friday or Saturday if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The Senator from Montana requests that on Monday, starting at 2 o'clock, the Senate debate the matter of the overriding of the Presidential veto of the radio and television bill and that the vote on that bill occur at 5 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, of course—I hope that the majority leader will see to it that we do not find ourselves in the position of having an early vote on Monday on the HEW bill before we take up the Presidential veto, if we have not finished the HEW bill by that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator would accept this suggestion, if that occurs, the joint leadership at that time would ask that the vote on the HEW bill take place immediately after the vote on the question of the overriding of the Presidential veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, in statement form, is as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote at 5 o'clock p.m. on Monday, November 23, 1970, on the motion to override the President's veto on S. 3637, to revise the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 which

relate to political broadcasting, with debate on the motion between 2 o'clock p.m. and 5 p.m. being equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, or their designees.

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 207) to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 17, after the word "chairman," strike out "The" and insert "Except for the year 1970, the"; on page 2, line 20, after the word "of", insert "the interrelationship between"; in line 22, after the word "and", where it appears the first time, strike out "their effect on"; on page 4, line 17, after the word "the", strike out "appropriate"; and in line 21, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, strike out "appropriate"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is established a joint congressional committee which shall be known as the Joint Committee on the Environment (hereafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "committee") consisting of eleven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and eleven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the eleven Members of the Senate appointed under this subsection, six members shall be from the majority party and five members shall be from the minority party. Of the eleven Members of the House of Representatives appointed under this subsection, six members shall be from the majority party, and five members shall be from the minority party. In the appointment of members of the committee under this subsection, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall give due consideration to providing representation on the committee from the various committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives having jurisdiction over matters relating to the environment.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. Except for the year 1970, the chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the Members of that House. The committee may establish such subcommittees as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments are made.

(d) A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

(e) The committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the committee and shall

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not the intention of the joint leadership at this time to call up H.R. 8298 because of the fact that other Senators who are interested in that matter are not present.

NATIONAL RETAILING WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1232, House Joint Resolution 1255, which has been cleared on both sides. It is only a resolution to set aside a certain week as National Retailing Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1255) to authorize and request the President to proclaim the period January 10, 1971, through January 16, 1971, as "National Retailing Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield, I would like to reiterate what I have said to the assistant minority leader. It is the intention to start later this afternoon on the opening statements covering the HEW appropriations bill, on tomorrow to take up the conference report on the farm bill, on Monday to take up the question of overriding the veto, and some time next week, hopefully, to take up the consumer class action bill. If there are any further possibilities, I will of course confer with the Republican leadership so that they will be fully aware.

I again express my apologies for not notifying them.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the majority would accept a suggestion, I propose that before we consider the consumer protection bill that we be given at least 1 day's notice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is satisfactory; at least 1 day's notice.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1040, Senate Joint Resolution 207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

be kept in the offices of the committee or such other places as the committee may direct.

(f) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate or to the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee—

(1) to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the interrelationship between the character and extent of environmental and technological changes and population, communities, and industries.

(2) to study methods of using all practical means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster, promote, create, and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans; and

(3) to develop policies that would encourage maximum private investment in means of improving environmental quality.

(b) The environmental quality report required to be submitted pursuant to section 201 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the committee, as well as to standing committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives having jurisdiction over the subject matter of such report.

(c) On or before the last day of December of each year, the committee shall submit to the State and to the House of Representatives for reference to the standing committees an annual report on the studies, reviews, and other projects undertaken by it, together with its recommendations. The committee may make such interim reports to the standing committees of the Congress prior to such annual report as it deems advisable.

(d) Before undertaking any study or investigation, the committee shall notify and consult with standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter thereof to avoid unnecessary duplication with any investigation undertaken by any other joint committee, or by any standing committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this joint resolution, the committee is authorized, as it deems advisable, (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to hold such hearings; (3) to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and (4) to employ and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants. Persons employed under authority of this subsection shall be employed without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties for which employed.

(b) The committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 4. To enable the committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this joint resolution, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a report from the Committees on Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works.

Over the past 10 years Congress has enacted many new substantive programs which are designed to improve the Nation's capacity to deal with pressing environmental problems and to improve the quality of life in America. These measures have included far-reaching air- and water-pollution control legislation, a greatly expanded national recreational program, measures to conserve

open space, fish and wildlife conservation measures, the land and water conservation fund, measures to deal with solid waste problems, controls for pesticide and chemical proliferation, and many other important conservation, recreation, and environmental measures.

In the 91st Congress legislation has been enacted which deals in a fundamental way with the organization of the executive branch for environmental management. Other measures are now pending in the form of far-reaching reorganization plans. These measures reflect an appreciation of the fact that the effectiveness of substantive programs depends in large measure on the organizations and institutions for developing, effectuating, and enforcing policies and programs.

Legislative measures enacted in this Congress include the National Environmental Policy Act which, among other things, established a three member Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President, and the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970 which established the Office of Environmental Quality to provide additional staff support to the Council and to the President. Both of these acts were designed to deal with the problems growing out of increased specialization and fragmentation of responsibility for environmental management within the executive branch.

On July 9, 1970, the President sent to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 3 which would create an independent Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). That Agency would be composed of offices and administrations now scattered throughout the Government having responsibility for one or more phases of protection of our total environment—air, water, and land. The plan is predicated upon recognition that:

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

Enactment of these measures has given or will give the President and the American people an institutional framework within the executive branch which can provide an overview of environmental problems and an ongoing assessment of issues, problems, trends, and areas requiring attention and special treatment.

The committees believe that the creation of a nonlegislative Joint Committee on the Environment will provide the legislative branch with a parallel overview capacity on a continuing basis. While all committees of the Congress have an important role to play in exercising oversight and enacting legislation to maintain and improve the quality of America's natural environment, it is clear that none of the existing congressional committees is equipped, or has the jurisdictional authority, to provide a comprehensive overview which will identify emerging problems which threaten the deterioration of man's environment.

BACKGROUND

Legislative proposals designed to improve congressional capacity to cope with environmental problems and to deal with the forces of change created by man's growing mastery of science and increasing technological powers have been introduced and considered in previous Congresses.

Proposals to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment were introduced by Senator Muskie and others in the 89th and 90th Congress. These measures were actively considered by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations. The hearing record and the subcommittee reports on Senate Resolution 298 (89th Cong.) and Senate Resolution 78 (90th Cong.) provide important documentation and testimony on the need for a congressional institution capable of providing a

INTRODUCTION

Over the past 10 years the Congress has enacted many new substantive programs which are designed to improve the Nation's capacity to deal with pressing environmental problems and to improve the quality of life in America. These measures have included far-reaching air- and water-pollution control legislation, a greatly expanded national recreational program, measures to conserve

continuing assessment and investigatory capacity to deal with environmental problems not within the legislative jurisdiction of existing standing committees.

A full documentation of legislative proposals introduced in the 90th Congress dealing with legislative organization for environmental decisionmaking is set out in appendix B of a special report to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs entitled "A National Policy for the Environment," committee print, July 11, 1968. Additional documentation of proposals in the 89th and 90th Congresses is found in a "Congressional White Paper on a National Policy for the Environment," appendix p. 17, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, October 1968; and Legislative Reference Service Multilith, TP-450, SP-170 entitled "Environmental Quality: Selected Bills and Resolutions, June 20, 1969."

In the present Congress, an initial tabulation indicates that over 40 bills have been introduced which are concerned either with a national policy for the environment or the establishment of machinery to study the overall problems of the human environment.

It is the committees' judgment that the establishment of a non-legislative Joint Committee on the Environment will be useful in developing a coordinated congressional response to environmental problems; in insuring that environmental degradation problems are not overlooked; and in undertaking in-depth studies of problems which are not within the province of the standing committees.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose for establishing a Joint Committee on the Environment is to improve congressional capacity for gathering relevant information on present and emerging environmental problems and to create a well-staffed congressional institution that can make a continuing assessment of the relationship between man and his environment.

Senator Magnuson noted when Senate Joint Resolution 207 was introduced that:

"In this time of rapid change and progress Congress must retain flexibility as an institution and be prepared to improve its structure in order to meet and solve important problems facing the Nation. There are no more pressing national problems than those embodied in the term "environment." It is time for Congress to adjust its structure to meet head on in a coordinated fashion these problems."

1. Relationship to Standing Committees.—The members of the three reporting committees are in full agreement that the creation of a Joint Committee on the Environment is in no way intended to infringe in any way upon the legislative, substantive or oversight jurisdiction of any standing committee. As Senator Muskie noted in his introductory statement on June 4:

"It is not the intent of this resolution to establish a committee which would infringe the substantive jurisdiction of any standing committee. The joint committee would have no jurisdiction over legislation or powers of legislative oversight. Rather, it would provide a source of information and analysis not now available to the Congress. Information which the standing committees do not have the time nor the mandate to develop for themselves."

"Standing committees are increasingly burdened with legislative proposals within their special fields, and the committee staffs have little opportunity to explore the broad relationships between other fields and the environment. The hearings developed by the joint committee would provide Members of Congress, their assistants, and committee staff members with information for the de-

velopment of legislative and executive policy."

Senator Jackson, in his introductory remarks on the joint resolution noted that:

"On a subject so pervasive, broad, and important as "environment" and the "quality of life," no committee may exercise exclusive jurisdiction. It is also clear, however, that environmental management must be viewed in a comprehensive way. We have established the Council on Environmental Quality or provide an overview of the environmental system within the executive branch. We have, as yet, no comparable forum within the Congress to consider the general status of the environment at large. We must do so if our presently fragmented, problem-solving efforts in this area are to be made cohesive."

The need for an "integrating forum" and an increased information gathering capacity was discussed by Senator Baker:

"It is clear that environmental issues cross every area of jurisdiction and although rational management dictates a division of responsibilities, it is essential that an integrating forum be available to Congress to explore the full range of the problems arising in man's relationship to his environment."

"The Joint Committee on Environment would serve this important role; having as its principal function the development of information on the broad range of problems and making that information available to the authorizing committees of Congress, thereby assisting in the development of a unifying thread holding together the multitude of congressional activities."

Concern was expressed by Senator Hart on the need for informal procedures to better coordinate the Nation's response to environmental problems and to avoid waste and duplication of effort:

"Although the Congress in the past years has become increasingly sensitive to problems of environmental quality, its efforts have been hampered to a significant degree by a lack of coordination. Duplication of effort has too often denied valuable resources or projects of vital importance. Laudable efforts have too often been dissipated by dispersal in different and sometimes inconsistent directions."

Senator Nelson said:

"It is equally important to provide Congress with an effective service mechanism that will make a continuing study of Federal environmental progress, will regularly report on Federal activities in this regard, and will make long-range assessments and recommendations in the broadest environmental context. In making new policies and in judging present ones, every congressional committee is increasingly confronted with the task of making very difficult decisions having environmental implications in some way."

We contemplate that there will be a close relationship and continuing dialogue between the appropriate standing committees and the joint committee in the selection of appropriate areas of inquiry and investigation. In this way coordination may be enhanced, duplication may be avoided, and relevant information and studies may be made available on a timely basis. Senator Muskie stated in his introductory statement that:

"The standing legislative committees involved with the environment should help determine the areas of inquiry which they felt were most relevant to their requirements. They could help guide the effort of the joint committee along lines which would assure maximum benefit to the standing committees."

The committee is in full accord on the need for consultation and the desirability of having the joint committee proceed in a manner which would assure maximum benefit to the work of the standing committees. Section 2(d) of the joint resolution is de-

signed to establish a notification and consultation procedure which will allow the standing committees a role in guiding the work of the joint committee.

STAFFING REQUIREMENTS

The committees strongly feel that the staff of the joint committee should be selected solely on the basis of their professional qualifications and their ability to provide the members of the joint committee as well as the Congress with competent and objective information. Identifying, describing, and presenting to the Congress the major environmental issues facing the Nation will require many skills and the expertise of many disciplines. These include, but are not limited to law, economics and the natural sciences.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

At the present time the Legislative Reference Service reports that there are over 40 bills and resolutions pending before Congress which propose some form of restructuring of the legislative branch to deal with environmental problems. These measures range from the creation of new standing committees, select committees, and joint committees to proposals to establish an office of technology assessment as an arm of the Congress. These measures call for the establishment of an institution to provide oversight, conduct studies, and recommend environmental legislation, utilizing such variant titles for the committee as "environmental quality," "environment and technology" and "environmental quality and population policy."

House Joint Resolution 1117 which was passed by the House May 25, and referred to the Senate June 1, uses the short title, "Joint Committee on the Environment." The House resolution and Senate Joint Resolution 207, which was introduced in the Senate June 4, were jointly referred to the Committees on Public Works, Commerce and Interior, and Insular Affairs with instruction to report back to the Senate by July 15. By unanimous consent the instruction to report back to the Senate was later extended to July 22.

Both Senate Joint Resolution 207 and House Joint Resolution 1117 are similar to a Senate resolution to create a Senate Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment, first introduced in the second session of the 89th Congress by Senator Muskie as Senate Resolution 298. A hearing was held on that resolution on December 15, 1966, and the resolution was reintroduced in the next Congress as Senate Resolution 68. This proposal was the subject of further hearings before the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee in March and April of 1967, and was reported favorably to the full committee.

In the 91st Congress the measure was reintroduced as Senate Resolution 78, and hearings were held in March, April, and May of 1969.

On June 29, 1970, special subcommittees of the Interior, Commerce, and Public Works Committees met jointly to consider Senate Joint Resolution 207. Following the meeting, the subcommittees reported to the parent committees. On July 7, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered Senate Joint Resolution 207 reported to the Senate with the amendments recommended by the special subcommittee. The Public Works Committee ordered Senate Joint Resolution 207 reported on July 16, and the Commerce Committee reported the legislation on July 21. No objections to the joint resolution were raised in any of the committees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the bill, about which I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, my distinguished col-

league (Mr. JACKSON) the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), and others involved in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state there are a number of committee amendments. Does the Senator ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I now send to the desk the amendment to which I referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "Senate," add the words "acting upon the recommendations of the Majority and Minority Leaders."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, technically, of course, the Vice President appoints these committee members. We would add that it should be done on the advice of the minority and majority leaders.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator to what extent, if any, the proposed legislation would affect legislation now referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not. This is not a legislative committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there is so much conflict about jurisdiction on environmental problems as they concern the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and other committees—

Mr. AIKEN. And the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. It cuts across everything. We may have to make a decision one of these days if we are going to have a special committee to handle these matters. I am not sure, but this is a beginning. It is not a legislative committee, but we hope we can collect many ideas and submit an arrangement on environmental problems.

Mr. AIKEN. This legislation would not affect in any way insecticides, pesticides, fungicides, and so forth. Is that right?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. We have a lot of those bills in the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Public Works. There are also bills concerning those matters before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Defense Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. It cuts across everything.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But we hope we can be helpful in putting some of these things together to achieve the goals and objec-

tives we all want in the field of environment.

Mr. AIKEN. My only purpose in rising at this time was to keep the RECORD clear.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We hope we can correlate some of these matters. When I read from the report that there are at least 40 bills, I would guess that there are 250 such bills in the House and in the Senate. We hope we can bring these matters together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Washington explain after which word "Senate" in line 7 the amendment is to go?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The second word "Senate" on page 1, line 7 where it states, "The President of the Senate—."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think this is a worthy idea. It follows very much along the lines we have pursued in the hunger situation and the school desegregation situation. I think it can be very useful, especially in view of the interest of the young in the problems involving the environment. It would give them a focal point for new ideas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Obviously, the standing committees now have the expertise in certain matters and should continue their initiative on certain environmental issues. For instance, the Senator from Vermont and I are concerned about the pending power shortage that will occur in this country. If we talk about nuclear power it is necessary to get the advice and expertise of people who have been working on it for a long time. The Committee on Public Works has been very active in clean air and water pollution, whereas the Committee on Commerce is charged with all matters offshore. However, we are all trying to achieve the same goal.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, because I think it is quite proper to do so, a list of the distinguished sponsors.

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

Mr. Muskie (for himself, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Baker, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Church, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Spong, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of Ohio, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey).

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 207, to establish a joint committee of the Congress on the environment, marks an important commitment to the preservation of the human element. I have sought this commitment since 1966, and as sponsor of this resolution I am gratified at its fulfillment. The creation of the joint committee is an outgrowth of efforts over the last 5

years in behalf of a select committee in the Senate.

The fundamental purposes of the joint committee will be to improve congressional ability for gathering relevant information on environmental problems and to enable the Congress to make a continuing assessment of the relationship existing between man and his environment.

We live in a finite world where all our life systems, natural, and synthetic, depend on each other. The air we breathe; the water we drink; the food we eat; the housing over our heads; the energy and resources we consume; and even the laws by which we live are all critical parts of the human environment. When those parts become substantially out of balance, as they are now, we are in trouble.

Our environment is under increasing pressure from a rising population, from growing use and consumption of our resources and from accelerating scientific and technological advances. We face enormous problems because our environmental planning has been haphazard or nonexistent.

For those of us responsible for the welfare of our communities and the well-being of our citizens, these pressures on the environment pose a serious challenge. Many competent scholars question whether we can identify the dangers ahead and control environmental change without modifying our present institutions of Government.

Congress has not developed an adequate mechanism for the assessment of environmental problems and for the review of the management of these problems. Instead, we have groped from crisis to crisis, creating a fragmentation of laws and programs to meet short-range needs. This approach has diffused Federal responsibility and confused State and local governments.

Recently, in response to this increasing problem, Congress established a Council on Environmental Quality and an Office of Environmental Quality in the office of the President. We have also approved creation of an environmental protection agency. These are important changes, but they are not enough.

It is important that Congress have its own mechanism for keeping itself informed on environmental change. Congress should have its own early warning system on the benefits and hazards of economic, scientific, and technological change and on needed public and private investment in environmental protection.

Over 40 eminent scientists, educators, Government officials, and spokesmen for professional organizations emphasized the need for a congressional forum in hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during the 89th and 90th Congresses on resolutions which I introduced to create a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

Dr. Donald Hornig, former science adviser to the President, and Director of the Office of Science and Technology, saw the interaction between advancing technology and society as a problem rooted in history. He said:

What is new, is the scale, the variety, and the speed of change, both in man's physical and his social environment.

This is a "deadly serious game of tight-rope walking," as we "sustain rapid economic growth, we must also attempt to foresee the consequences of major changes to protect ourselves from unintended secondary effort . . ."

This is why I think it is very important there be in Congress a forum for discussing the overall problems, and not just the problems as defined by the structures of congressional communities.

Lee C. White, former Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, indicated the important role he felt such a committee could play, when he said:

The special advantage would be its ability to illuminate new and unexpected relationship between technological advance and human environment, without being limited by lines of committee jurisdiction or the bounds of a particular item of particular legislation. We need studies of this type every bit as much as we need detailed examination of particular problems.

The Joint Committee on the Environment to be established by Senate Joint Resolution 207 would provide such an opportunity for environmental inquiry and assessment. Through its hearings and reports, the Joint Committee could make an important contribution to scholars and academic institutions, to professional organizations, and to the public at large.

Mr. President, the quality of life and the environment supporting it which we pass on to our children will reflect our ability to define the problems we face as much as our determination to solve them. If we fail to complete the work we have begun, future generations will have to pay more than the price of our inaction. The future of our society will depend on how well we, at the Federal level, provide the leadership and the answers with respect to the critical relationship between our human and natural resources.

A Joint Committee on the Environment will be a step toward this leadership.

JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE NEEDED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the measure before the Senate to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment deals with a matter of great concern in our country.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which has primary jurisdiction over much environmental legislation, and as a cosponsor of this important proposal, I am acutely aware of the need for legislation to protect our environment and of the public demand for action.

Earlier this week I spoke of the demonstrated public willingness to pay the price of environmental enhancement as reflected in the election returns. Voter approval on November 3 of a high percentage of bond issues for environmental improvement proves that our citizens are serious and are ready and willing to pay for the costs.

On another level, the executive branch of the Federal Government is reorganizing agencies concerned with the environment and creating a major new agency to cope with the problems of pollution and environmental degradation and enforcement.

The Congress, too, is participating in this effort through the passage of effective legislation to correct the abuses of the past and prevent their recurrence.

The United States is mounting a major assault on pollution. The Congress must adjust its organization so that we can contribute fully and efficiently to the elimination, in as large a measure as possible, of pollution from our world.

Creation of the Joint Committee on the Environment is a sound step we must take. Such a body would be of immense help in coordinating the work of the several standing committees with responsibility for environmental legislation.

Through the functioning of the Joint Committee on the Environment, the Congress could provide the kind of prompt and effective response to the urgent demands being made on it by a public that will no longer tolerate the destruction of our natural environment.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this resolution, which the Commerce Committee and the Interior Committee and the Public Works Committee, have cooperated in preparing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 207) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. J. RES. 207

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is established a joint congressional committee which shall be known as the Joint Committee on the Environment (hereafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "committee") consisting of eleven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, acting upon the recommendations of the majority and minority leader, and eleven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the eleven Members of the Senate appointed under this subsection, six members shall be from the majority party and five members shall be from the minority party. Of the eleven Members of the House of Representatives appointed under this subsection, six members shall be from the majority party, and five members shall be from the minority party. In the appointment of members of the committee under this subsection, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall give due consideration to providing representation on the committee from the various committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives having jurisdiction over matters relating to the environment.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. Except for the year 1970, the chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the Members of that House. The committee may establish such subcommittees as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments are made.

(d) A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum therefor for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

(e) The committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the committee and shall be kept in the offices of the committee or such other places as the committee may direct.

(f) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate or to the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee—

(1) to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the interrelationship between the character and extent of environmental and technological changes and population, communities, and industries.

(2) to study methods of using all practical means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster, promote, create, and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans; and

(3) to develop policies that would encourage maximum private investment in means of improving environmental quality.

(b) The environmental quality report required to be submitted pursuant to section 201 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the committee, as well as to standing committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives having jurisdiction over the subject matter of such report.

(c) On or before the last day of December of each year, the committee shall submit to the Senate and to the House of Representatives for reference to the standing committees an annual report on the studies, reviews, and other projects undertaken by it, together with its recommendations. The committee may make such interim reports to the standing committees of the Congress prior to such annual report as it deems advisable.

(d) Before undertaking any study or investigation, the committee shall notify and consult with standing committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter thereof to avoid unnecessary duplication with any investigation undertaken by any other joint committee, or by any standing committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 3. (a) For the purposes of this joint resolution, the committee is authorized, as it deems advisable, (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to hold such hearings; (3) to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and (4) to employ and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants. Persons employed under authority of this subsection shall be employed without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties for which employed.

(b) The committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimburs-

able basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

Sec. 4. To enable the committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this joint resolution, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand the leadership is ready to recess in a little while. While the germaneness rule has not yet expired I ask, with the consent of the leadership on the floor, that I be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes as in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no pending business, the Senator may proceed.

REPRESENTATION OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate today a situation which has developed in the United Nations where I have the honor to be the delegate this year to the General Assembly. The matter to which I address myself requires congressional attention, in view of the past record of Congress on this subject.

In my capacity as U.S. Delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations I have had a particular opportunity to give attention to the question of representation of China—one of the most complex and sensitive issues before the world today. During my absence in Europe on NATO business, the U.S. position was stated by Ambassador Phillips on November 12 in a speech to the General Assembly.

The U.S. position this year on the admission of the People's Republic of China is in my judgement a new position; for the first time in 20 years, the United States has moved away from a position of outright opposition to Peking's admission.

The Nixon administration is to be commended for this major initiative which is in accordance with the Nixon doctrine governing U.S. policy in Asia. The support of the Congress on so vital a matter of U.S. policy is of the greatest importance.

The speech of Ambassador Phillips showed that the main thrust of the U.S. position is that the United States opposes the expulsion of the Republic of China on Taiwan as the precondition for the admission of the People's Republic of China into the U.N. The corollary of this proposition is to open the door for a change in the U.S. position, the main thrust of which has been heretofore to oppose the admission of the People's Republic of China to the U.N. per se. I

agree with this new position adopted by the Nixon administration and consider that following the vote in the U.N. a similar reopening of the question in the Congress is essential.

The record of Congress on this subject would indicate support for a continued U.S. position of opposition to the admission of the People's Republic of China into the U.N., regardless of terms. For example, the last rollcall vote we had in the Senate on this question was on July 23, 1956, when House Concurrent Resolution 265 was passed by a vote of 86 to 0.

It has long been the practice to include "sense of Congress" expressions, opposing the admission of the Chinese People's Republic, in foreign assistance legislation, as well as in State Department Appropriations Acts.

For example, the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1970, approved on February 9, 1970, retains this provision in its section 105, which is an old-style congressional expression of view on the Chinese representation issue. The Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1971, approved on October 21, 1970, just before the election recess, states:

SEC. 105. It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

In view of this legislative history, I feel it is essential that the Congress express its support for the posture adopted on this question by the Nixon administration, as embodied in a statement of November 12 given by Ambassador Phillips.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, once the vote is taken in the U.N., I shall submit to the Senate an appropriate resolution, which I hope will begin the debate for taking a new position on the part of Congress in respect of the admission of Communist China to the U.N.

I expect the vote this year will show a mixed result. It seems likely that the Albanian resolution, calling for Peking's admission and for Taipei's expulsion might possibly even gain a majority for the first time this year. Also, and very importantly, the "Important Question" resolution cosponsored by the United States is likely to receive a strong majority again this year. If this is, indeed, the result, the General Assembly will in effect have upheld the position of the Nixon administration—that is, also favoring the continued membership on some acceptance terms of the Republic of China's Government on Taiwan.

The task for next year will be to devise a new resolution which will effect the will of the majority—that is representation for both Peking and Taipei. I hope the United States will take the leadership in devising a new resolution to this end for presentation next year. I hope also that a climate will have been created

in the Congress to facilitate such a decision.

It is unreasonable for Peking to insist on Taipei's expulsion as a condition for its acceptance of membership. It is equally unreasonable for Taipei to insist on Peking's continuing exclusion as the condition for its continuing participation. I hope the United States will do its best to get both the governments of Peking and Taipei to drop their rigid preconditions for participation in the United Nations. This could be done without settling the question of whether there is one China, two Chinas, or one China and one Taiwan.

Because of the U.S. relationship with the Nationalist Government in Taipei, I feel that the United States bears a special diplomatic responsibility to convince the Government of the Republic of China to recede from its rigid attitude of refusing to participate in the United Nations if the Chinese People's Republic should be voted in.

In recognition of the first 20 years of the United Nations, and of the great changes in the world scene which have taken place since the United Nations was founded, the United States should take a lead in proposing the principle of universality with respect to membership in the United Nations for all those willing in good faith to undertake the obligations of the U.N. Charter. Under this sensible and equitable formula, both Peking and Taipei would be welcome to participate. Both are functioning governments in control of significant populations and territory.

While it is possible that both or either of the governments of Peking and Taipei may stick to their rigid posture of pre-conditioning the other's exclusion as the price of its membership, I believe that the best and most efficacious position for the United States and for the United Nations is one which embraces the principle of universality as to all willing in good faith to undertake the obligations of the Charter. This would then make it clear that the exclusion of either Peking or Taipei was a decision of that government and not a decision of the United States or the United Nations.

There is an essential task to be performed in Congress in support of the Nixon administration's initiative to meet the challenge of the Chinese representation issue. Members of the Senate will recall the history of congressional expressions of opposition to Peking's entry into the United Nations. These expressions, beginning with Senate Resolution 36 passed on January 23, 1951, were the product of the deep feeling engendered by the Korean war period. While appropriate to their time, I believe that the day has come for the Senate to reexamine its position.

The Congress needs to buttress the administration in seeking a new, more realistic and—in terms of world opinion—more widely acceptable resolution of this complex issue which is so gravely important to the peace of the world and the future of the United Nations. In my judgment, this could best be done in a way which will make it possible for Taipei to remain in, while also making it

possible for Peking to come in. Both governments have a significant contribution to make.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I regret that I did not hear the earlier part of the speech of the distinguished Senator from New York, who serves with great distinction on the Foreign Relations Committee. What was the intention of the Senator from New York in terms of the Security Council?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that to be the knottiest question. There are several possible formulas to handle that question. I do not wish to express a personal judgment on the matter at this time. Rather, I want to focus attention on the first part of the problem—That of opening up United Nations membership to both governments. The Security Council seat is a problem which the United Nations and other nations will have to wrestle with, once the first hurdle has been crossed.

The administration maintains there really has been no change in its policy, but it seems to me it is a change and it is a major change which opens the way, at long last, to the United States receding from a position which has really been unaltered for over 20 years—that of simply and flatly opposing the admission of Communist China. We may be able to help, in the Congress, with a formula, so that the U.S. position might be founded on the ways and means rather than on a doctrinaire attitude of flat opposition.

It seems to me that has been foreshadowed in the administration. The question is "Will we followup in the Congress"? I hope we will. I am hoping to bring the issue to a debate by bringing the question before the Congress in the form of a resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator. I look forward to reading his comments with great interest.

I was interested in the fact that in the last couple of weeks the United Nations has admitted Fiji, with a population a little less than that of Indianapolis; and still China, with a population of close to 800 million, has been denied admission.

I thank the Senator. I look forward to reading his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me that as a delegate, but being in effect the Senate's delegate, it was my duty to ascertain what was going on and, without trying to commit the administration, to bring before the Senate what I really feel is a new fork in the road. In view of the record which the Congress has on this issue, we ought to join in taking advantage of the opportunity which has now been created to move our Nation's position forward in a constructive and realistic way.

I thank my colleague.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR CHRISTOPHER H. PHILLIPS, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, IN PLENARY, ON CHINESE REPRESENTATION, NOVEMBER 12, 1970

Mr. President, distinguished delegates: We have before us for consideration once again a proposal sponsored by Albania, Algeria and sixteen other states to expel the Republic of China from the United Nations

and to place in the same seat representatives from the People's Republic of China. I use the words "once again" because this proposal, and the resolution which seeks to effect it, differ not at all from similar proposals and resolutions which we have considered—and decisively rejected—many times in the past. My Delegation hopes that it will be rejected again this year.

Mr. President, the position of the United States is well known. We have joined with the governments of seventeen other states, embracing representatives from every continent, in co-sponsoring a procedural resolution which affirms that any proposal to change the representation of China in the United Nations is an important question and requires a two-thirds majority for adoption. This is a long-established position of the General Assembly, affirmed and re-affirmed by large majorities on many occasions when there has been a substantive debate on the issue of Chinese representation.

We would do well to look into the matter and understand why the "important question" procedure has so consistently received overwhelming support, particularly since we have already heard it attacked as nothing more than a transparent device for withholding from the People's Republic of China something which, it is claimed, is its own. The fact of the matter, however, is that far from being some sort of maneuver, the "important question" procedure found in Article 18 of our Charter is one of the most essential protections of all members of the United Nations, whether large or small. The plain language of Article 18 is that decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting. Important questions are defined in that Article as recommendations with respect to international peace and security, election to various offices within our organization, questions relating to the operation of the trusteeship system and the budget, the suspension of rights and privileges of membership, the admission of new members and the expulsion of present members—and this is precisely what document A/L 605 would have us do.

Mr. President, to insist on the integrity of the Charter, to re-affirm the protections which it provides, and to insist that these protections must be available to all members without distinction, is not only a matter of self-interest for all of us within this room; it is also a matter of simple equity and justice. It would set a most dangerous precedent to expel a Member of the United Nations—an act that has never been taken in this Organization's quarter century of life—by a simple majority of those present and voting. Those who may be tempted to disregard the Charter's safeguards because of their views on the present issue should consider carefully whether at some future time on some future issue they might find themselves in a position similar to that in which some have sought to place the Republic of China. We should remain faithful to the plain words of the Charter and ensure that these words apply to all without discrimination. In thus re-affirming the "important question" principle we will be taking an action that relates to far more than just the question of Chinese representation.

It is for these reasons that my country has joined in co-sponsoring the resolution set forth in document A/L 599. It is for these reasons that I strongly urge all Members, regardless of their position on the substantive question of Chinese representation, to vote to re-affirm this vital procedure.

Mr. President, I turn now to the substantive resolution, contained in document A/L 605. You are all well aware of my Government's firm opposition to this draft resolution. Its proposal to expel

the representatives of the Republic of China is both unwise and unjust.

Mr. President, the expulsion of a member state is a most serious business. Article 6 of the Charter reserves this action to cases in which a member has persistently violated the principles upon which our organization was founded, and it requires joint action by both the Security Council and the Assembly. There is not a single act of the Republic of China that would justify these extreme measures. Yet the resolution before us has deliberately joined the concept of admitting the People's Republic of China to the call for expelling the Republic of China. Indeed they are so joined as to prevent the extrication of one from the other.

We have heard it said before, and doubtless it will be repeated during the course of this debate, that the People's Republic of China is a reality that cannot be ignored. Indeed that is so. And I do not believe any of us here today, or any of the governments that we represent, ignores that reality. As far as the United States is concerned, as most are aware, we have actively sought to move from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. Representatives of my Government have met with representatives of the People's Republic of China twice this year and would have met more often had Peking been willing to do so. And my Government has taken a number of concrete actions—actions for which we neither proposed nor anticipated a quid pro quo—to ease relations between us. The fact of the matter is, the United States is as interested as any in this room to see the People's Republic of China play a constructive role among the family of nations. All of us are mindful of the industry, talents and achievements of the great people who live in that ancient cradle of civilization.

But let us also remember, Mr. President, that the Charter nowhere confers upon states the right to make their own conditions for membership in the United Nations. Neither in the Charter, nor in any resolution is it written that a state may say "We will join, but only if you expel member X". What the Charter does say is that membership shall be open to all peace-loving states able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership, and that members may be expelled only if they have persistently violated the principles of the Charter.

All of us must recall that many times during the period of General Debate earlier in this session, and in the speeches delivered during the special commemorative week, we have heard distinguished delegates, Foreign Ministers, and even Heads of State warmly endorse the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations. How curious it is that some of the same delegations who then urged universality of membership, now with equal fervor urge that we expel one of our present members. Surely if universality means anything at all, it means that we add to our present membership, not subtract from it. My Government fails to see how it is possible for a delegation that favors universality of membership—or for any delegation at all—to vote to expel from our midst a government which:

Effectively governs 14 million people—a population larger than that of two-thirds of the members of this Assembly;

Is recognized diplomatically by more than sixty of the members of this organization;

Has been a member of the United Nations since the organization's founding;

Has worked faithfully and constructively for the good of the organization;

Has contributed more than its share to the work of the Specialized Agencies;

And has consistently sought to assist the process of development throughout the world.

The sponsors of the resolution now before us, as they have done in previous years, would have us ignore such considerations and, by spurious appeals to the principle of universality and misrepresentation of fact, call on us to expel a member which has faithfully abided by the Charter of this Organization. Such a demand clearly violates the principles of equity and justice. It should be opposed by all those who believe that these principles should guide the actions of this Organization and who maintain that the Charter must be upheld if this Organization itself is to survive and be effective.

Mr. President, we believe that these reasons require that this Assembly reject this proposal to expel the Republic of China from the United Nations. Whatever views Members may hold on the question of Peking's participation, we do not see how the purposes of this Organization can be served by expelling any Member which has long and faithfully observed the obligations set forth in its Charter.

It is on this basis, Mr. President, that I urge the distinguished delegates of this Assembly to reject decisively the resolution contained in document A/L.605.

PART-TIME JOBS FOR WOMEN IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT—A WAY TO DEAL WITH "JOB FREEZES" AND "EMPLOYMENT CEILINGS"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it ought to be self-evident to us all that there is a great unused reserve of skilled talent among the women of this country, and very often the waste of this talent—particularly among married women with school-age children—could be overcome if only there were useful employment available on a part-time or half-time basis, so that mothers could work the first half of the day and still be home, if they wish, to be with their children when they return home from school.

The Federal Government, as the largest single employer in the Nation, has an obligation, in my view, to lead the way in dealing with this problem. Indeed, the executive branch of the Government has, on a number of occasions, urged Government agencies to make employment available to them and others who can only work part-time.

Each branch of the executive department has, in recent years, been placed under various "ceilings" and "job freezes," and it has come to my attention that the application of these limits may operate unfairly and unintentionally to preclude part-time employment which is so necessary for the solution to this problem. For the effect of these ceilings is very often to confront the executive department head with an unfair dilemma: each new part-time employee is charged against the department's overall employment ceiling just as if it were a full-time job, and so, if the department head wishes to divide one full-time job into two part-time jobs, he risks being charged with two jobs, instead

of one, in order to get the same work done.

What is needed is some flexibility in these employment ceilings, so that a department head may—if he wishes to—convert one full-time job into two half-time jobs without paying any "extra price" in terms of the job ceiling.

To explore the implications of such a policy, I have asked my administration assistant, Frank Cummings, to correspond with the executive branch and determine what flexibility there may be, and that correspondence has revealed a most encouraging willingness to make the conversion almost routinely.

As the experience of my office has been that department heads are unaware of this flexibility, however, I take this occasion to call their attention to certain statements in a recent letter from the assistant director of the Office of Management and Budget in the White House. After conceding that the present ceilings on total employment and full-time employees yield a "derived ceiling" on part-time employment, the OMB letter notes that "our regulations do not preclude splitting a full-time job into two half-time jobs," but of course that does not solve the problem of the ceiling.

What is most important, I think, however, is the following statement, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues and to the heads of the various executive branches, departments and agencies:

There can be circumstances, however, under which this requires a change in the total ceiling allowed—a change which would be almost automatically granted upon request.

Thus, it now appears that applications for conversion of an employment ceiling to permit the splitting of one full-time job into two-half jobs would be almost routinely granted, and I hope very much the heads of the departments in the executive branch will keep this in mind and use this flexibility where the situation permits, because it will permit them to make most effective use of a most important and effective segment of our population.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence I have discussed be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1970.
Mr. FRANK CUMMINGS,
Administrative Assistant to Senator Jacob
K. Javits, Senate Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUMMINGS: In further response to your letter of October 12 as extended in your conversation with Mr. George Strauss, let me try again to explain what the policies and procedures are with respect to personnel ceilings.

Actually, at the President's direction, this Office establishes two kinds of ceilings. As indicated in my letter of October 3, these are (1) full-time, permanent employment, and (2) total employment. By subtracting (1) from (2), the difference becomes, in effect, a limitation on the number of part-time, temporary, and intermittent employees. Since all ceilings apply to the last day of each fiscal year, June 30, the agencies have flexibility as to how to apply these ceilings

within the year, particularly with respect to the nonfull-time employment.

In short, all employment is subject either to actual or a derived ceiling, and all employees in each category of employment must be included in the monthly employment reports which are furnished to the Congress, and which the Committees of the Congress, the President, and this Office use to monitor administration of the ceiling requirements.

Apparently, there is no problem in your mind with respect to the category of full-time, permanent employees—that is, persons occupying permanent positions who have a base workweek of 40 hours. Mr. Strauss informs me that you still have problems with that category of employees which you designate as "part-time, permanent"—for example, two persons each working 20 hours a week and both performing the same duties so that the sum of the hours worked by both is the equivalent of one full-time, 40-hour a week permanent job. So far as the ceiling procedure is concerned, the issue of "permanent" has nothing to do with the sub-category "part time." A part-time employee, regardless of the nature of his employment is one who works less than 40 hours a week. His employment may be regular and recurring (in other words, permanent); it may be for a temporary period; or it may be intermittent in the sense of working only when called in, but it is still the kind of employment which is subject to the derived ceiling.

If persons seeking regular, permanent part-time jobs have been told that this is impossible because each such position must be charged against the full-time, permanent ceiling, they have been incorrectly advised. This Office, together with the Civil Service Commission, has strongly urged that Government agencies make employment available to women who can work only part time; to the physically handicapped, many of whom cannot work full time; to persons who want to work only part time because of their desire to continue their education; and to similar categories.

Returning again to the way in which you state your concern in the last two paragraphs of your letter of October 12, our regulations do not preclude splitting a full-time job into two half-time jobs. There can be circumstances, however, under which this requires a change in the total ceiling allowed—a change which would be almost automatically granted upon request.

In past years several women's professional groups have raised this issue on a theoretical basis, but we have never had specific factual information about any qualified woman who has been denied a position for this reason. If you have—or can obtain—such information in a specific case, we would like to have it and do something about it. Although we recognize that ceilings are somewhat arbitrary and cumbersome, we try to administer them in a way that permits or even encourages the kind of flexibility that results in improved efficiency and productivity. If executive agencies are not moving along similar lines, we will be happy to take up specific cases with the taxpayer can obtain the best value for each dollar spent.

In your conversation with Mr. Strauss, you asked for the language used in our standard letter in which ceilings are transmitted to the agencies. I attach the section of our Examiner's Handbook which gives the exact language as it was used in February 1970 for the ceilings as of June 30, 1970 and the preliminary ceilings of June 30, 1971. There is almost always some adjustment of the current year ceilings in the course of the review of the budget which takes place each fall.

Sincerely,

ROGER W. JONES,
Assistant Director.

Attachment.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable [Full name]
[Title]
Washington, D.C. [Zip Code]

DEAR MR. [Title]:

This letter formally conveys the results of the President's review of your 1971 budget submission, establishes revised 1970 ceilings for your department [agency], and discusses potential problems in connection with the Government-wide ceiling on 1970 outlays established by Public Law 91-47.

1971 BUDGET ALLOWANCES

The President has approved 1971 allowances for your department [agency], including both 1970 supplements and 1971 items proposed for separate transmittal, as shown on page[s] [show appropriate page numbers in Part 5 of the Budget] of the 1971 Budget.

[Insert here any separate policy determinations that the division believes should be included, such as notification of amounts for specific items that were included in budget allowances. Items that can be found in the printed schedules of the budget may be omitted or referenced as appropriate.]

[When exceptions to the provisions of circular No. A-22 have been requested with respect to prestige vehicles, use the applicable paragraph.]

Use if exception is authorized.

As an exception to Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-22, you are authorized [state the exception].

Use if exception is denied.

No exceptions to Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-22 are authorized.

EMPLOYMENT CEILINGS

The ceilings on civilian employment established by the President for your department [agency] are set forth below. The data reflect revised 1970 ceilings, and 1971 ceilings based on the allowances specified above.

These ceilings exclude disadvantaged summer and part-time youth and worker-trainees under the Public Service Careers program. (Instructions and limitations on such excluded employees will be issued by the Civil Service Commission.) Employment under items of pending or proposed legislation is included in the total ceiling figures and is listed separately; such employment will be considered part of your ceilings only if Congress enacts the proposed legislation and related funds are provided [available].

June 1970, revised, June 1971.

Total employment, excluding disadvantaged youth and Public Service Careers trainees.

Full-time employment in permanent positions, excluding Public Service Careers trainees.

Employment included above for items of pending or proposed legislation:

Total employment, excluding disadvantaged youth and Public Service Careers trainees.

Full-time employment in permanent positions, excluding Public Service Careers trainees.

These ceilings cover all employment in your department [agency], including any reimbursable arrangements [and allocations]. If reimbursements [and allocations] do not materialize as estimated, you should hold your employment down accordingly. If additional employment is needed because of unexpected growth in the volume of activities so financed, you should arrange with the other agency concerned to reduce its ceiling[s] by a number at least equal to the increase needed in your ceiling[s]. Requests for adjustments from both agencies should be submitted concurrently to the Bureau of the Budget for approval.

[Use heading and language below as applicable]

Adjustments for staff detailed to the White House

Use if appropriate to specify amounts of adjustment.

The 1971 Budget proposes that, beginning in fiscal year 1971, agency staff in White House positions are to be charged to the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation of the White House office. Accordingly, your 1971 allowances and employment ceilings have been reduced by \$----- and ----- employees for this reason.

Use if amounts of adjustment do not warrant identification.

The 1971 Budget proposes that, beginning in fiscal year 1971, agency staff in White House positions are to be charged to the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation of the White House office. Your 1971 allowance and employment ceilings have been appropriately adjusted for this change.

1970 OUTLAY CEILINGS

For 1970 the Government-wide ceiling on outlays established by Public Law 91-47 is legally controlling. Despite a concerted effort by the Administration to hold operations within the legal ceiling established by the Congress, it now appears—because of increases in uncontrollable items—that spending in 1970 will exceed that ceiling.

In the Budget Message, the President recommended amendment of the outlay limitation provisions of Public Law 91-47 to permit the limitation to be raised by the full amount of the growth in outlays for the designated uncontrollable programs, and to enlarge the ceiling sufficiently to permit prudent management of the Executive Branch without forcing crippling cuts in vital programs. However, in view of the uncertainty of congressional action on this recommendation, executive agencies must exercise more positive control of their outlays during the remainder of fiscal year 1970.

The 1970 outlay ceiling for your department [agency] is set forth in Attachment A. This ceiling supersedes and is to be substituted for that given to you in our letter of [date of earlier ceiling letter]. It agrees with amounts shown for your department [agency] in the 1970 column of the 1971 budget.

Use where applicable.

Since your 1970 appropriation[s] had not been enacted when the 1971 budget was prepared, adjustments may be necessary as a result of final congressional action. You will be advised of such adjustments as required.

ADMINISTRATION OF 1970 OUTLAY CEILING

It is imperative that your 1970 outlay ceiling be strictly observed over the remainder of fiscal year 1970. Your department's [agency's] operations must be adjusted to remain within the prescribed amounts. Further, you must recognize that your outlay ceiling, when added to those of other agencies, results in a Government-wide total that is in excess of the current statutory limitation. If *legislative relief*—such as the amendment proposed by the President—is not obtained, *drastic cutback action will later be required*.

It is readily apparent that, in the present situation, all executive agencies must cooperate fully with the Bureau of the Budget if the Administration is to keep abreast of the relationship of expected 1970 outlays to the Government-wide outlay ceiling imposed by Public Law 91-47. For this purpose, I am requesting each agency head to maintain an internal control system that will permit the submission—quickly and accurately—of current data on status and plans with respect to agency outlays. This action supplements the requirements established in paragraph 5 of Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 70-3 on "Control of outlays during fiscal year 1970."

This control system should be established in such a way that it will identify—on a current and up-to-date basis—the status of your financial situation in relation to amounts shown in Attachment A. The system should use as a base figure the April 15, 1969 outlay estimate for your agency; and should reflect the changes that have been made and will occur in relation to that base with respect to each of the control elements of the ceiling imposed by Public Law 91-47. These include changes in:

Uncontrollable items designated in the law.
Receipt items designated in the law.

Appropriation amounts resulting from congressional enactments.

Amounts allowed by Congress for proposed legislation which provides budget authority or requires subsequent 1970 appropriation.

Estimates that need to be recognized because of lack of congressional action.

Bureau of the Budget examiners will be glad to assist your staff in coordinating your base estimates with those we are using centrally. Following up on the provisions of Bureau of the Budget Bulletin 70-3, Bureau of the Budget staff will also periodically (1) contact individual agencies concerning explanations of status and possible ceiling revisions, or (2) request (on relatively short notice) status reports on the kinds of changes identified above, and agency plans for the remainder of fiscal year 1970. As part of such submissions, you may also be requested to furnish the basis for the estimates and re-estimates used for those items that are not yet firm or actual figures. Such information will be necessary for effective administration on a Government-wide basis.

Sincerely,

Director [for oral review agencies], or Deputy Director [for all other agencies].

ATTACHMENT A

1970 OUTLAY CEILING [NAME OF AGENCY]

Date _____

Amount (in thousands)

1. Federal funds.
 - a. Gross amounts.
 - b. Deductions: (proprietary receipts and inter-fund transactions).
 - c. Total, Federal funds.
2. Trust funds.
 - a. Gross amounts.
 - b. Deductions (proprietary receipts and inter-fund transactions).
 - c. Total, Trust funds.
3. Deduction for intragovernmental transactions.
4. Total, net outlays.

Separate Allowances and Determinations:
Divisions to use as appropriate.

- A. \$----- of the amount on line [1a] [2a] is for the following:
[List separately amounts allowed for (1) major relatively uncontrollable items (identifying specifically those designated in Public Law 91-47); (2) 1970 unabsorbed pay increases; and (3) special foreign currency programs.]

B. Line [1b] [2b] contemplates \$----- of offsetting receipts for the following:
[List separately significant amounts, specifically identifying those designated in Public Law 91-47.]

- C. \$----- of the amount on line [1a] [2a] is for the following:
[Specify separately the amount allowed for each item of proposed or pending legislation.]
- D. [Insert other special guidance as appropriate.]

OCTOBER 12, 1970.

Mr. ROGER W. JONES,
Assistant Director, Office of Management and
Budget, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: Many thanks for your letter of October 3, 1970, in response to my letter of September 10 to Gene Cowen.

I must say that your answer, while it reviews the general principles applicable to various departments of the Executive Branch, does not strike me as responsive to the central question raised in my original letter. As I understand your answer, the "ceilings" apply to "full time permanent positions only," but do not apply to "part time, temporary, or intermittent employment." But with respect to the latter, the context of your discussion suggests to me that *part time permanent* would be subject to the ceiling, and that the flexibility referred to in your letter really applies only to *part time temporary* employment. (Please correct me if I am wrong.)

My letter, on the other hand, was addressed to the problem of persons (principally women) seeking *part time permanent* employment, who have experienced negative reactions on the ground that the filling of two half time permanent positions would be charged against the ceiling to the same extent as the filling of two full time permanent positions. Either I am wrong in interpreting your rules and regulations, or at least various departments of the Executive Branch are wrong, because it is clear to me that there are departments of the Executive Branch which interpret your rules and regulations as I do.

Could you please clarify the matter, and if, in fact, your regulations do preclude the splitting of a full time job into two half time jobs, my Senator and I would like to know the reason why. We understand, of course, that the "ceiling" might be used in a given instance as a convenient way of not hiring someone who might otherwise not be hired in any event.

What we would like to know is whether these ceilings would preclude an agency from hiring two half time employees in lieu of one full time employee, if, in fact, the agency *wanted* to hire these two half-time employees but would do so only if the agency would not be charged against its ceiling with two full time jobs.

Many thanks for your cooperation.
Sincerely,

FRANK CUMMINGS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1970.

Mr. FRANK CUMMINGS,
Administrative Assistant to Senator Jacob K. Javits, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUMMINGS: Your letter of September 10, 1970, addressed to Mr. Eugene Cowen, on the subject of relaxing Federal employment ceilings with respect to part-time employees, has been referred to me for reply.

In order to fully respond to your suggestion, I should like to review some of our employment ceiling procedures and concerns.

Administrative employment ceilings are established each year during the President's annual budget review process. However, if unforeseen situations arise, agencies may appeal to this Office for relief at any time. Such requests are evaluated on the basis of demonstrated need of the requesting agency and are related to the needs of all other agencies and the total employment situation in the executive branch. On this basis relief is either granted, partially granted, or denied, and the agency concerned is notified accordingly.

The ceilings set by this Office for full-time, permanent employment and for total employment—the latter category includes part-time, temporary and intermittent employees—apply to June 30 of each year, thereby giving flexibility to agency heads. While this flexibility may not provide a wide latitude for full-time permanent employment, it does give agency heads unlimited flexibility with-

in the fiscal year for temporary employment. Further, it offers far more administrative latitude than the arbitrary month-to-month cutback formula under section 201 of Public Law 90-364 which was only repealed by the Congress in July 1969, after the President committed his Administration to exercise strict administrative controls over the level of Federal employment.

With respect to the setting of a ceiling "for other than full-time, permanent employment," the Bureau of the Budget in fiscal year 1967 placed ceilings on full-time, permanent positions only. The part-time, temporary, and intermittent employment (which was thus removed from the ceiling) expanded by 10 percent during this year, even though we believed such an increase would not be possible under our control of the dollar expenditures for personnel compensation. We are strongly of the view that since significant seasonal variations are common for this type of employment, the fact that ceilings apply to June 30 provides substantial flexibility to agency heads for this category of employment during the remainder of the year.

Our experience indicates that the public at large, Members of Congress, and most Presidents (all with prior Senate experience since World War II) have taken the position that Federal employment is excessive, and that ceilings, in addition to budget dollars, are necessary and should be used to restrain further growth. As you probably know, monthly reports on Federal employment are made public by both the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Federal Expenditures and the Civil Service Commission. Public and Congressional attention focuses on the total Federal employment in terms of how many are actually on the Federal payrolls and reported in the statistics just mentioned.

It has been our observation, based on experience in several Administrations, and on requested increases by Federal agencies that, in the absence of ceilings, employment would increase at a faster rate than the President or the Congress would find acceptable. Also, it seems evident that dollar limitations alone would not keep employment from increasing year after year. There have been occasions, for example, when the filling of vacancies was deliberately delayed by agencies in order to use funds late in the fiscal year to fill a greater number of positions, which in turn were annualized in the following year's budget.

Nevertheless, if concrete plans are developed and an agency can demonstrate the need, we will be glad to entertain specific proposals for the reduction of full-time, permanent and the increase of part-time positions in a ratio that seems reasonable under the circumstances.

I would just like to add one other thought. On occasion agency interviewers of prospective employees have been known to use employment ceilings as a convenient excuse to turn down job applicants who do not fully meet qualifications, agency work schedules, or who want part-time work. I trust that this is not the case in the situations you have in mind.

Since repeal of the statutory employment restrictions of Public Law 90-364, this Office has not received agency requests for employment ceiling relief for the reasons stated in your letter.

I hope that this reply has been informative and helpful.

Sincerely,

ROGER W. JONES,
Assistant Director.

SEPTEMBER 10, 1970.

HON. EUGENE COWEN,
Special Assistant to the President, The
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENE: As you know, various Government agencies operate under a "freeze"

or "job limit" as to hiring additional personnel.

It has come to my Senator's attention that, when an agency or department is not permitted to hire more than a set number of employees, this limit may operate to the disadvantage of applicants, particularly women, who would be interested in part-time employment. Evidently the departments and agencies are not permitted to take a full-time job which could be filled under the limit and divide it into two half-time jobs, without being charged with "two jobs."

As you no doubt are aware, there is an enormous reserve of unused skilled talent among married women, particularly those with children. Many such women could and would work, if only they could find jobs which were about 40-60% full-time, thus enabling them to work, for example, from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., and then get home when the kids return from school. But if an agency or department will have to charge two half-time jobs as the equivalent of two full-time jobs of "freezes" or "ceilings", the chances of such part-time employment will be (as they now are) just about nil.

My Senator is interested in exploring the possibility of a change, either in the law or in existing regulations, to permit such half-time jobs to be charged "two for one" against any hiring limits.

Could you let me know whether this would be feasible, what the problems are, or at least to whom I should speak to get details?

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

FRANK CUMMINGS,
Administrative Assistant to Senator
Javits.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1350, H.R. 18515.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

THE ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 18515) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

RECESS

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is the understanding of the leadership that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) will make his comments and presentations to the Senate beginning at the hour of 2 o'clock.

Therefore, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 p.m.

The Senate reconvened at 2 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KENNEDY).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 703) for the relief

of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2108. An act to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

S. 2543. An act to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4463. An act for the relief of Francis X. Tuson;

H.R. 4665. An act for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose;

H.R. 6100. An act for the relief of Hershel Smith, publisher of the Lindsay News, of Lindsay, Okla.;

H.R. 12958. An act for the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corp.;

H.R. 12962. An act for the relief of Maureen O'Leary Pimpire;

H.R. 13182. An act for the relief of Frank E. Dart;

H.R. 15270. An act for the relief of Thaddeus J. Pawlak;

H.R. 15272. An act for the relief of David L. Kennison;

H.R. 15505. An act for the relief of Jack B. Smith and Charles N. Martin, Jr.; and

H.R. 16965. An act for the relief of Richard N. Stanford.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

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

S. 882. An act for the relief of Capt. William O. Hanle;

S. 902. An act to amend section 1162 of title 18, United States Code, relating to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Donal E. McGonegal;

S. 2455. An act to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 3620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anastasia Pertsowitch;

S. 3853. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pang Tai Tai;

S. 3858. An act for the relief of Bruce M. Smith; and

H.R. 13978. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize marketing research and promotion projects including paid advertising for almonds.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 4463. An act for the relief of Francis X. Tuson;

H.R. 4665. An act for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose;

H.R. 6100. An act for the relief of Hershel Smith, publisher of the Lindsay News, of Lindsay, Okla.;

H.R. 12958. An act for the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corp.;

H.R. 12962. An act for the relief of Maureen O'Leary Pimpire;

H.R. 13182. An act for the relief of Frank E. Dart;

H.R. 15270. An act for the relief of Thaddeus J. Pawlak;

H.R. 15272. An act for the relief of David L. Kennison;

H.R. 15505. An act for the relief of Jack B. Smith and Charles N. Martin, Jr.; and

H.R. 16965. An act for the relief of Richard N. Stanford.

further, That this appropriation shall not be available for contracts made under title I of the Economic Opportunity Act extending for more than twenty-four months: *Provided further*, That all grants agreements shall provide that the General Accounting Office shall have access to the records of the grantee which bear exclusively upon the Federal grant: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, as authorized by section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and for the purchase of real property for training centers."

On page 3, line 13, after "\$42,165,000", insert a comma and "to remain available until June 30, 1972".

On page 7, line 14, strike out "\$16,500,000" and insert "\$16,700,000".

On page 7, line 21, after the word "rendered", strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$45,531,000"; and, in line 24, after the word "which", strike out "\$27,953,000" and insert "\$28,159,000".

On page 10, line 10, after the word "and", strike out "\$614,000" and insert "\$674,000"; and, in line 12, after "(63 Stat. 409)", strike out "\$9,752,000" and insert "\$9,812,000".

On page 12, at the beginning of line 8, strike out "\$106,003,000" and insert "\$110,503,000"; and, in the same line, after the word "which", strike out "\$27,900,000" and insert "\$28,900,000".

On page 12, line 20, after "(42 U.S.C. 3251 et seq.)", insert a comma and "and under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969"; and, in line 22, after the word "aircraft", strike out "\$52,580,000" and insert "\$62,000,000".

On page 13, line 8, after "(Public 89-793)", strike out "\$368,516,000" and insert "\$390,516,000".

On page 14, line 8, after the word "Act", strike out "\$247,178,000" and insert "\$250,000,000".

On page 14, line 19, after the word "Act", strike out "\$255,339,000" and insert "\$255,659,000".

On page 15, line 8, after the word "Act", strike out "\$96,502,000" and insert "\$115,000,000"; in line 9, after the word "which", strike out "\$79,500,000" and insert "\$97,998,000"; and, in line 11, after "title IX", insert a colon and "Provided, That of the amount appropriated \$6,000,000 shall be available for research and demonstration projects on early care for suspected coronary patients."

On page 16, line 2, after the word "aircraft", strike out "\$41,938,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 16, line 10, after "(42 U.S.C. 2681-2687)", strike out "\$181,521,000" and insert "\$196,521,000"; and, in line 17, after the word "Act", insert a colon and "Provided, That there remain available until expended \$5,000,000 for grants and \$10,000,000 for loans for nonprofit private facilities pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457): Provided further, That the Secretary is authorized to issue commitments for direct loans to public agencies in accordance with section 627 of the Public Health Service Act which shall constitute contractual obligations of the United States, the total of such outstanding commitments not to exceed \$30,000,000 at any given time; to sell obligations received pursuant to such commitments as provided in section 627, and the proceeds of any such sale shall be used to make a direct loan pursuant to the outstanding commitment under which the obligations were received."

On page 17, after line 5, insert:

"For an additional amount for grants or loans pursuant to section 601(b) of the Public Health Service Act, for such hospitals and related facilities as are specified for this purpose in the report of the Sen-

ate Appropriations Committee, \$8,703,078; to be made without regard to the allotments and priority provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act."

On page 19, line 3 after the word "Act", strike out "\$227,383,000" and insert \$235,-383,000".

On page 19, line 8, after the word "Act", strike out "\$178,479,000" and insert "\$203,-479,000".

On page 19, line 12, strike out "\$35,257,000" and insert "\$36,257,000".

On page 19, line 17, after the word "diseases", strike out "\$138,339,000" and insert "\$140,339,000".

On page 20, line 2, strike out "\$100,807,000" and insert "\$115,807,000".

On page 20, line 7, after the word "diseases", strike out "\$102,249,000" and insert "\$102,749,000".

On page 20, line 15, strike out "\$166,-072,000" and insert "\$171,072,000".

On page 21, line 5, after the word "sciences", strike out "\$20,620,000" and insert "\$21,620,000".

On page 21, line 16, after the word "Act", strike out "\$260,934,000" and insert \$295,-000,000".

On page 22, line 9, after the word "Act", strike out "\$10,954,000" and insert "\$11,014,000".

On page 22, line 15, after the word "resources", strike out "\$66,201,000" and insert "\$66,801,000".

On page 22, line 20, after the word "facilities", strike out "\$126,100,000" and insert "\$150,000,000".

On page 23, line 5, after the word "Act", strike out "\$19,769,000" and insert "\$22,-233,000".

On page 25, after line 15, insert:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

"For an additional amount to carry out the Follow Through program, as authorized under section 222(a)(2) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, \$70,400,000."

On page 27, line 12, strike out "\$120,000,-000" and insert "\$98,000,000".

On page 27, line 17, after the word "Act", strike out "\$566,640,000" and insert "\$575,-640,000"; in line 22, after the word "and", strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$13,215,-000"; in the same line, after the word "for", strike out "construction"; and, in line 24, after "June 30", strike out "1972" and insert "1973".

On page 28, line 21, after the word "Aging", strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$34,000,-000".

On page 29, line 9, after "(74 Stat. 364)", strike out "\$75,435,000" and insert "\$77,-435,000".

On page 29, line 25, after the word "Service", strike out "\$35,067,000" and insert "\$33,000,000".

On page 32, line 4, after "(20 U.S.C. 101-105)", strike out "\$1,557,000" and insert "\$1,517,000".

On page 32, line 18, after "(68 Stat. 265)", strike out "\$6,870,000" and insert "\$7,225,-000"; and, in line 20, after the word "expended", insert "and \$128,000 shall be for carrying out an adult education program".

On page 33, after line 9, insert:

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

"For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, section 426 of the Social Security Act of April 9, 1912 (42 U.S.C. 191), and for partial support of a White House Conference on Children and Youth, and for the conduct of the Project Headstart program under section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, \$346,417,000, of which \$399,000,-000 is for Project Headstart."

On page 33, at the beginning of line 21, strike out "\$7,927,000, together with not to exceed \$947,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1)

of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein" and insert "\$8,874,000".

At the top of page 34, strike out:

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

"For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, section 426 of the Social Security Act and the Act of April 9, 1912 (42 U.S.C. 191), and for partial support of a White House Conference on Children and Youth, \$5,917,000."

On page 36, line 9, after the word "University", insert a comma and "the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf".

On page 38, after line 11, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 208. None of the funds contained in this title may be used for payments to any State for fiscal year 1971 for services, staff training, and administrative expenses under titles I, IV (part A), X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act which, in the aggregate, exceed 115 percent of the aggregate amount estimated for these purposes for such State for fiscal year 1970."

On page 38, at the beginning of line 19, change the section number from "208" to "209".

On page 41, line 26, after the word "amended", strike out "\$2,046,200,000" and insert "\$894,400,000"; and, on page 42, line 9, after "1964", insert "and for the purchase of real property for training centers".

On page 43, after line 17, insert:

PAYMENT TO THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

"To enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as authorized by section 396(k)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for expenses of the Corporation, \$22,500,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in addition, there is appropriated in accordance with the authorization contained in section 396(k)(2) of such Act, to remain available until expended, amounts equal to the amount of total grants, donations, requests, or other contributions (including money and the fair market value of any property) from non-Federal sources received by the Corporation during the current fiscal year, but not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000."

On page 44, after line 7, insert:

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

"For necessary expenses of the National Credit Union Administration, with respect to consumer credit training, as authorized by section 21(f)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1766), \$500,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have a general statement on this very important bill—the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the ranking minority member, also has a statement—which I should like to present to the Senate at this time. It is my understanding and his understanding, too, with the leadership, that we will present our general statements today and that there will be no votes on any amendments until an appropriate time tomorrow, either before the agricultural conference report or immediately thereafter.

Mr. President, the Labor-HEW bill, H.R. 18515, as reported to the Senate, provides a total amount of \$19,070,-964,078.

It is to be understood that this year's HEW appropriations, on the education appropriation section of the bill, that the House made it a separate item and we took it up some months ago as a

separate item. The President vetoed that bill and then the Senate and the House proceeded to override the veto. Thus, we are dealing here with all the appropriations involving Labor and HEW with the exception of the Office of Education portion.

As I mentioned, the bill totals \$19,-070,964,078.

This is an increase over 1970 of \$2,-568,293,048, an increase over the President's recommendations of \$311,587,078, and an increase over the House allowance of \$246,301,078.

Before I turn to an explanation covering the highlights of the bill and the reasons for the committee action in providing some increases in the Nation's health care, and a stronger commitment in helping our poor escape poverty, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a summary table showing all of the action to this point on well over 100 line items in this major money bill.

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

MAJOR INCREASES OVER THE HOUSE ALLOWANCE RECOMMENDED IN H.R. 18515 BY THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Department of Labor, \$991,000: Mostly in wage and labor standards; to fund a new program of jobs for returning veterans; and to promote employment of the handicapped.

Environmental Health Service, \$13,920,000: For programs under the Clear Air Act \$4.5; occupational health \$5; solid waste management and water hygiene \$4.3.

Mental Health, \$22,000,000: \$20 million for additional staffing of community mental health centers; \$2 million for State hospital staff improvement programs.

Comprehensive Health Planning and Services, \$2,822,000: To improve migrant health services.

Maternal and child health, \$320,000: To expand dental care program for children.

Regional medical programs, \$18,498,000: To more adequately support emergency cardio-respiratory mobile care units; kidney treatment centers; and cancer treatment centers.

Communicable diseases, \$8,062,000: For state and local immunization programs in diphtheria, measles, polio and venereal diseases.

Medical facilities construction, \$23,703,-078: To meet special Hill-Burton needs of 35 projects in nine states and allow scheduled improvements in D.C. hospital program.

National Institutes of Health, \$118,590,-000: For medical research and treatment centers of the 11 Institutes \$57.5 million, especially in heart, stroke, cancer, spinal cord, and blood diseases; \$23 million for construction of health education facilities; \$2.4 million for the National Library of Medicine Biomedical communications programs; health manpower \$34 million with \$18 for institutional support and \$18 in student loan programs.

Rehabilitation Services and Facilities, \$19,000,000: Services for mentally retarded \$12; rehabilitation services for migrants \$5 million; and income maintenance experiments \$2 million.

Gallaudet College, \$355,000: Restore cut in academic program and initiate an adult education program.

Office of Child Development, \$19,200,000: For Headstart and research and demonstration projects. Net increase over House allowance \$246,301,078. Net increase over President's request \$311,587,078.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1970 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1971
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of definite appropriations unless otherwise indicated]

Appropriation/activity	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹ after 2 percent reduction	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	Senate bill compared with—								
						(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)					
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION														
Manpower Training Activities														
Training and allowance payments:														
Job opportunities in the business sector/														
on-the-job training	\$229,608,000	\$229,608,000	\$260,000,000	\$260,000,000	\$260,000,000	+\$30,392,000								
Concentrated employment program	199,000,000	199,000,000	199,000,000	192,440,000	192,440,000	−6,560,000	−\$6,560,000							
Public service careers	96,000,000	96,000,000	132,000,000	126,800,000	126,800,000	+30,800,000	−5,200,000							
Institutional training	245,000,000	245,000,000	256,000,000	256,000,000	256,000,000	+11,000,000								
Part-time and other training	10,084,000	10,084,000	10,084,000	10,084,000	10,084,000									
Disadvantaged youth program	76,400,000	76,400,000				−76,400,000								
In-school	62,400,000	62,400,000	62,400,000	59,100,000	59,100,000	−3,300,000								
Summer programs	121,500,000	121,500,000	146,500,000	138,670,000	138,670,000	+17,170,000	−7,830,000							
Out of school	98,000,000	98,000,000	134,200,000	127,000,000	127,000,000	−29,000,000	−7,200,000							
Job Corps	170,200,000	170,200,000	180,000,000	170,390,000	170,390,000	+190,000	−9,610,000							
Operation Mainstream	41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	38,800,000	38,800,000	−2,200,000								
Program support	17,400,000	17,400,000	18,300,000	18,300,000	18,300,000	+900,000								
Program services:														
Employment security services	44,892,400	44,892,400	50,492,000	50,492,000	50,492,000	+5,599,600								
State institutional training services	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000		−1,000,000							
On-the-job-training services	1,500,000	1,500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	+820,000	−3,000,000							
Planning and technical assistance	18,109,000	18,109,000	21,929,000	18,929,000	18,929,000									
Labor market information and job matching	15,934,000	15,934,000	29,089,000	29,089,000	29,089,000	+13,155,000								
Jobs for Veterans					200,000	+200,000	+200,000	+200,000	+200,000					
Total, manpower training activities	*1,455,027,400	*1,455,027,400	*1,549,494,000	1,504,594,000	1,504,794,000	+49,766,600	−44,700,000							
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES														
Experimental, demonstration, and research programs														
Planning, research, and evaluation	19,709,000	19,709,000	20,618,000	19,768,000	19,768,000	+59,000	−850,000							
Training and employment	3,896,900	3,896,900	4,232,700	4,141,400	4,141,400	+244,500	−91,300							
Trust fund transfer	6,397,900	6,397,900	7,878,800	7,504,900	7,504,900	+1,107,000	−373,900							
Federal institutional training service	(11,852,700)	(11,852,700)	(12,033,600)	(12,033,600)	(12,033,600)	(+180,900)								
Civil rights compliance	2,572,600	2,572,600	2,572,600	2,572,600	2,572,600									
Trust fund transfer	(617,000)	(617,000)	(628,700)	(628,700)	(628,700)	(+11,700)								
Executive direction:														
General administration	1,623,300	1,623,300	1,695,000	1,676,200	1,676,200	+52,900	−18,800							
Trust fund transfer	(373,300)	(373,300)	(373,100)	(378,100)	(378,100)	(+4,800)								
Financial and management services	2,811,600	2,811,600	3,039,500	2,913,500	2,913,500	+101,900	−126,000							
Trust fund transfer	(2,241,200)	(2,241,200)	(2,277,600)	(2,277,600)	(2,277,600)	(+36,400)								
Manpower management data systems	3,007,600	3,007,600	3,040,200	3,040,200	3,040,200	+32,600								
Trust fund transfer	(1,496,200)	(1,496,200)	(1,517,000)	(1,517,000)	(1,517,000)	(+20,800)								
Reports to the public on manpower programs	619,700	619,700	494,200	494,200	494,200	−125,500								
Total, Manpower Administration, salaries and expenses	40,638,000	40,638,600	43,667,000	42,165,000	42,165,000	+1,526,400	−1,502,000							
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training														
Promote apprenticeship and training	6,872,498	6,872,498	6,958,000	6,958,000	6,958,000	+85,502								
Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees and Ex-Servicemen and Trade Adjustment Activities														
Payments to Federal employees	63,600,000	63,600,000	68,500,000	68,500,000	68,500,000	+4,900,000								
Payments to ex-servicemen	121,400,000	121,400,000	131,000,000	131,000,000	131,000,000	+9,600,000								
Trade adjustment activities	2,930,000	2,930,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	−2,330,000								
Total, unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen and trade adjustment activities	187,930,000	187,930,000	200,100,000	200,100,000	200,100,000	+12,170,000								
Limitation on Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration														
Unemployment Insurance service	(284,033,000)	(284,033,000)	(320,031,000)	(312,831,000)	(312,831,000)	(+28,798,000)	(−7,200,000)							
Employment service	(328,968,000)	(328,968,000)	(352,141,000)	(347,341,000)	(347,341,000)									
Administration and management	(39,771,000)	(39,771,000)	(42,528,000)	(42,528,000)	(42,528,000)									
Contingency Fund	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(+2,000,000)	(+12,000,000)							
Total, limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and Employment Service Administration	(665,772,000)	(665,772,000)	(717,700,000)	(717,700,000)	(717,700,000)	(+51,928,000)								
Unemployment Insurance Service														
Unemployment insurance service	(4,210,000)	(4,210,600)	(4,274,000)	(4,274,000)	(4,274,000)	(+63,400)								
Total, Manpower Administration	1,690,468,498	1,690,468,498	1,800,219,000	1,753,817,000	1,754,017,000	+63,548,502	−46,202,000	+200,000						

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1970 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1971—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of definite appropriations unless otherwise indicated.]

Appropriation/activity	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹ after 2 percent reduction	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	Senate bill compared with—			
						(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
LABOR-MANAGEMENT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION									
Labor-management relations services	\$397,400	\$397,400	\$402,200	\$402,200	\$402,200	+\$4,800			
Labor-management policy development	658,200	658,200	1,265,400	965,400	1,065,400	+407,200	-\$200,000	+\$100,000	
Administration of reporting and disclosure laws	9,331,700	9,331,700	10,747,092	10,378,092	10,478,092	+1,146,392	-269,000	+100,000	
Veterans' reemployment rights	1,290,108	1,290,108	1,511,508	1,511,508	1,511,508	+221,400			
Federal labor-management relations	750,000	750,000	2,517,500	2,517,500	2,517,500	+1,767,500			
Executive direction and administrative services	710,200	710,200	725,300	725,300	725,300	+15,000			
Total, Labor-Management Services Administration	13,137,608	13,137,608	17,169,000	16,500,000	16,700,000	+3,562,392	-469,000	+200,000	
WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION									
Improving and protecting wages of the Nation's workers:									
Compliance and enforcement	21,862,038	21,862,038	22,364,900	22,364,900	22,570,900	+708,862	+206,000	+206,000	
Wage and employment standards	803,400	803,400	814,000	814,000	814,000	+10,600			
Special wage standards	1,771,200	1,771,200	1,790,100	1,790,100	1,790,100	+18,900			
Executive direction and planning research	2,946,600	2,946,600	2,984,000	2,984,000	2,984,000	+37,400			
Wage determinations under Davis-Bacon Act.	951,700	951,700	1,523,000	1,276,400	1,276,400	+324,700	-246,600		
Improving safety and working conditions of workers	5,453,894	5,453,894	5,901,900	5,370,900	5,695,900	+242,006	-206,000	+325,000	
Advancing opportunities and status of women	1,057,800	1,057,800	1,179,800	1,179,800	1,179,800	+122,000			
Federal contract compliance:									
Federal contract compliance	605,000	605,000	1,568,300	1,568,300	1,568,300	+963,300			
Plans for progress	227,000	227,000	227,000			-227,000			
Workmen's compensation	6,255,500	6,255,500	7,369,400	7,369,400	7,369,400	+1,113,900			
Executive direction, planning, evaluation, and research	277,438	277,438	429,600	282,200	282,200	+4,762	-147,400		
Total, Wage and Labor Standards Administration	42,211,570	42,211,570	45,925,000	45,000,000	45,531,000	+3,319,430	-394,000	+531,000	
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES									
Federal civilian employees benefits	45,943,500	45,943,500	95,627,200	95,627,200	95,627,200	+49,683,700			
Armed Forces reservists benefits	11,175,000	11,175,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	-400,000			
War Claims Act benefits	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000				
Other benefits	2,597,500	2,597,500	2,997,800	2,997,800	2,997,800	+400,300			
Total employees' compensation claims and expenses	60,116,000	60,116,000	109,800,000	109,800,000	109,800,000	+49,684,000			
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS									
Manpower and employment	9,371,900	9,371,900	10,170,300	9,770,300	9,770,300	+398,400	-400,000		
Prices and cost of living	3,801,300	3,801,300	4,556,100	4,086,100	4,086,100	+284,800	-470,000		
Wages and industrial relations	3,765,300	3,765,300	4,293,200	3,935,200	3,935,200	+169,900	-358,000		
Productivity, technology, and growth	1,498,600	1,498,600	1,522,600	1,522,600	1,522,600	+24,000			
Foreign labor and trade	519,400	519,400	529,900	529,900	529,900	+10,500			
Executive direction and staff services	4,492,954	4,492,954	4,990,400	4,790,400	4,790,400	+297,446	-200,000		
Revision of the Consumer Price Index	644,000	644,000	1,515,500	1,515,500	1,515,500	+871,500			
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	24,093,454	24,093,454	27,578,000	26,150,000	26,150,000	+2,056,546	-1,428,000		
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS									
International organizations affairs	151,700	151,700	154,300	154,300	154,300	+2,600			
Foreign labor and manpower policy and program development	330,000	330,000	335,300	335,300	335,300	+5,300			
Labor and manpower technical services	153,200	153,200	156,500	156,500	156,500	+3,300			
Trade negotiations and economic policy development	390,500	390,500	398,000	398,000	398,000	+7,500			
Executive direction and management services	436,600	436,600	445,900	445,900	445,900	+9,300			
Total, Bureau of International Labor Affairs	1,462,000	1,462,000	1,490,000	1,490,000	1,490,000	+28,000			
SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY									
Special Foreign Currency			75,000	75,000	75,000	+75,000			
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR									
Litigation	684,700	684,700	771,100	771,100	771,100	+86,400			
Interpretations and options	606,400	606,400	615,300	615,300	615,300	+8,900			
Trust fund transfer	(157,000)	(157,000)	(157,000)	(157,000)	(157,000)				
Labor relations and civil rights	359,100	359,100	361,400	361,400	361,400	+2,300			
Legislation	593,200	593,200	597,400	597,400	597,400	+4,200			
Labor-management laws	391,200	391,200	399,200	399,200	399,200	+8,000			
Field legal services	2,658,600	2,658,600	2,714,400	2,714,400	2,714,400	+55,800			
Total, Office of the Solicitor	5,721,300	5,721,300	5,884,000	5,884,000	5,884,000	+162,700			

Appropriation/activity	(1)	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹ after 2 percent reduction	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	Senate bill compared with—		
							(7)	(8)	(9)
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY									
Executive direction	\$1,125,700	\$1,125,700	\$2,456,400	\$1,806,400	\$1,806,400	+\$680,700	-\$650,000		
Office of information	381,400	381,400	326,600	326,600		-54,800			
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration:									
Immediate office	147,200	147,200	147,600	147,600	147,600		+400		
Office of Management Assistance	112,200	112,200	113,300	113,300	113,300		+1,100		
Personnel operations	1,510,300	1,510,300	1,448,600	1,448,600	1,448,600		-61,700		
Library	413,600	413,600	418,500	418,500	418,500		+4,900		
Office of Budget Policy and Review	208,300	208,300	310,600	310,600	310,600		+102,300		
Office of Program Review and Audit	1,564,200	1,564,200	1,923,600	1,923,600	1,923,600		+359,400		
Trust fund transfer	(593,000)	(593,000)	(595,000)	(595,000)	(595,000)		(+2,000)		
Office of Management Systems	582,400	582,400	537,000	537,000	537,000		+8,600		
Purchase of data processing equipment			1,931,000	1,931,000	1,931,000		+1,931,000		
Appeals from determinations of Federal employee claims	173,300	173,300	174,800	174,800	174,800		+1,500		
Promoting employment of the handicapped	575,000	575,000	614,000	614,000	674,000		+99,000	+60,000	+60,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	6,739,600	6,739,600	10,402,000	9,752,000	9,812,000	+3,072,400	-590,000	+60,000	
Total appropriations, Department of Labor	1,843,950,030	1,843,950,030	2,018,542,000	1,968,468,000	1,969,459,000	+125,508,970	-49,083,000	+991,000	

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION									
Food and Drug Control									
1. Food and drugs	\$58,152,500	\$58,152,500	\$62,725,000	\$62,725,000	\$62,725,000	+\$4,572,500			
2. Hazardous products	4,355,000	4,355,000	5,144,000	5,144,000	5,144,000	+789,000			
3. Pesticides	12,544,000	12,544,000	14,938,000	14,938,000	14,938,000	+2,394,000			
4. Program management	6,566,000	6,566,000	6,742,000	6,742,000	6,742,000	+176,000			
Total, FDA	81,617,500	81,617,500	89,549,000	89,549,000	89,549,000	+7,931,500			
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE									
Air pollution control:									
1. Abatement and control	35,914,000	35,194,000	40,301,000	40,301,000	42,801,000	+7,607,000	+\$2,500,000	+\$2,500,000	
2. Research and demonstration (Sec. 104 research) (Obligations)	66,419,000	59,669,000	57,282,000	57,282,000	58,282,000	-1,387,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000	
3. Manpower training	(45,000,000)	(38,250,000)	(27,900,000)	(27,900,000)	(28,900,000)	(-9,350,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	
4. Program management	(37,880,000)	(37,880,000)	(33,915,000)	(33,915,000)	(34,915,000)	(-2,965,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	
Total	109,782,000	103,032,000	106,003,000	106,003,000	110,503,000	+7,471,000	+4,500,000	+4,500,000	
Environmental control									
1. Solid waste management	15,275,000	15,275,000	15,336,000	17,136,000	19,276,000	+4,001,000	+3,940,000	+2,140,000	
2. Occupational health	10,353,000	10,353,000	13,423,000	8,283,000	13,423,000	+3,070,000		+5,140,000	
3. Radiological health	16,639,000	16,639,000	16,862,000	16,862,000	16,862,000	+223,000			
4. Community environmental management	5,872,000	5,872,000	4,712,000	4,712,000	4,712,000	-1,160,000			
5. Water hygiene	2,701,000	2,701,000	2,344,000	2,344,000	4,484,000	+1,783,000	+2,140,000	+2,140,000	
6. Program management	3,237,000	3,237,000	3,243,000	3,243,000	3,243,000	+6,000			
Total	54,077,000	54,077,000	55,920,000	52,580,000	62,000,000	+7,923,000	+6,080,000	+9,420,000	
Buildings and facilities									
(Obligations)	(4,844,000)	(5,861,000)	(21,750,000)	(21,750,000)	(21,750,000)	(+15,889,000)			
Office of the Administrator	4,078,000	4,078,000	4,775,000	4,244,000	4,244,000	166,000	-531,000		
Total Environmental Health Service	167,937,000	161,187,000	166,698,000	162,827,000	176,747,000	+15,560,000	+10,049,000	+13,920,000	
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION									
1. Research:									
(a) Grants	85,254,000	85,254,000	87,740,000	89,600,000	91,600,000	+6,346,000	+3,860,000	+2,000,000	
(b) Direct operations	25,952,000	25,952,000	26,389,000	26,389,000	26,389,000	+437,000			
Subtotal	111,206,000	111,206,000	114,129,000	115,989,000	117,989,000	+6,783,000	+3,860,000	+2,000,000	
2. Manpower development:									
(a) Grants	118,366,000	118,366,000	116,350,000	116,350,000	116,350,000	-2,016,000			
(b) Direct operations	5,603,000	5,603,000	5,671,000	5,671,000	5,671,000	+68,000			
Subtotal	123,969,000	123,969,000	122,021,000	122,021,000	122,021,000	-1,948,000			
3. State and community programs:									
(a) Community mental health centers:									
(1) Construction (Obligations)	35,500,000	29,200,000	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	-29,200,000			
(2) Staffing	47,550,000	47,550,000	60,100,000	80,100,000	100,000,000	+52,550,000	+40,000,000	20,000,000	
(b) Narcotic addiction and alcoholism programs:	12,000,000	11,175,000	15,900,000	11,900,000	15,900,000	+4,725,000			
(c) Direct operations	2,453,000	2,453,000	2,499,000	2,499,000	2,499,000	+46,000			
Subtotal	97,503,000	90,378,000	78,499,000	98,499,000	118,499,000	+28,121,000	+40,000,000	+20,000,000	
4. Rehabilitation of drug abusers	16,619,000	16,619,000	19,640,000	19,640,000	19,640,000	+3,021,000			
5. Program support	11,384,000	11,384,000	12,367,000	12,367,000	12,367,000	+983,000			
Total	360,681,000	353,556,000	346,656,000	368,516,000	390,516,000	+36,960,000	+43,860,000	+22,000,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1970 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1971—Continued

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

(Note—All amounts are in the form of definite appropriations unless otherwise indicated)

Appropriation/activity	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹ after 2 percent reduction	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	Senate bill compared with—			
						(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—Continued									
Saint Elizabeths Hospital Obligations	\$14,212,000	\$14,212,000	\$14,823,000	\$14,823,000	\$14,823,000	+\$611,000			
Health Services Research and Development	(41,428,000)	(41,428,000)	(42,077,000)	(42,077,000)	(42,077,000)	+649,000			
Comprehensive Health Planning and Services	42,653,000	42,474,000	57,403,000	57,403,000	57,403,000	+14,929,000			
1. Partnership for health grants:									
(a) Planning	20,000,000	19,008,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	+2,992,000			
(b) Formula	100,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000				
(c) Project	73,843,000	73,596,000	109,500,000	109,500,000	109,500,000	+35,904,000			
Subtotal	193,843,000	182,604,000	221,500,000	221,500,000	221,500,000	+38,896,000			
2. Migrant health	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	17,822,000	+2,822,000	+2,822,000	+2,822,000	+2,822,000
3. Standard setting and resource development	10,252,000	10,252,000	10,434,000	10,434,000	10,434,000	+182,000			
4. Program management	4,380,000	4,380,000	4,564,000	4,564,000	4,564,000	+184,000			
Total	223,475,000	212,236,000	251,498,000	251,498,000	254,320,000	+42,084,000	+2,822,000	+2,822,000	+2,822,000
Less trust fund transfer	—4,320,000	—4,320,000	—4,320,000	—4,320,000	—4,320,000				
Total appropriation	219,155,000	207,916,000	247,178,000	247,178,000	250,000,000	+42,084,000	+2,822,000	+2,822,000	+2,822,000
Maternal and Child Health									
1. Maternal and child health:									
(a) Formula grants	108,000,000	108,000,000	118,600,000	118,600,000	118,600,000	+10,600,000			
(b) Project grants	77,869,000	75,825,000	83,030,000	83,030,000	83,350,000	+7,525,000	+320,000	+320,000	+320,000
(c) Research and training	17,085,000	14,885,000	17,085,000	17,085,000	17,085,000		+2,200,000		
(d) Program management	3,071,000	3,071,000	3,109,000	3,109,000	3,109,000	+38,000			
Subtotal	206,025,000	201,781,000	221,824,000	221,824,000	222,144,000	+20,363,000	+320,000	+320,000	+320,000
2. Family planning:									
(a) Grants and contracts	22,800,000	22,800,000	32,015,000	32,015,000	32,015,000	+9,215,000			
(b) Program management			1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	+1,500,000			
Subtotal	22,800,000	22,800,000	33,515,000	33,515,000	33,515,000	+10,715,000			
Total	228,825,000	224,581,000	255,339,000	255,339,000	255,659,000	+31,078,000	+320,000	+320,000	+320,000
Regional Medical Programs									
1. Regional medical programs:									
(a) Grants	73,500,000	73,500,000	79,500,000	79,500,000	97,998,000	+24,498,000	+18,498,000	+18,498,000	+18,498,000
(b) Obligations	(73,500,000)	(78,500,000)	(94,500,000)	(94,500,000)	(112,998,000)	(+34,498,000)	(+18,498,000)	(+18,498,000)	(+18,498,000)
(c) Direct operations	1,771,000	1,771,000	1,812,000	1,812,000	1,812,000	+41,000			
Subtotal	75,271,000	75,271,000	81,312,000	81,312,000	99,810,000	+24,539,000	+18,498,000	+18,498,000	+18,498,000
2. Technical assistance and disease control	20,930,000	18,287,000	13,168,000	13,168,000	13,168,000	-5,119,000			
3. Program management	1,947,000	1,947,000	2,022,000	2,022,000	2,022,000	+75,000			
Total	98,148,000	95,505,000	96,504,000	96,502,000	115,000,000	+19,495,000	+18,498,000	+18,498,000	+18,498,000
Communicable Diseases	41,301,000	41,301,000	41,538,000	41,938,000	50,000,000	+8,699,000	+8,462,000	+8,062,000	+8,062,000
Medical Facilities Construction									
1. Construction grants	172,200,000	172,200,000	50,000,000	172,200,000	180,903,078	+8,703,078	+130,903,078	+8,703,078	+8,703,078
2. Direct loans			30,000,000				-30,000,000		
3. Interest subsidies			5,000,000		5,000,000		+5,000,000		
4. D.C. medical facilities	10,000,000	8,500,000			15,000,000	+6,500,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000
5. Program direction and technical assistance	4,149,000	4,149,000	4,321,000	4,321,000	4,321,000	+172,000			
Total	186,349,000	184,849,000	89,321,000	181,521,000	205,224,078	+20,375,078	+115,903,078	+23,703,078	+23,703,078
Patient Care and Special Health Services	77,443,000	77,443,000	79,889,000	79,889,000	79,889,000	+2,446,000			
National Health Statistics	9,174,000	9,174,000	9,918,000	9,668,000	9,668,000	+494,000	-250,000		
Retired pay or commissioned officers	16,700,000	16,700,000	19,501,000	19,501,000	19,501,000	+2,801,000			
Building and Facilities									
(Obligations)	(2,805,000)	(2,805,000)	(10,121,000)	(10,121,000)	(10,121,000)	(+7,316,000)			
Office of the Administrator	11,043,000	11,043,000	11,812,000	11,812,000	11,812,000	+769,000			
Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration	1,305,684,000	1,278,754,000	1,269,880,000	1,384,090,000	1,459,495,078	+180,741,078	+189,615,078	+75,405,078	+75,405,078

Footnotes at end of table.

Appropriation/activity	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971 after 2 percent reduction	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	Senate bill compared with—							
						(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH													
Research Institutes													
Biologics Standards.....	\$8,443,000	\$8,441,000	\$8,640,000	\$8,838,000	\$8,838,000	+\$397,000	+\$198,000	+\$198,000					
National Cancer Institute.....	190,969,050	181,332,000	202,383,000	227,383,000	235,383,000	+54,051,000	+33,000,000	+8,000,000					
National Heart and Lung Institute.....	171,792,500	161,049,000	171,747,000	178,479,000	203,479,000	+42,430,000	+31,732,000	+25,000,000					
National Institute of Dental Research.....	30,914,500	28,860,000	34,563,000	35,257,000	36,257,000	+7,397,000	+1,694,000	+1,000,000					
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.....	141,171,000	132,091,000	132,152,000	138,339,000	140,339,000	+8,248,000	+8,187,000	+2,000,000					
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke.....	102,892,000	96,320,000	96,972,000	100,807,000	115,807,000	+19,487,000	+18,835,000	+15,000,000					
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.....	101,166,500	98,321,000	99,219,000	102,249,000	102,749,000	+4,518,000	+3,530,000	+500,000					
National Institute of General Medical Sciences.....	159,987,000	148,309,000	148,376,000	166,072,000	171,072,000	+22,763,000	+22,696,000	+5,000,000					
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....	77,318,000	76,221,000	93,303,000	94,436,000	94,436,000	+18,215,000	+1,133,000	+1,133,000					
National Eye Institute.....	25,398,500	23,892,000	25,586,000	30,986,000	30,986,000	+7,094,000	+5,300,000	+5,300,000					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.....	18,485,000	17,730,000	19,843,000	20,620,000	21,620,000	+3,890,000	+1,777,000	+1,000,000					
John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences.....	2,954,000	2,791,000	2,664,000	3,582,000	3,582,000	+791,000	+918,000	+918,000					
Total.....	1,031,491,500	975,267,000	1,035,548,000	1,107,048,000	1,164,548,000	+189,281,000	+129,000,000	+57,500,000					
Health Manpower													
1. Institutional support:													
(a) Medical, dental, and related.....	105,000,000	101,400,000	113,650,000	116,350,000	130,350,000	+28,950,000	+16,700,000	+14,000,000					
(b) Nursing.....	8,400,000	7,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	12,500,000	+5,500,000	+1,500,000	+1,500,000					
(c) Public health.....	10,071,000	9,471,000	9,071,000	9,071,000	9,471,000		+400,000	+400,000					
(d) Allied health professions.....	11,587,000	10,988,000	14,245,000	14,245,000	14,245,000	+3,257,000							
Subtotal.....	135,058,000	128,859,000	147,966,000	150,666,000	166,566,000	+37,707,000	+18,600,000	+15,900,000					
2. Student assistance:													
(a) Traineeships.....	20,670,000	20,670,000	22,270,000	22,270,000	22,870,000	+2,200,000	+600,000	+600,000					
(b) Direct loans:													
(1) Medical, dental, etc. (Obligations).....	23,781,000	15,000,000	12,000,000	22,000,000	33,576,000	+18,576,000	+21,576,000	+11,576,000					
(2) Nursing (Obligations).....	(24,894,000)	(16,113,000)	(12,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(33,576,000)	(+17,463,000)	(+21,576,000)	(+11,576,000)					
Subtotal, direct loans.....	40,141,000	24,610,000	21,610,000	37,610,000	54,576,000	+29,966,000	+32,966,000	+16,966,000					
(c) Scholarships:													
(1) Medical, dental, etc.....	15,541,000	15,541,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,600,000	+59,000	+600,000	+600,000					
(2) Nursing.....	7,178,000	7,178,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	+9,822,000							
Subtotal.....	22,719,000	22,719,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,600,000	+9,881,000	+600,000	+600,000					
Subtotal, student assistance.....	83,530,000	67,999,000	75,880,000	91,880,000	110,046,000	+42,047,000	+34,166,000	+18,166,000					
3. Manpower requirements, utilization and program management.....	16,771,000	16,746,000	18,388,000	18,388,000	18,388,000	+1,642,000							
Total, Health manpower.....	235,359,000	213,604,000	242,234,000	260,934,000	295,000,000	+81,396,000	+52,766,000	+34,066,000					
Health Education Loan Funds													
Sales insufficiencies and interest losses (Obligations):													
(a) Loan activity.....	(10,128,000)	(10,128,000)	(5,711,000)	(5,711,000)	(5,711,000)	(-10,128,000)							
(b) Interests and insufficiencies.....	(3,553,000)	(3,553,000)				(+2,158,000)							
Total.....	957,000	957,000	3,083,000	3,083,000	3,083,000	+2,126,000							
Dental Health	11,722,000	10,824,000	10,954,000	10,954,000	11,014,000	+190,000	+60,000	+60,000					
Research Resources	71,324,000	62,692,000	63,701,000	66,201,000	66,801,000	+4,109,000	+3,100,000	+600,000					
Construction of Health Educational Research, and Library Facilities													
1. (a) Medical and related (Obligations).....	94,500,000	94,500,000	94,500,000	94,500,000	111,230,000	+16,730,000	+16,730,000	+16,730,000					
(b) Dental (Obligations).....	(112,922,000)	(112,922,000)	(94,500,000)	(94,500,000)	(111,230,000)	(-1,692,000)	(+16,730,000)	(+16,730,000)					
2. Nursing (Obligations).....	23,600,000	23,600,000	23,600,000	23,600,000	28,380,000	+4,780,000	+4,780,000	+4,780,000					
3. Health research facilities (Obligations).....	(28,200,000)	(28,200,000)	(23,600,000)	(23,600,000)	(28,380,000)	(+180,000)	(+4,780,000)	(+4,780,000)					
Total, construction (Obligations).....	126,100,000	126,100,000	126,100,000	126,100,000	150,000,000	+23,900,000	+23,900,000	+23,900,000					
National Library of Medicine	19,573,000	19,263,000	19,769,000	19,769,000	22,233,000	+2,970,000	+2,464,000	+2,464,000					
Buildings and Facilities (Obligations).....	1,900,000	1,615,000				-1,615,000							
Office of the Director	7,845,000	7,845,000	8,206,000	8,206,000	8,206,000	+361,000							
Scientific Activities Overseas (Special Foreign Currency Program)	3,455,000	3,455,000	32,444,000	32,444,000	32,444,000	+28,989,000							
Total, National Institute of Health.....	1,509,726,500	1,421,622,000	1,542,039,000	1,634,739,000	1,753,329,000	+331,707,000	+211,290,000	+118,590,000					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION													
Elementary and secondary education—follow-through.....	10 70,300,000	10 70,300,000	10 69,000,000	10 70,400,000	10 70,400,000	+100,000	+1,400,000						

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1970 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1971—Continued

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

[Note—All amounts are in the form of definite appropriations unless otherwise indicated]

Appropriation/activity	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹ after 2 percent reduction	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	Senate bill compared with—				
				New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority in House bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE								
Grants to States for Public Assistance								
1. Maintenance assistance.....	\$4,350,180,000	\$4,350,180,000	\$4,943,551,000	\$4,943,551,000	\$4,943,551,000	+\$593,371,000		
2. Repatriated U.S. nationals.....	700,000	600,000	770,000	770,000	770,000	+170,000		
3. Medical assistance.....	2,654,122,000	2,654,122,000	3,109,685,000	3,109,685,000	3,109,685,000	+455,563,000		
4. Social services.....	463,738,000	463,738,000	509,328,000	509,328,000	509,328,000	+45,590,000		
5. State and local training.....	23,264,000	23,264,000	25,536,000	25,536,000	25,536,000	+2,272,000		
Subtotal (noncontrollable).....	7,492,004,000	7,491,904,000	8,588,870,000	8,588,870,000	8,588,870,000	+1,096,966,000		
6. Child welfare services.....	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000			
7. Research and training.....	17,200,000	16,980,000	17,080,000	17,080,000	17,080,000	100,000		
Total.....	7,555,204,000	7,554,884,000	8,611,950,000	8,651,950,000	8,651,950,000	+1,097,065,000		
Work Incentives								
1. Training.....	94,140,000	85,140,000	92,750,000	73,257,000	66,257,000	-18,883,000	-\$26,493,000	-\$7,600,000
2. Day care.....	25,860,000	16,860,000	77,250,000	46,743,000	31,743,000	+14,883,000	-45,507,000	-15,000,000
Total.....	120,000,000	102,000,000	170,000,000	120,000,000	98,000,000	-4,000,000	-72,000,000	-22,000,000
Rehabilitation Services and Facilities								
1. Services:								
(a) Basic State grants.....	436,000,000	436,000,000	503,000,000	503,000,000	503,000,000	+67,000,000		
(b) Innovation.....	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000			
(c) Rehabilitation service projects:								
(1) Regular expansion grants.....	9,500,000	9,500,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	+3,300,000		
(2) Training in industry.....	500,000	450,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+50,000		
(3) New careers.....	1,000,000	900,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,100,000		
(4) Services for migrants.....			5,000,000		5,000,000	+5,000,000		
(5) Workshop improvement.....	10,533,000	9,906,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	+1,394,000		
(6) Initial staffing.....	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000			
Subtotal.....	22,083,000	21,306,000	32,650,000	27,650,000	32,650,000	+11,344,000		
(d) Services for the mentally retarded.....	24,959,000	23,644,000	24,790,000	24,790,000	24,790,000	+13,146,000	+12,000,000	+12,000,000
Subtotal.....	486,252,000	484,150,000	563,640,000	558,640,000	575,640,000	+91,490,000	+12,000,000	+17,000,000
2. Facilities:								
(a) Vocational rehabilitation facilities (Obligations).....	3,500,000	2,892,000				-2,892,000		
(b) Facilities for the mentally retarded.....	(3,841,300)	(3,233,000)				(-3,233,000)		
Subtotal.....	12,031,000	10,226,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	(7)	-10,226,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
Total.....	15,531,000	13,118,000	8,000,000	8,000,000		-13,118,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
Programs for the Aging								
1. State grants.....	13,000,000	13,000,000	15,200,000	15,200,000	15,200,000	+2,200,000		
2. Foster grandparents program.....	9,250,000	8,817,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	11,000,000	+2,183,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
3. Research and training.....	6,110,000	5,942,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	+838,000		
White House Conference on Aging.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-750,000)		
4. Retired Senior Volunteer program (RSVP).....					1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Total.....	28,360,000	27,759,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	34,000,000	+6,241,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control								
Research and Training	10,000,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	+5,000,000		
1. Research and demonstrations:								
(a) Rehabilitation.....	21,425,000	20,603,000	22,360,000	22,360,000	26,360,000	+2,468,000	-2,000,000	
(b) Social services.....	3,500,000	3,289,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	10,000,000	+2,000,000	-2,000,000	+2,000,000
(c) Income maintenance experiments.....	8,000,000	8,000,000	12,000,000	8,000,000	10,000,000	+2,000,000		
Subtotal.....	32,925,000	31,892,000	40,360,000	34,360,000	36,360,000	+4,468,000	-4,000,000	+2,000,000
2. Training.....	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000			
3. Special centers.....	10,875,000	10,331,000	13,375,000	13,375,000	13,375,000	+3,044,000		
Total.....	71,500,000	69,923,000	81,435,000	75,435,000	77,435,000	+7,512,000	-4,000,000	+2,000,000
Social and Rehabilitation Activities Overseas (Special Foreign Currency Program)								
Salaries and Expenses	2,000,000	2,000,000	7,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+2,000,000	-3,000,000	
Less trust fund transfer.....	-360,000	-360,000	-390,000	-390,000	-390,000	-30,000		
Total.....	28,285,000	28,285,500	37,439,000	35,067,000	33,000,000	4,714,500	-4,439,000	-2,067,000
Total, Social and Rehabilitation Service.....	8,317,132,500	8,292,119,500	9,566,464,000	9,500,092,000	9,489,025,000	+1,196,905,500	-77,439,000	-11,067,000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION								
Federal Funds								
Payments to Social Security Trust Funds								
1. Matching payments for supplementary medical insurance.....	928,151,000	928,151,000	1,245,282,000	1,245,282,000	1,245,282,000	+317,131,000		
2. Hospital insurance for uninsureds.....	617,262,000	617,262,000	878,688,000	878,688,000	878,688,000	+261,426,000		
3. Military service credits.....	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000			
4. Retirement benefits for the uninsured.....	364,151,000	364,151,000	370,916,000	370,916,000	370,916,000	+6,765,000		
Total.....	2,014,564,000	2,014,564,000	2,599,886,000	2,599,886,000	2,599,886,000	+585,322,000		

Footnotes at end of table.

Appropriation/activity	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹ after 2 percent reduction	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	Senate bill compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority in House bill	
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners	\$7,250,000	\$7,250,000	\$(153,000,000)	\$(9)	\$(9)	-\$7,250,000	(-\$153,000,000)		
Total, Federal funds	2,021,814,000	2,021,814,000	2,599,866,000	\$2,559,886,000	\$2,599,886,000	+578,072,000			
Trust Funds									
Limitation on Salaries and Expenses									
Limitation on Construction (Obligations)	(934,369,000)	(934,369,000)	(997,461,000)	(997,461,000)	(997,461,000)	(+63,092,000)			
	(5,004,000)	(5,004,000)	(2,800,000)	(2,800,000)	(2,800,000)	(+2,800,000)			
			(13,096,000)	(13,096,000)	(13,096,000)	(+8,092,000)			
Total Social Security Administration	2,021,814,000	2,021,814,000	2,599,866,000	2,599,886,000	2,599,886,000	+578,072,000			
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS									
American Printing House for the Blind	1,404,000	1,404,000	1,476,000	1,557,000	1,517,000	+113,000	+41,000	-\$40,000	
National Technical Institute for the Deaf									
1. Academic program	2,851,000	2,851,000	3,608,000	3,608,000	3,608,000	+757,000			
2. Construction			16,136,000	16,136,000	16,136,000	+16,136,000			
	Subtotal	2,851,000	2,851,000	19,744,000	19,744,000	19,744,000	+16,893,000		
Model Secondary School for the Deaf									
1. Academic program	427,000	427,000	2,182,000	2,182,000	2,182,000	+1,755,000			
2. Construction	351,000	351,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	-101,000			
	Subtotal	778,000	778,000	2,432,000	2,432,000	2,432,000	+1,654,000		
Gallaudet College									
1. Academic program	4,494,000	4,494,000	5,750,000	5,470,000	5,825,000	+1,331,000	+75,000	+355,000	
2. Construction	1,106,000	1,106,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	+294,000			
	Subtotal	5,600,000	5,600,000	7,150,000	6,870,000	7,225,000	+1,625,000	+75,000	+355,000
Howard University									
1. Academic program	21,109,000	21,109,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	+2,891,000			
2. Construction	30,410,000	30,410,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-29,410,000			
	3. Freedmen's Hospital	9,875,000	9,875,000	11,185,000	11,185,000	11,185,000	+1,310,000		
	Subtotal	61,394,000	61,394,000	36,185,000	36,185,000	36,185,000	-25,209,000		
	Total, special institutions	72,027,000	72,027,000	66,987,000	66,788,000	67,103,000	-4,924,000	+116,000	+315,000
OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT									
1. Research and demonstrations			8,500,000	3,500,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	-3,500,000	+1,500,000	
2. White House Conference on Children and Youth	400,000	400,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	+200,000			
3. Administration and technical assistance	1,507,000	1,507,000	2,355,000	1,817,000	1,817,000	+310,000	-538,000		
4. Headstart	326,000,000	326,000,000	339,000,000	321,300,000	339,000,000	+13,000,000		+17,700,000	
	Total	327,907,000	327,907,000	350,455,000	327,217,000	346,417,000	+18,510,000	-4,038,000	+19,200,000
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT									
Office for Civil Rights	6,666,000	6,666,000	8,874,000	8,874,000	8,874,000	+2,208,000			
Less trust fund transfer	-856,000	-856,000	-947,000	-947,000	-947,000	+856,000	+947,000	+947,000	
	Total	5,810,000	5,810,000	7,927,000	7,927,000	8,874,000	+3,064,000	+947,000	+947,000
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT									
1. Executive direction	6,523,000	6,523,000	8,299,000	7,637,000	7,637,000	+1,114,000	-662,000		
2. Public information	691,000	691,000	729,000	729,000	729,000	+38,000			
3. Community and field services	4,223,000	4,223,000	5,415,000	5,096,000	5,096,000	+873,000	-319,000		
4. Legal services	4,063,000	4,063,000	4,488,000	4,420,000	4,420,000	+357,000	-68,000		
5. Financial management:									
(a) Audit	11,455,000	11,455,000	12,917,000	12,774,000	12,774,000	+1,319,000	-143,000		
(b) Other	2,246,000	2,246,000	2,477,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	+129,000	-102,000		
6. National Summer Youth	3,000,000	3,000,000	7,144,000	6,405,000	6,405,000	+421,000	-739,000		
7. Administrative management	5,984,000	5,984,000	1,456,000	1,389,000	1,389,000	+9,000	-67,000		
8. Surplus property utilization	1,380,000	1,380,000	1,380,000	1,389,000	1,389,000				
	Subtotal	39,565,000	39,565,000	42,925,000	40,825,000	40,825,000	+1,260,000	-2,100,000	
Less trust fund transfer	-5,429,000	-5,429,000	-5,855,000	-5,725,000	-5,725,000	-296,000			
	Total	34,136,000	34,136,000	37,070,000	35,100,000	35,100,000	+964,000	-1,970,000	
Total, departmental management	39,946,000	39,946,000	44,997,000	43,027,000	43,974,000	+4,028,000	-1,023,000	+947,000	
Total, HEW	13,914,091,500	13,767,294,000	15,765,955,000	15,878,615,000	16,095,925,078	+2,328,631,078	+329,970,078	+217,310,078	

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

National Labor Relations Board	\$38,522,000	\$38,522,000	\$37,930,000	\$39,430,000	\$39,430,000	+\$908,000	+\$1,500,000
National Mediation Board	2,353,000	2,353,000	2,394,000	2,394,000	2,394,000	+41,000	
Railroad Retirement Board:							
Payment for military service credits	19,206,000	19,206,000	19,969,000	19,969,000	19,969,000	+763,000	
Limitation on salaries and expenses	(15,162,000)	(16,162,000)	(16,740,000)	(16,740,000)	(16,740,000)	(+578,000)	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	9,027,000	9,027,000	9,508,000	9,508,000	9,508,000	+481,000	
United States Soldiers' Home (trust fund appropriation):							
Operation and maintenance	9,445,000	9,445,000	9,822,000	9,822,000	9,822,000	+377,000	
Capital outlay	170,000	170,000	128,000	128,000	128,000	-42,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1970 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1971—Continued
TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued

[Note—All amounts are in the form of definite appropriations unless otherwise indicated]

Appropriation/activity	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) ¹ after 2 percent reduction	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1971	Senate bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority in House bill
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM								
Community Development Programs								
(a) Research, development and evaluation	\$75,600,000	\$75,600,000	\$118,300,000	\$114,600,000	\$114,600,000	+\$39,000,000	-\$3,700,000	-----
(b) Health and nutrition programs	155,200,000	155,200,000	176,800,000	195,300,000	195,300,000	+40,100,000	+18,500,000	-----
(c) Legal services programs	53,800,000	53,800,000	63,400,000	61,400,000	61,400,000	+7,600,000	-2,000,000	-----
(d) Community action operations	382,100,000	382,100,000	384,600,000	388,600,000	388,600,000	+6,500,000	+4,000,000	-----
(e) Special impact program	36,800,000	36,800,000	32,100,000	37,100,000	37,100,000	-300,000	+5,000,000	-----
(f) Migrant program	30,900,000	30,900,000	35,500,000	35,500,000	35,500,000	+4,600,000	-----	-----
(g) VISTA	35,000,000	35,000,000	38,500,000	36,500,000	36,500,000	+1,500,000	-2,000,000	-----
Subtotal	769,400,000	769,400,000	849,200,000	869,000,000	869,000,000	+99,600,000	+19,800,000	-----
Rural loan program	9,400,000	9,400,000	5,000,000	9,400,000	9,400,000	-----	+4,400,000	-----
General support	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Total	12 794,800,000	12 794,800,000	12 870,200,000	12 894,400,000	12 894,400,000	+99,600,000	+24,200,000	-----
Federal Radiation Council	132,000	132,000	144,000	144,000	144,000	+12,000	-----	-----
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	460,000	460,000	810,000	810,000	810,000	+350,000	-----	-----
National Commission on Product Safety	1,475,000	1,475,000	-----	-----	-----	-1,475,000	-----	-----
President's Council on Youth Opportunity	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	-----	-----	-----
Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People	537,000	537,000	675,000	675,000	675,000	+138,000	-----	-----
Payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting	15,000,000	15,000,000	22,500,000	-----	27,500,000	+12,500,000	+5,000,000	+\$27,500,000
National Credit Union Administration	500,000	500,000	-----	500,000	500,000	+500,000	-----	+500,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, related agencies	891,427,000	891,427,000	974,880,000	977,580,000	1,005,580,000	+114,153,000	+30,700,000	+28,000,000
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority	16,649,468,530	16,502,671,030	18,759,377,000	18,824,663,000	19,070,964,078	2,568,293,048	+311,587,078	+246,301,078
Consisting of—	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Definite appropriations	16,618,589,530	16,471,792,030	18,725,053,000	18,790,339,000	19,036,640,078	+2,564,848,048	+311,587,078	+246,301,078
Indefinite appropriations	30,879,000	30,879,000	34,324,000	34,324,000	34,324,000	+3,445,000	-----	-----

¹ 1970 appropriations are adjusted to be comparable to the 1971 estimates.² Includes budget amendment of \$5,140,000; not considered by House.³ The proposed general provision limiting social services, administration, and training to 115 percent of the 1970 budget estimate was included in the bill.⁴ Undistributed as yet.⁵ Tentative estimate. Supplemental will be submitted as soon as final estimate can be made.⁶ Open-ended; obligations authorized to be charged to subsequent appropriations.⁷ Construction of facilities for the mentally retarded becomes a part of the formula grant (up to 50 percent) under the provisions of the Developmental Disabilities Bill, S. 2846.⁸ Represents Office of Economic Opportunity funds administered by the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports in fiscal year 1970.⁹ Includes work and training activities transferred from Office of Economic Opportunity. The Senate Committee provided \$760,100,000 for these activities.¹⁰ Reflects transfer of Follow Through program from Office of Economic Opportunity.¹¹ Reflects transfer of Head Start program from Office of Economic Opportunity.¹² Reflects transfer of work and training activities to the Department of Labor, and child development programs to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BUDGET REQUESTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for the second successive year, our committee must express grave concern about the apparent downgrading of health as reflected by the budget requests.

Some programs were cut below 1970 levels, others were given only insignificant increases, and most would remain at funding levels that would hardly allow a maintenance of effort level of activity.

Health problems still beset the American people which must be recognized as a serious threat to our society. All of us on the appropriations committee are mindful of the importance of holding down Federal expenditures, especially in an inflationary period. But we also know that we would not be fulfilling our responsibilities if we failed to exercise independent judgment in considering this appropriation bill.

Congress must again and now reassess its leadership in the health field if this crisis is to be reversed.

The expenditures for medical education and research have been limited in the campaign against inflation. It will be recalled that the President vetoed the entire HEW appropriation bill last year based upon what he said was his considered judgment that this bill would

be inflationary. We agree that inflation is an ever-increasing problem with which we all must be concerned, but I should like to suggest that restriction of such funds is actually inflationary.

How much greater would the gross national product be in a given year if disease and premature mortality from diseases had not interfered?

Billions of dollars of productivity are lost each year. With more adequate support for medical education and research we can do "our thing" and help reduce these inflationary pressures and also reduce the pain and grief to millions of our citizens and the costs.

False economy can result when action is deferred on pressing domestic needs. The inflationary fires in the health care industry will continue to burn out of control until there is an adequate supply of trained manpower. This is one of the major reasons for the high costs of hospital and medical care.

HEALTH MANPOWER

In April of this year, the Public Health Service reported on the present status of our health manpower needs. For 1970 they estimate the total shortage of doctors, dentists, nurses, and allied health personnel to be 482,000.

For 1980 their projections were even more disturbing if we continue present levels of effort in these health manpower training programs—in 1980 they estimated these shortages would be 725,000.

Therefore, in light of a thorough examination of the needs of health manpower, health research, and the special health care delivery programs reflected in this budget bill, we are recommending an appropriation that exceeds the President's requests by \$311.6 million.

Although that is a significant sum, it works out to less than 2 percent of the total amounts involved here. Less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national product.

After reviewing all these programs we made a number of adjustments. We provided increases in two major health areas, the Hill-Burton hospital construction and modernization program, and the National Institutes of Health, where we recommend increases of \$327 million.

The vast majority of our increases were in health—medical research, health manpower, and the delivery of health services.

I will not repeat all of those figures, or detail our recommendations. They are all covered in a very succinct report to the Senate on this bill.

Just over two-thirds of our increase above the President's requests is in the National Institutes of Health.

Some \$34 million of that is for their special health manpower programs. For direct support to health educational institutions—the schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, public health, nursing, and veterinary medicine—and for sadly needed loan funds for students in all of these health educational programs.

I know that my colleagues on the committee join me in hoping these increases are approved, and expended, so they might give impetus to the vitally important health manpower programs which have lagged far behind the rhetorical statements about the Nation's urgent needs for physicians, nurses, and ancillary health personnel.

Under the recommendations submitted to the Congress, only 10 percent of the nursing students and 12 percent of the health professions students now enrolled in such programs could have secured educational loans. I want to stress that I refer to loans, which would be repaid, with interest, by these students once they graduate.

Under the increases we are recommending, some 21 percent of the nursing students and 34 percent of the health professions students could be assisted with loans. In both categories, this is slightly less than the actual percentages of students who needed such loans, and received them, during 1969. It is far less than what the schools report to be their needs, but it is just below the authorization limit for the health professions and up to the absolute limit for nursing students.

In numbers, these recommendations will assist an additional 16,272 nursing students and an additional 18,594 students enrolled in schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, podiatry, optometry, pharmacy, public health, and veterinary medicine.

I should point out at this time that we rejected recommendations that would have restricted these programs to purely medical specialties. Another item of special concern to the committee was the suggestion embodied within the budget presented which would have precluded the schools of veterinary medicine from the institutional formula grants, and which would have curtailed the participation of their students, along with students in schools of public health, from student assistance programs.

The committee not only rejected that proposal, but has specifically restored those funds. As much as we do agree that there is a critical shortage of physicians, we were unanimous in our determination that all of the health professions, nursing and allied health professions should continue to participate fully in these programs.

In reference to the health professions and nursing student loans I want to say a particular word about recent efforts of the Department to arbitrarily limit access of students to these loan programs.

The basic authorization established these programs to grant loans to those students who, for financial reasons, might otherwise be prevented from completing

their educational program. Responsibility is placed upon the participating educational institutions to evaluate individual applicants and determine eligibility upon the basis of need. Those institutions must also invest their own funds in loans as well as cover all administrative expenses.

All of the evidence submitted to our committee indicates that health profession and nursing students from the lowest economic groups have received the highest number of loans. I do not believe the basic law needs to be changed, and I do not agree with administration proposals that would limit access to those students from families with annual incomes of less than \$10,000. Discretion and flexibility must be retained and we should leave to the participating institutions the responsibility of making these difficult decisions.

Within the regional medical program we added almost \$4 million to help train more allied health personnel—the technicians and physicians assistants who can help bring better care to the sick, and we also restored the hospital improvement grant program to the 1970 operating level—a program that helps all of the State mental hospitals improve their treatment programs and upgrade their professional staffs.

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction of new teaching facilities in the health professions there is an alarming backlog of approved but unfunded projects. Every State and region is involved. In many instances, projects are ready to go to contract, local and State financing secured, bonds floated, and interest charges running—but no Federal matching funds are available.

This backlog of approved projects is well over \$2 billion—more than two-thirds of that State and local funds—about \$600 million of anticipated, almost promised and approved Federal matching. Regrettably, only \$150 million is provided in this bill—we have increased the President's request and the House allowance, by \$24 million.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

Another cause of real alarm is the increases in communicable diseases. For the first time in a decade, polio is on the increase. In some areas diphtheria is on the increase: across the Nation, every mother—especially expectant mothers—fear another breakout of German measles; and nationwide, various venereal diseases are on the increase.

To bolster State and local efforts at immunization programs against communicable diseases, we have added \$8 million to this bill over the President's recommendations which merely maintained the same dollar figures as last year. Future costs of an unchecked German measles epidemic alone could exceed all of the increases contained in this bill.

Hospital construction and modernization under Hill-Burton received special attention by our committee. We added almost \$24 million, and together with the House increases this will be \$116 million more than the President requested.

This increase cannot meet all the needs, but it will help a program of overwhelming significance to almost every community in our Nation. And it will be especially helpful to some 35 projects in nine States that were sadly shortchanged under fiscal controls imposed by the administration during fiscal 1970. A listing of those specific projects appears in our committee report, pages 27 and 28.

MENTAL HEALTH

For the community mental health program we have recommended an additional increase of \$20 million for staffing of these vital community resources that have helped thousands of Americans, restored them to sound mental health, and saved those patients, their families, State and local governments, untold millions of dollars.

Together with the House allowances, our recommendations are \$40 million over the President's requests. This will allow the community mental health program to proceed in an orderly manner—and not languish for lack of funds to meet the minimum staffing requirements of those centers that are located in over 250 cities across the Nation. After the tremendous capital investment that has been made by State and local units, private charitable organizations and individuals, we cannot renege on the Federal share.

For special services to the mentally retarded that are rendered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service, we allowed \$4 million more than the President requested. Here again is a program that not only helps render care to those in need, but which has proven highly successful in returning to gainful employment those afflicted with these ailments.

Like the community mental health program, this is an investment which in the long run saves taxpayers funds and untold expenses by families of those recipients.

Mr. President, many of these programs are truly blue chip investments, returning far more than we have ever expended.

HEALTH MANPOWER—RESEARCH

Another factor that must be recognized in biomedical research and the production of health manpower is that if significant efforts are compromised today then many years must be spent to regain lost momentum. Reductions in health care, health manpower, and health research funding to possibly control inflation is tantamount to balancing the budget by the sacrifice of human lives. The shrill voices of the budget balancers are wrong if they think this is the way to right a failing economy. It is the shortfall in revenues from a no-growth economy and the excessively high interest rates that are pushing up the needle of inflation.

Biomedical research and the translation of what has already been discovered into the mainstreams of our health care delivery system, received very special attention from our committee.

REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS

We had a great deal of testimony on regional medical programs. I would guess that 98 percent of the testimony was favorable. Those testifying thought these

programs should be expanded, and we paid special attention to this matter. We found, and I am sure the testimony and the report points out, that these regional medical programs have developed a framework of cooperative relationships for improving the organization and delivery of health services throughout our Nation.

This has been accomplished by developing the voluntary cooperation of the various providers of health care—both public and private—in identifying the patients' needs. When these have been determined, the local and regional groups and institutions develop projects and programs to meet those needs.

These RMP activities include the full spectrum of health care: prevention, primary care, specialized care using the latest scientific techniques, and rehabilitation. The regional medical program provides funds for organizing a system of health care locally acceptable and responsive to local needs, but linked to regional and national resources not available locally. It is also helping in that area so badly neglected by almost everyone—planning and innovation for better systems of delivery of health care.

By increasing the allowances for RMP by \$18.5 million, we can help bolster training programs in allied health that I already mentioned; provide special support to expand the emergency mobile care units for heart attack and stroke victims that are proving so successful; help to build regional cancer treatment centers where there are not such facilities available today; and increase the rate of development of kidney disease treatment centers and the training of those health professions specialists who can render treatment to kidney disease victims.

NIH—RESEARCH

For basic and applied research at the National Institutes of Health we increased the House allowances by \$57.5 millions. Together with the House increases we approved, the total increase over the President's recommendations would be \$129 million, or about 12 percent.

These increases cover all of the 11 research institutes, but the major increases are in cancer, heart, stroke, lung, arthritis, and neurological diseases. Although primarily for research into all the diseases that plague mankind. Necessary funds were also restored to keep special training and fellowship programs supported at their 1970 levels.

Mindful that greater knowledge of genetics will ultimately solve a whole spectrum of diseases, we approved a special allowance granted by the House for a genetics task force.

Current knowledge of genetics must be brought into sharper focus and the leads at hand developed in an orderly way. This special program of project grants in genetics-related research will accomplish those purposes.

Mr. President, some criticism has been directed toward biomedical research.

Some have said that it takes too long for what is newly discovered, what has been found to be effective, to become available to all. That it takes too long

to get from the research labs what is new into the mainstream of the delivery of health care to all Americans.

Regrettably, that allegation is true in many instances, that is why we have recommended increases in the regional medical program, the comprehensive health program, and NIH to increase our efforts in the applied research area. That is why we recommend adding more to the National Library of Medicine and the development of the Lister Hill Biomedical Communications Network.

But another allegation is made that the expansion of research activity diverts too many physicians from their primary task of treating the sick. That is not true.

Most of the laboratory research in the biomedical sciences is done by scientists with a Ph. D. degree who are not licensed to provide health care. Those Ph. D.'s conduct over 70 percent of the research projects supported by NIH.

The remaining NIH projects are clinical research projects, involving human patients receiving specialized treatment and such projects must involve medical doctors and health professionals.

Such a physician has not been diverted from patient care. On the contrary, he is deeply involved in patient care, and those patients are probably getting better attention than would normally be the case. In most instances many other health professionals are being trained in patient care at the same time this clinical research is being conducted.

These efforts are most deserving of continued Federal support. Any curtailment of these research funds could prove costly in both financial and human terms.

Like most everything involved in health—research does not stand alone. It is intertwined with the delivery system and training programs, especially the improvements we hope to achieve.

FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAINING GRANTS

Health manpower training programs are equally complicated and I would not take the time to explain all that went into our considerations. We did maintain the fellowship and training grants at the 1970 levels, and refused to approve further reductions in those programs.

We must not shirk our obligations in training programs because once again any lost momentum cannot be recovered at some later time. In years to come, we know that new medical schools and other health professions schools will have to be established and funded. We know this is a certainty.

If we are to have adequately prepared teachers, professors and technicians to fill the professional staffs of those new schools—and replace those in existing schools—only the training programs of today will produce those people. This is not a spigot we can casually turn on or off. This is a resource of talented people, highly trained, that must be constantly nurtured and renewed. Time is just as precious as dollars if not more so, and we cannot afford to lose a moment.

RETURNING MEDICAL CORPSMEN

In the delivery of health care the real excitement of those who are striving to

improve the delivery systems is directed toward developing programs to train new types of professionals who can play a significant role in ministering to the needs of the sick and helping to prevent illness.

These are technicians, physicians assistants, specialized nurses—all different types. One of the greatest resources of potential participants in these new fields of health manpower are returning medical corpsmen.

Previously, most of these men and women, with invaluable training and practical experience gained during their tour of service, did not enter into a health career in civilian life immediately upon discharge from the military.

Currently, about 30,000 enlisted medical corpsmen are being discharged every year.

Through the special efforts of the Defense Department, and officials in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, over 40 percent of those people are now being attracted into health careers.

Through a joint Federal-State venture known as Operation MEDHIC, the transition of those trained medical personnel into civilian health occupants is being facilitated.

In a related effort, MEDEX programs have developed a model for training selected medical corpsmen to serve as physicians' assistants, particularly for medical practice in rural America which is suffering from severe shortages of physicians.

The cooperative efforts of the Defense Department, HEW, the various regional medical programs, health professions schools, the States and professional societies is exemplary. It proves what can be done.

The committee, at the urging of Chairman RUSSELL, also included funds for a new "jobs for veterans" program to increase the number of job opportunities for all Vietnam veterans. The Department of Labor will conduct this program along with other departments and agencies involved in veterans affairs.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Special concern for the health of our environment was also evidenced by our committee. Many of the Federal programs that help States and local communities achieve cleaner air, better methods of solid waste disposal, more effective sewage systems, and more reliable supplies of drinking water—these are contained in this bill and are under the jurisdiction of HEW during this fiscal year.

Again, we found recommendations that would make it impossible to achieve minimum goals. We were faced with instances where the President's requests would force reductions of effort—or barely allow for the same level of activity as last year. We did not feel such neglect to be tolerable.

For the environmental health service we have provided an additional \$13.9 million. This is primarily for programs under the Clean Air Act; for improved occupational health programs to assist miners—this is a special program under a special bill; for solid waste

management research and demonstrations—not the construction of solid waste facilities, but for some management research in this field, and for demonstrations, which we think will prove more than helpful; and for the training of additional employees who work within the municipal and rural water systems across our Nation.

With the overwhelming evidence, acknowledged by almost everyone in public and private positions of responsibility, that we must have action now against environmental pollution, we were disappointed—to say the very least—at the administration's proposals to cut down on research and development in environmental control.

Alarming incidents occurring around the country tell of chemical poisoning of drinking water, cities run over with garbage, and smog alerts are not isolated incidents.

Yet the reductions for research grants training and fellowships proposed throughout the Environmental Health Service would cripple efforts to gain new knowledge and increase the supply of both the skilled scientists and the technicians capable of dealing with these serious problems.

There is a great shortage of people who are experienced in this field in the country, especially those in the day-to-day operations at the local level.

In recognition of the paucity of trained personnel to carry out programs in solid waste management, we added \$2.1 million for the support of training grants—primarily in the field of solid waste disposal techniques.

We added a similar amount to accelerate existing programs of surveillance technical assistance, and research and training to help rectify the deficiencies identified in the findings of a recently completed nationwide survey of community water supply systems.

Special efforts will be made to provide the States the technical assistance needed to put to use existing technology related to the detection and treatment processes for contaminants in drinking water.

Under the Clean Air Act we added \$2.5 million to provide increased assistance to State and local control agencies in preparing their air quality standards implementation plans, to increase work on health effects research, and to work in air quality monitoring.

We provided an additional \$1 million to accelerate motor vehicle pollution research and to implement the Federal clean car incentive program. We provided a similar increase to give additional training opportunities for technical personnel for industry. Federal, State, and local government research and control operations in air pollution.

If we are to have any hope for successes in solving these environmental health problems, these additional funds are an absolutely necessity.

TRANSFER AND CONSOLIDATION OF OEO APPROPRIATIONS TO LABOR AND HEW

Finally, a major action by our subcommittee—and agreed upon by the full membership of the Appropriations Com-

mittee—has to do with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The President requested slightly over \$2 billions for OEO programs during fiscal 1971, yet only about 43 percent of those funds are actually administered by OEO.

Over 57 percent of that \$2 billion goes to the Departments of Labor and HEW. Where the funds are actually administered for programs like manpower training and retraining, for Headstart and Follow Through.

The committee has been highly critical of this "pass through" type funding for several years. Last year we stated our objections strongly. We were then, and are now, convinced that such procedures are cumbersome and inefficient at best—and possibly highly wasteful at worst.

I know that this questionable procedure has caused countless problems with local agencies—public and private—who have been on the frontlines and dealing directly with the recipients of these many programs.

Considerable time and effort has been expended by OEO officials who have been involved in transferring these funds. I often question what is accomplished by all these discussions and conferences.

Our criticism last year apparently went for naught. The administration proposals for 1971 would continue this questionable "pass through" practice. The committee version recommends that the Headstart appropriation be transferred from OEO to the Office of Child Development, HEW, and the Follow Through appropriation be transferred from OEO to the Office of Education, HEW. Both would be funded at the level of the President's budget request.

This transfer will not in any way affect the authorization for these programs. Presently, these programs are administered under a memorandum of agreement which delegates authority for administering the programs from the Director, OEO to the Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare. While this agreement will have to be "rephrased" to recognize the technical fact that the money is appropriated to HEW rather than OEO, this would not require changing the substance of the agreement nor the way the programs are administered.

It is important to understand that the legislative authority of these programs remains in the Economic Opportunity Act. The committee had no intention nor, to the best of the committee's knowledge would HEW or OEO have any intention of going counter to either the letter or the spirit of the authorizing legislation nor the wishes of the appropriate legislative committees. The people served by these programs should have no concern that transferring the location of the money will force a change in how these programs are administered. In fact, it is the committee's belief that transferring the appropriations to HEW will decrease uncertainty and confusion.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Does the distinguished chairman agree with me in feeling that if we succeed in abolishing this transfer

of funds from OEO to HEW, and in other cases to the Department of Labor, the saving of manpower engaged in the physical acts of the transfer will mean that more money than heretofore has reached the pockets of the needy, that with the same appropriations, the needy will get more money?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is perfectly true. Also, it would reduce the uncertainty of local administration of these things, which means that the program should be much more effective.

Answering the question of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, recipients would thereby be assured just what amounts of money would be available and would not be dependent on any problems that OEO has with internal distribution of the funds.

Regarding the direct appropriations to Labor, the Senate and the House have approved separate manpower bills that contain the same provisions with respect to consolidation of OEO work and training programs with other manpower programs in the Department of Labor.

The distinguished occupant of the Chair, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. FROUTY) knows that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is expected also to deal with the Headstart program in a similar manner at the beginning of the next session, which should be done. So none of the proposed legislation will become effective until fiscal year 1972, and in the meantime, we will eliminate immediately the confusion in the pass-through practice.

From the standpoint of authorizing legislation, the language proposed for the consolidated appropriation clearly identifies the authorizing legislation. Further, it is not unusual that a given appropriation include funds authorized under two or more different pieces of authorizing legislation—that is, the appropriation for "Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses"—that is the line item—is authorized by the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, two bills with which the present occupant of the Chair is very familiar.

Administratively, we see no major change in the operation of the work and training programs of the Economic Opportunity Act. The new legislation in both Houses of Congress clearly defines a role for OEO in the planning and evaluation of manpower programs for the disadvantaged. The OEO delegations will still be in effect, and OEO will still have the same role in operations which they had in the past. The primary benefit to be gained from the consolidation will be simplification in the administration of funds. In fiscal year 1970, for example, funds for the regular neighborhood youth corps summer program were in the OEO appropriation but the supplemental appropriation was made to the MDTA account. The Appropriations Committee is correcting this problem by the proposed consolidation and believes this is essential to sound and efficient administration of the programs now.

It is for these reasons that this com-

mittee feels that it can make considerably more sense out of the appropriation structure, without foreclosing in any way on the deliberations of the legislative committees.

In essence, by the elimination of this administrative transfer of funds, we will eliminate some other "buckpassing" that has gone on. We also will eliminate some of the duplication and overlapping.

Mr. President, at this point, I request unanimous consent to have a table printed in the RECORD showing the effect of the committee action on the funding levels, including the committee's recommended increase for the popular Headstart program.

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

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
AMOUNTS REQUESTED IN THE 1971 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM BILL

Appropriation/activity	1970 comparable appropriation	1971 budget	1971 House action	Committee recommendation
FUNDS TO OEO				
Economic opportunity program:				
1. Community development programs:				
a. Research, development, and evaluation	\$75,600,000	\$118,300,000	\$114,600,000	\$114,600,000
b. Health and nutrition programs	155,200,000	176,800,000	195,300,000	195,300,000
c. Legal services programs	53,800,000	63,400,000	61,400,000	61,400,000
d. Community action operations	382,100,000	384,600,000	388,600,000	388,600,000
e. Special impact program	36,800,000	32,100,000	37,100,000	37,100,000
f. Migrant program	30,900,000	35,500,000	35,500,000	35,500,000
g. VISTA	35,000,000	38,500,000	36,500,000	36,500,000
Subtotal	769,400,000	849,200,000	869,000,000	869,000,000
FUNDS TO LABOR				
2. Work and training programs:				
a. JOBS	47,000,000			
b. Concentrated employment	149,400,000	123,000,000	116,440,000	116,440,000
c. Public service careers	47,000,000	96,600,000	91,400,000	91,400,000
d. In-school and summer programs	183,900,000	208,900,000	197,770,000	197,770,000
e. Out of school	98,000,000	134,200,000	127,000,000	127,000,000
f. Job Corps	170,200,000	180,000,000	170,390,000	170,390,000
g. Operation Mainstream	41,000,000	41,000,000	38,800,000	38,800,000
h. Program support	17,400,000	18,300,000	18,300,000	18,300,000
Subtotal	753,900,000	802,000,000	760,100,000	760,100,000
FUNDS TO HEW				
3. Child development programs:				
a. Headstart	326,000,000	339,000,000	321,300,000	339,000,000
b. Follow Through	70,300,000	69,000,000	70,400,000	70,400,000
c. National summer youth	3,000,000			
Subtotal	399,300,000	408,000,000	391,700,000	409,400,000
FUNDS TO OEO				
4. Rural loan program	9,400,000	5,000,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
5. General support	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
Total	1,948,000,000	2,030,200,000	2,046,200,000	2,063,900,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. In reference to OEO itself, I would like to say a word about their legal services programs. We recommend that the full amount appropriated for legal services be used for actual operations and that any funds necessary for technical assistance, training, or evaluation, be funded from the much larger general funds granted OEO for those purposes. This would be the same as they have done in previous years.

We also expressed concern about recent proposals that would have transferred the control over local legal services programs to the regional directors of OEO.

Such a transfer would seriously impede the success of legal services programs by denying them resources and by stripping them of the political independence that they need if they are to retain their vitality.

I am pleased that the Director of OEO has revised his reorganization plans for legal services. He has wisely chosen to listen to the voices of reason here on the hill and elsewhere—rather than choose the expedient path which would have freed him from political heat at the cost of a vital national program.

SECTION 208—GENERAL PROVISION

Mr. President, we again had a sticky problem on a general provision—section 208. We spent a great deal of time on this in the committee, and I think we came up with a sensible approach. The administration proposed to close the open end on the payment of welfare services, and suggested a 110-percent ceiling on payments to States—allowing each State at least a 10-percent increase over last year, if they deemed it desirable. I want this to be clear. It has nothing to do with the money payments to recipients. This proposal would reduce or stabilize the Federal obligation and put a greater burden on the States should they want to or be required to continue to increase their services. The committee found that this was a little discriminatory between States and contained an exception clause. Some States would not have been affected to any great extent. Other States would have had to drop their programs from levels they now provide. So we thought that a limitation at 115 percent would more nearly even this out, and that is in the bill.

As I understand it, the House did not include this provision in their bill.

The committee is suggesting that the limitation be placed at 115 percent.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that a separate document showing the effect the 115-percent limitation has on each State, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE
GENERAL PROVISIONS—SECTION 208

The Senate Committee version of Section 208 is as follows:

"None of the funds contained in this title may be used for payments to any State for fiscal year 1971 for services, staff training, and administrative expenses under titles I, IV (Part A), X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act which, in the aggregate, exceed 115 percent of the aggregate amount estimated for these purposes for such State for fiscal year 1970."

If the Senate, and subsequently the Congress, should fail to adopt Section 208, the August State estimates indicate that an additional appropriation of \$183 million would be required for the cost of services, administration, and training.

According to the August State estimates, almost 75 percent of the additional \$183 million would be received by four States: \$71 million would go to California, and more than half of the remaining \$112 million would be received by Pennsylvania, Michigan and New York.

Purpose of Section 208

The original justification for making public assistance an "open-ended" appropriation was to protect the rights of individuals who were entitled to and in need of cash assistance. In other words, the Congress did not want to see a person in need denied assistance because an appropriation had not been passed at the Federal level. This concept of an "open-ended" appropriation was later extended to program administration, training, and social services aspects of the overall public assistance program. The Administration believes that appropriations for these activities should be controllable. The Executive and the Congress should make deliberate choices—in advance—as to their size and character and as to the Federal financial Government does not exercise this control—it merely pays the bills as rendered by the States. This is what Section 208 was intended to correct.

Effect of Section 208 on States' estimated requirements

The wording of the limitation requires that the increase in 1971 be limited to 115 percent of the 1970 level for the aggregate payments for social services, administration of cash payments to welfare recipients, and training made to the States for 1970. This would permit the State to decide which of the program elements could be constrained and still effectively carry out those of highest priority.

Based on the August data from the States for 1971 requirements, application of the 115 percent limitation, without exception, would produce the following:

1. 23 States will have no problem since the limitation would provide more than their current estimate;
2. 10 States would receive 90 percent or more of their requirements;
3. 11 States would receive between 80 percent and 90 percent of their requirements;
4. 10 States would receive less than 80 percent of their requirements; These States are Alaska, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Maryland, Michigan, New Hampshire, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

Listing of States by percentage of fiscal year 1971 request for services, administration, and training allowed under 115 percent limitation

[Dollars in thousands]

Received.—Total request (23 States): Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont.

90 to 99.9 percent of request

(10 States):

Alabama	863
Colorado	826

Iowa	906	Nebraska	878
New York	16,515	New Jersey	3,113
Ohio	1,623	Tennessee	2,304
Puerto Rico	568	Washington	4,249
Virgin Island	8	West Virginia	2,189
Virginia	810	Less than 80 percent of request	
Wisconsin	427	(10 States):	
Wyoming	116	Alaska	566
80 to 89.9 percent of request			
(11 States):			
Florida	2,685	California	70,677
Guam	26	Georgia	5,012
Idaho	376	Hawaii	1,237
Kansas	1,129	Maryland	5,589
Louisiana	2,292	Michigan	15,374
Minnesota	2,357	New Hampshire	534
		Oregon	3,674
		Pennsylvania	29,202
		Texas	6,589

EFFECT OF SECTION 208 (115 PERCENT) BASED ON STATES' AUGUST ESTIMATES

	Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Fiscal year 1970 times 115 percent	Fiscal year 1971 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 allowance under limitation	Estimated savings	Allowance as percent of 1971 estimate		Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Fiscal year 1970 times 115 percent	Fiscal year 1971 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 allowance under limitation	Estimated savings	Allowance as percent of 1971 estimate	
United States	827,561	951,699	1,114,250	931,522	182,728	—	Missouri	18,226	20,960	18,180	18,180	—	—	100
Alabama	7,593	8,732	9,595	8,732	863	91	Montana	2,712	3,119	2,986	2,986	—	—	100
Alaska	1,835	2,110	2,676	2,110	566	79	Nebraska	5,062	5,821	6,699	5,821	878	87	100
Arizona	3,181	3,658	3,632	3,632	—	100	Nevada	1,636	1,881	1,776	1,776	—	—	100
Arkansas	3,773	4,339	4,215	4,215	—	100	New Hampshire	992	1,141	1,675	1,141	534	68	100
California	223,150	256,623	327,300	256,623	70,677	78	New Jersey	19,510	22,437	25,550	22,437	3,113	88	100
Colorado	11,305	13,001	13,827	13,001	826	94	New Mexico	5,268	6,058	5,133	5,133	—	—	100
Connecticut	8,198	9,428	8,230	8,230	—	100	North Carolina	132,108	151,924	168,439	151,924	16,515	90	100
Delaware	1,061	1,220	1,157	1,157	—	100	North Dakota	2,673	3,074	3,088	3,074	14	100	100
District of Columbia	6,111	7,028	6,344	6,344	—	100	Ohio	19,417	22,330	23,953	22,330	1,623	93	100
Florida	15,357	17,661	20,346	17,661	2,685	87	Oklahoma	10,940	12,581	11,811	11,811	—	—	100
Georgia	13,058	15,017	20,029	15,017	5,012	75	Oregon	9,836	11,311	14,985	11,311	3,674	75	100
Guam	146	168	194	168	26	87	Pennsylvania	29,346	33,748	62,950	33,748	29,202	54	100
Hawaii	1,780	2,047	3,284	2,047	1,237	62	Puerto Rico	5,556	6,389	6,957	6,389	568	92	100
Idaho	1,533	1,763	2,139	1,763	376	82	Rhode Island	3,972	4,568	3,267	3,267	—	—	100
Illinois	32,748	37,660	36,520	36,520	—	100	South Carolina	4,315	4,962	4,705	4,705	—	—	100
Indiana	6,778	7,795	7,150	7,150	—	100	South Dakota	2,371	2,727	2,649	2,649	—	—	100
Iowa	6,964	8,009	8,915	8,009	906	90	Tennessee	9,859	11,338	13,642	11,338	2,304	83	100
Kansas	6,943	7,984	9,113	7,984	1,129	88	Texas	16,751	19,264	25,853	19,264	6,589	75	100
Kentucky	7,852	9,030	8,623	8,623	—	100	Utah	3,844	4,421	4,376	4,376	—	—	100
Louisiana	14,254	16,392	18,684	16,392	2,292	88	Vermont	1,620	1,863	1,423	1,423	—	—	100
Maine	4,141	4,762	4,267	4,267	—	100	Virgin Islands	184	212	220	212	8	96	100
Maryland	16,926	19,465	25,054	19,465	5,589	78	Virginia	6,861	7,890	8,700	7,890	810	91	100
Massachusetts	15,630	17,975	15,698	15,698	—	100	Washington	22,037	25,343	29,592	25,343	4,249	86	100
Michigan	25,852	29,730	45,104	29,730	15,374	66	West Virginia	8,682	9,984	12,173	9,984	2,189	82	100
Minnesota	10,885	12,518	14,875	12,518	2,357	84	Wisconsin	16,462	18,931	19,358	18,931	427	98	100
Mississippi	5,427	6,241	6,121	6,121	—	100	Wyoming	1,219	1,402	1,518	1,402	116	92	100

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure this section will draw attention tomorrow and again in conference, if it reaches that point.

However, the committee is greatly concerned about the spiraling costs of welfare services and welfare outlays in general. When we talk about the cost of welfare services, we are not talking about the money that goes to the recipients. We are talking about services and administrative costs. There have been some valid complaints that the administration of welfare services are costing too much—that it is not getting down to the people. This may be a sensible restriction, but I am sure we are going to have some discussion about it on the floor of the Senate and surely in the conference with the House, if it should pass the Senate. By including this new section in the bill, we are providing a forum for debate in hopes that something can and will be done.

EFFECT OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the recommendations before the Senate in this appropriation bill total \$19,070,964,078.

Two major departments—HEW and Labor—six special institutions, and some 13 related agencies are involved. Approximately 110 separate line items are in this bill, and hundreds of programs and activities.

I have not counted up the number of witnesses we heard, but the Senator from New Hampshire and I think it was close to 250. These were not just witnesses; they were witnesses who had some official position in a department or those on the outside who were deans of medical schools or presidents of universities or scientists and those who had not just a passing interest in these matters, but intimate working knowledge and invaluable expertise.

This is a long and complicated bill. There was much discussion. There was not so much controversy. There was concern as to how much of our capabilities we could use in this important field, whether we were going too far, whether we were not giving enough, or doing the kind of job we should do, particularly in the health field. The Department of Labor is continually expanding. It is involved in rehabilitation and job training programs. More and more we have been passing bills giving them additional responsibility. I think the appropriations and the recommendations this year for the Labor Department are the highest of all time.

Mr. President, we could not agree with every recommendation of the administration, departmental officials, and the President of the United States or the House, but that is the very essence of the appropriation process.

We spent many days working, sometimes late in the evenings, hearing the testimony of hundreds of witnesses.

Along with my colleagues, we spent days and days hearing from hundreds of different witnesses who testified about all these programs.

We finally arrived at our recommendations after extensive deliberations, collectively and personally.

I believe wholeheartedly in these recommendations. They are not those of the Senator from Washington—in some instance I personally would have done more—in other, perhaps less. But they are sound recommendations, and they are reasonable. We tried to make them fiscally responsible. I think that we have. We think they are reasonable. We can defend them in conference. Therefore, the committee is hopeful that additional amendments will not be loaded upon this bill, making this bill seem unreasonable in size—difficult to get through conference and difficult to acquire a Presidential signature. We have gone through that before.

We have worked hard and long on this bill and we think it is a sensible one. If I had my way, I would do certain things differently, but it is a combination of what everyone seemed to think we wanted to do within our capabilities.

There is no use repeating that the programs are important to the Nation,

to every citizen and to every family in America. They are important to the well-being of our whole society.

They assist those who are often unable to assist themselves, especially the young, the aged, and the sick.

They help to improve our environment.

They will help to solve some of the very complex and difficult ecology problems that face America today.

They will help to build much needed medical facilities.

They will help reduce unemployment.

They will help to train countless men and women who are not available today to help deliver adequate health care to our people.

They will help to bring about much needed improvements in the health care delivery systems of our Nation.

They will help to solve some of the mysteries of diseases and sicknesses that plague all mankind.

The Senator from New Hampshire and all of us on the committee are not just confining this to the United States alone. If we could find something in the health that will benefit the people of the world, we hope that it will be used all over the world.

Mr. President, I strongly recommend to the Senate the bill as reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, there is no need for the Senator from New Hampshire to detain the Senate by reason of any extended opening remarks on the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the chairman of the subcommittee, has just concluded a very thorough, accurate, and fair appraisal of the bill and of the committee's actions upon the bill. It would be simply repetitious if I were to retrace these steps and repeat the details contained in the bill.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington, in handling this bill which contains approximately 5,000 pages of testimony and in dealing with the many problems contained in the bill has, in my judgment and my sincere belief, accomplished a very remarkable and able piece of legislative work. I heartily commend him, and I have valued the opportunity to work with him.

There may be minor points on which we do not see eye to eye. I remember on one occasion when former President Lyndon Johnson was a Member of the Senate that he made a remark that somehow lingers in my memory. He said that when two men think alike on every point, it can be pretty definitely assumed that only one of them is doing the thinking. Therefore, I would not rubberstamp every opinion that my distinguished chairman may have on minor points.

It has been a privilege to work with the Senator from Washington. We are in accord on the major points. I think that is also true with respect to nearly all members of the Appropriations Committee.

I would like to express my own appreciation for the able assistance of Harley Dirks, Bill Kennedy, and the other mem-

bers of the staff, both of the majority and minority. They have worked with all of us. There has not been any time that members of the committee could not obtain the assistance of staff members.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I agree with those sentiments.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I think I may be pardoned for a moment for saying something that we may not hear too much of in this special session. I want to say something in defense of the President of the United States. That is not simply because I represent the Republican minority on the committee.

We will hear much criticism in the next couple of days concerning the failure of the administration to give adequate support in its budget recommendations to this program, that program, or some other program. We will hear many comments in the next couple of days about the money that we spend for other purposes and the alleged—and I emphasize that word—reluctance of the administration to be generous enough in these great humanitarian programs.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that last year we passed a bill which was vetoed. We then reduced the amount contained in that bill by 2 percent and passed a new bill. So, the ultimate result was a 2-percent reduction of the amount contained in the bill the Congress had previously enacted. The amount was still substantially in excess of the President's budget recommendations last year.

This year the President's recommendations that came to Congress on the HEW appropriations contained an increase in the amount over last year's appropriations by \$2,256,706,000. That is approximately \$2 1/4 billion.

Mr. President, when all is said and done, I feel entitled to say that represents the fact that the administration is straining every resource and has gone just as far as it felt it could go in view of the overall fiscal situation confronting the country to deal as generously as possible with all of these problems that are so vital and in which we are all interested, wherever we sit in the Senate.

That is what the Congress started out with—a proposed budget that contained an increase of \$2 1/4 billion over the appropriations for the last fiscal year.

The committee also desired to go as far as it could. So the committee proceeded after long and careful and painful consideration—because it is not easy to put a dollar-and-cent limitation on many of these programs that deal with human life and human suffering and human happiness—to add amounts so that the programs exceed the President's recommendations this year by \$426,611,078. That represents nearly another one-half billion dollars. To be sure, there were certain decreases that took place that reduced the amount to \$311,587,078.

I wish to read into the Record the specific increases recommended by the committee: Air pollution control, \$4.5 million; environmental control, \$6,080 million; Health Services and Mental Health Administration, \$43,860 million; comprehensive health planning services, \$2,822 million; maternal and child

health, \$320,000; regional medical centers, \$18,498 million; communicable diseases, \$8,462 million; Hill-Burton funds, \$115,903,078; NIH research institutes, \$129 million and NIH health manpower, \$52,766 million; construction, \$23.9 million; social rehabilitation services, \$12 million; programs for the aging, \$2 million; National Relations Board, \$1.5 million; and payment for public broadcasting, \$5 million; making a total of \$426 million-plus added to the bill and recommended by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, no matter what we reported, if we had wanted to play the old game of trying to do everything we could to hold down the ultimate size of the bill, we might well have reported a lesser figure in order to have something to bargain with and in order to accept here and there a good many amendments. But, Mr. President, when you are dealing with the health of the Nation, that is not the way a committee of the Senate should act and so we differed on some points but we reached an understanding and a meeting of the minds and we sincerely tried in this committee to recommend every last dollar we felt we could squeeze justifiably into this bill, and we tried to place the most dollars in the most critical areas.

Our judgment may not be perfect. I do not know of any man or group of men whose judgment is perfect. But I do know it is our best judgment and it is our honest judgment. It does not hold back anything for bargaining purposes.

So I join my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington. I would be the last one to suggest that this bill could not be improved or to suggest Senators should not work their will and endeavor to place before the Senate any changes in the bill that they feel are justified, but I sincerely hope that the Senate will not try to balloon the amount of this bill so high that we run into difficulties and go through any such experience as we had to pass through last year, bearing in mind that when this appropriation has passed through the committee of conference and, we hope, signed by the President, much of the fiscal year will have passed and large increases could hardly be squeezed into the closing months of a fiscal year with effectiveness and much money would be wasted.

I can sincerely suggest to the Senate it would gain little and lose much if any substantial increase were made in this appropriation bill. Someone has reported to me—I think someone from the staff—that already there are printed Senate floor amendments which would increase this bill by some \$600 million more. Bearing in mind that the President exercised his judgment and recommended an increase of \$2.25 billion over last year's appropriation and that the House and the Senate have increased it by \$311.5 million, I think it would be unfortunate if we did not restrain ourselves and try to keep the bill within reasonable limits so that we can get it through conference, get it to the President, get it enacted, and enable the health services and authorities, the Headstart program and all of

the other programs, to know what they are going to get so that they may be in a position to plan and spend the money wisely.

Mr. President, I hope this bill will be enacted and I solicit the support of Members of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have introduced today an amendment to the bill providing appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare on behalf of myself and the Senators JAVITS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, KENNEDY, MATHIAS, EAGLETON, PELL, SCHWEIKER, CRANSTON, and SAXBE.

I offer this amendment as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As the chairman knows, it is a bipartisan effort by Senators from both parties on an emergency matter. I understand this amendment will be considered tomorrow under the agreement entered into today.

The purpose of the amendment is to give emergency assistance to medical schools of this country, many of which are in dire financial straits while at the same time we are facing a critical shortage of doctors.

I am certain that Senators have noticed the reports in the Washington Post in the last few days in connection with the dire financial straits of George Washington University, where they are being forced to close the teaching hospital and medical school there.

That situation is repeated in medical schools in Chicago, St. Louis and Cincinnati. There are a number of medical schools in very critical situations. Nearly all of the medical schools of this Nation are beleaguered by a gargantuan financial crisis. Quite literally, they have begun to feed off of themselves; that is, they are increasingly being forced to expend their endowments in order to keep from going under. An elementary knowledge of economics is enough to enable us to conclude that the policy can be sustained for only a short period of time.

If we are to have any hope of effectively grappling with the health care crisis which afflicts this country, it is essential that our academic medical centers be financially stable. We cannot expect those institutions to substantially expand their efforts, as they should, when they can barely keep their heads above water financially.

In response to that dilemma, the Senate in passing S. 3586, the Health Training Improvement Act of 1970, included a provision to establish a 1-year disaster relief program for medical schools in financial distress.

The principal author of that act was the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). That was to be a special, 1-year program designed to enable the medical schools to survive for 1 year. This was to be a special 1-year program of assistance. It was designed to allow them to survive for an additional year in anticipation of the renewal of the basic legislative authority for medical schools. In conference with the House, however, that proposed authority was deleted. However, the conferees did make two very important points:

(1) The Congress finds and declares that the Nation's economy, welfare, and security are adversely affected by the acute financial crisis which threatens the survival of medical and dental schools which provide the highest quality of teaching, medical and dental research, and delivery of health care for the Nation.

(2) Existing law authorizes appropriations up to \$168 million for formula grants and project grants to health professions schools covering a wide variety of purposes. The budget submitted by the Administration calls for the appropriation of \$113 million of these authorized amounts, leaving approximately \$55 million in authorization for appropriations for fiscal year 1971. Among the purposes for which funds may be appropriated pursuant to this remaining \$55 million authorization, as described in section 772 of the Public Health Service Act, are appropriations for providing assistance to "any such schools which are in serious financial straits to meet their costs of operation or which have special need for financial assistance to meet the accreditation requirements.

The conference substitute would provide authority to meet the purposes of the Senate amendment by providing that funds appropriated for fiscal year 1971 to meet the needs set out in the previously quoted language are authorized to remain available until expended, or until June 30, 1972, whichever first occurs. To the extent that funds are requested by the administration for this purpose, this authority will permit added flexibility in the use of these funds. The managers on the part of the House also wish to point out that section 601 of the Hospital Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970 will apply to funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization, and therefore are not subject to administrative cutbacks or withholding from expenditure, so that if appropriated, these funds will be used for aid to these schools.

Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, did not have these facts at the time it marked up the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. The Senate did not adopt the conference report on S. 3586 until October 14, the "11th hour" prior to its recess.

We could not get that conference report over to the Senate from the House until about 3 o'clock on the afternoon of the 14th. After the conference had completed its work on the 5th and 6th of October, the House declined to take it up until the 13th of October. So the Senate Appropriations Committee did not have the benefit of the action of the legislative committees. The House got it to us on the 13th of October. We passed it between 3 or 4 o'clock on the afternoon of the 14th of October.

The HEW appropriations bill had been reported out the day before. Had we benefit of the action of the legislative committees earlier, we might very well have revised substantially upward our appropriation under the existing authority.

The amendment now before this body is designed to make clear our commitment to stand behind these great centers of medical excellence. It raises the appropriation to the limit of the authorization, \$168 million. That amounts to an increase of about \$38 million above the committee's bill, to support medical schools in dire need. To do any less, amounts to nothing less than false econ-

omy. Imagine the costs associated with revitalizing these institutions after they have collapsed. The proposed course of action is, therefore, sound, and prudent, in accordance with the formula just given by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. It is sound and prudent, and will keep medical schools open and prevent the need for having to restore and revitalize and reopen them.

As chairman of the Health Subcommittee, in August I sent out an appeal asking the schools to increase their enrollments by 5 or 6 percent. They all responded that they already had increased them from 8,000 to 11,000. As chairman of the Health Subcommittee, I sent another appeal to the medical schools to increase the number of students from one to five. There are 134 counties in this country without a single medical doctor in them. One hundred schools responded by saying that they could not add one more student to the student body. I think they could have. I think we all realize they could have. But five medical schools added 15 students. That will help. It will mean 15 doctors practicing in 15 counties which presently have no medical doctors. But they all pleaded the dire need for such a program.

By following this course of action, it gives us an additional period of time in which we of necessity must address this problem on a far more comprehensive basis. Until then, however, this amendment averts disaster.

Mr. President, this amendment has bipartisan support. It makes sense. As the Senator from New Hampshire explained, this proposal is not intended to criticize the administration. This is a situation we are in. With the collapse of medical care and the shortage of personnel to administer the programs, I think there is a great need for this measure. So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cast their vote of confidence for medical education in America when the amendment is offered.

I am hopeful that the distinguished sponsor of the bill will consider the requests that came before us, after the appropriation bill had been reported, on the 13th. I am hopeful that he will accept the bipartisan amendment, which is sponsored by a number of Senators, when, at the appropriate time, it is offered.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I should like to take just a minute or two, if I may, to make a brief observation and ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question at this point.

I have been very much interested in the problem of the health manpower in the United States and am gravely concerned about providing an adequate supply of doctors and dentists for the Nation.

There is a crisis here in our National Capital for the schools of medicine at George Washington University and Georgetown University and the School of Dentistry at Georgetown University. The presidents of these universities have testified before Congress that they have exhausted their financial reserves in keeping these schools going and now are

into their endowments and that these endowments will be used up before the end of the present academic year.

The testimony given before our committee indicates the emergency nature of the situation which has developed. Many graduates of the schools in question are physicians in my own State of Delaware, and students from Delaware now attend these institutions; so I am very first-handly concerned.

Since the authorizing bill for the medical dental manpower bill for the District of Columbia of 1970, S. 3974, is still under consideration by Congress, some remedy must be found as an interim method of keeping these schools open until the authorization is passed.

These schools have demonstrated their critical need of \$6.2 million in order to stay in existence. My question to the Senator from Washington is, Is it the intent of the committee that funds would be made available to meet these applications?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that we increased the institutional amount by \$15.9 million, as he will recall, \$14 million can be used for these fine schools here, and other places. I must say for the RECORD that one of the reasons for the increase was the pressing need that existed and the testimony that we had in behalf of these schools, the Senator mentioned as well as others. The Senator from Texas and others have a similar amendment, which would add an increase of \$38 million to the \$14 million.

Of course, as the Senator knows, we could not single out any certain school. But a lot of our testimony was about the plight of these schools, and I am hopeful that this money will be used in the best possible way.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the distinguished chairman. As I understand it, the increase to the amount of \$14 million was made in view of the testimony and the evidence before our committee as to the need of these schools?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. And it was increased to that amount in order that it might be possible to take care of these schools?

Mr. MAGNUSON. And testimony as to several other schools throughout the Nation. I think the Senator from Texas had the figures. There is a substantial amount in there now. We will have to meet that problem, but the \$14 million additional for medical, dental, and related schools is in the bill now.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the chairman for his reply. It has been a privilege to serve on this subcommittee. I compliment the distinguished and able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the distinguished and able ranking minority member, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) for their devotion and dedication, and the long hours and consideration they have given to this bill. I think it is a good bill, and I am hopeful that, with due consideration, the Senate may proceed to move along and enact it in substantially its present form.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New Hampshire and I appreciate the

Senator's kind words, but we had to have a lot of help from the Senator from Delaware and others, because some days we got pretty exhausted. The Senator from Delaware was dedicated to this effort, as well as the Senator from Hawaii, who was at most of the meetings. Many of the Members obviously could not attend them all; there were too many hearings.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, for myself and my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), I submit an amendment to the pending Labor-HEW appropriations bill to provide \$15 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to convert the laboratories and related facilities at Fort Detrick, Frederick, Md., which have been used up to this time for purposes of biological warfare, into a comprehensive health research center.

As the Senator is well aware, President Nixon, in a historic declaration, has renounced biological warfare as an instrument of the policy of the United States. This amendment would enable the National Institutes of Health to assume operations at this unparalleled research installation. It would provide funds for about 700 scientific and support personnel, thus keeping together in national service the bulk of the exceptional research team assembled at Fort Detrick. Finally, the amendment would permit the Detrick team to proceed with vital health research for which they and their laboratories are uniquely qualified.

According to the National Institutes of Health, the research programs funded under this amendment would include slow virus disease research; studies on hepatitis, fungal diseases, and latent viruses in animals; tissue culture studies of genetic defects; laboratory support for the national dental caries program; broad research on diseases of the eye; and the study of cancer-producing and related viruses, viral oncology, and chemical carcinogenesis.

A table summarizing these programs and the personnel and facilities required was placed in the RECORD of August 13, 1970, by the senior Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) and may be found at pages 28703-28705 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I contend that this amendment gives contemporary meaning to the biblical injunction that man should beat his swords into plowshares. By adopting this amendment, the Senate can take a major step toward converting a major national scientific resource from the tasks of defense to a new, peaceful mission, devoted to the solution of our most pressing health problems.

It was on November 25, 1969, almost a year ago, that President Nixon announced his historic decision that the United States would renounce the first use of lethal chemical and biological warfare. Literally from that day to this I have been in frequent contact with the President's Science Advisor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Army, and other

officials, urging them to develop a plan for the use of these Detrick laboratories without delay.

As this planning proceeded, the Army cooperated to an encouraging extent by postponing several scheduled reductions-in-force so that the personnel at Detrick could be held together until studies of the Fort's potential and alternatives could be completed. This fall, however, budget considerations have compelled the Army to announce their intention to proceed with substantial RIF's unless funds can be secured to support comprehensive research programs there.

It would be extremely shortsighted and costly to the Nation to allow the tremendous resources of Fort Detrick to be undermined by further delay or indecision. Once scattered, the installation's unique research teams, with talent and experience in many scientific disciplines, could not be reassembled. The physical facilities of Detrick represent an investment of over \$200 million and could not be easily or cheaply duplicated anywhere else.

Conversion of Fort Detrick to health research, on the other hand, should be very easy. The type of defensive biological research conducted at this facility since World War II is very closely allied to peacetime health research, and Detrick personnel have already made countless contributions to science and medicine as byproducts of their defense efforts.

Representatives of NIH and many other Federal agencies have agreed that little or no modification of Detrick facilities would be required to initiate major new research programs there.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an inventory of scientific personnel now at Fort Detrick, and a summary of the potential contributions which this impressive facility and its team can make toward resolving our urgent national health and environmental problems.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, this amendment actually proposes a very modest national investment, compared with the great national benefits which the conversion of Fort Detrick will provide. Approval of this amendment would be a forward-looking action, totally consistent with the efforts of this Congress and this administration to reshape our national priorities in response to the Nation's domestic needs.

I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his hospitality to this amendment, and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the ranking minority member, for his kindness and courtesy on this and all other occasions. I urge their careful analysis of the amendment, and also urge the Member of the Senate to support it and enact it as a part of this appropriation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire and I had the staff inquire just what NIH would use this for, and they have a pretty detailed statement. Will the Senator put

it in the RECORD? If not, we will put it in the RECORD. It sets out the uses.

Mr. MATHIAS. I would be very grateful to the Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent that that statement be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. The intended uses will not duplicate anything that is going on now. They are in new fields which are set forth in the effect of the amendment.

Following the Senator's remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD a letter from the president of the department of bacteriology of the University of California, who is also on the board of directors of the American Society for Microbiology, setting forth what they would do.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is an exciting new field. It deals with slow virus disease research, animal holding facilities, the special study of hepatitis, virus and tissue culture in support of the dental caries program, broad research on eye diseases, and the study of cancer producing and related viruses. This is the exciting new field in cancer research—whether or not

viruses cause some types of cancer. They are zeroing in on research in the whole broad field of virus.

Mr. MATHIAS. As the distinguished chairman knows—and I am grateful to him for his comments—this laboratory, because of the nature of its previous use, has particular application to the areas of research that he has just reviewed—the area of cancer research; for example, in which, as we make further progress, the safety of laboratory personnel will be a factor. These laboratories are built for just that kind of research. I think it is important not only from a local point of view but also from a national point of view.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a rare occurrence for us in the Appropriations Committee, and particularly this committee, that we do have a chance to convert a technically fine laboratory, one of the finest in the world, from manufacturing things that are going to kill people to looking into something that is going to keep them alive.

Mr. MATHIAS. I agree with the chairman, and I hope the Senate will embrace this opportunity.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a rare opportunity for us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed.

EXHIBIT 1

		Degrees				
		Number	M.D.	VMD	Ph. D.	Masters
BIOLOGICAL SCIENTIST						
401	Biologist	7				3
401	Bioscience administrators	5			3	
403	Microbiologist	140	1	2	40	32
414	Entomologist	1			1	
430	Botanist	1				1
434	Plant pathologist	11			9	
435	Plant physiologist	5			5	
437	Horticulturist	3				
471	Agronomist	4			2	
MEDICAL SCIENTIST						
602	Medical officer	2		2		
610	Nurse	4				
701	Veterinary medical officer	4		4		
PHYSICAL SCIENTIST						
1301	Physical scientist	12			4	4
1306	Health physicist	1				
1310	Physicist	9				1
1320	Chemist	36			10	
1520	Mathematician	3				2
1529	Mathematical statistician	4			2	
1530	Statistician	1				
ENGINEERS						
801	General engineer	5				
810	Civil engineer	1				
830	Mechanical engineer	23				1
850	Electrical engineer	2				
855	Electronic engineer	2				
861	Aerospace engineer	1				1
893	Chemical engineer	18				2
Total						
			3	6	76	56

POTENTIAL FOR SOLVING CURRENT URGENT NATIONAL PROBLEMS

The inherent characteristics of the existing Detrick plant and the existing Detrick research team, together with the record of their past accomplishments, provide unequivocal evidence of their potential for solving current urgent national health and environmental problems.

In recent months, Detrick has been visited by representatives from a number of government agencies. All have indicated that work for their agencies could be done in Detrick facilities with little or no modification required. These agencies have included: Technical Services Division, Consumer Market-

ing Service, USDA; Food and Drug Administration; a panel from Dr. Emil M. Mrak's Advisory Committee on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health; Veterinary Biologics Division, USDA; Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Department of Interior; Environmental Health Service, USPHS; DHEW; National Cancer Institute and National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, NIH, DHEW; Communicable Disease Center, USPHS, DHEW; and Consumer Protection Division, USPHS, DHEW.

What are some of the areas in which Detrick can make contributions? Detrick can provide research facilities and a proven staff

for work in almost any field of biomedical and environmental interest to existing or new Federal agencies that currently lack either the personnel or facilities to pursue assigned programs. A few representative examples follow:

Studies of the "slow virus" diseases of animals which apparently have counterparts in and may be transmissible to humans.

Studies with hazardous virus diseases, such as hepatitis, diseases transmitted by insects; hemorrhagic fevers, including exotic viruses like the Lassa virus, which caused a number of deaths among unprotected investigators in Africa and which infected several U.S. investigators who were working with the virus in this country.

Use of the available pilot plant and cell culture facilities to obtain large quantities of their by-products such as proteins and nucleic acids.

Cancer Research: One of the hopeful National goals is the elimination of cancer as a major disease during the 1970s. Detrick facilities and personnel are eminently suited for contributing to such research. Pilot plant facilities can provide the basic prerequisite, large-scale cell culture production, not only for the propagation of potential cancer-producing viruses but also for the study of tissue cell and virus genetics. Additionally, the Detrick professional staff includes a number of virologists and geneticists who have been collaborating with their colleagues at the National Cancer Institute in this field.

Infectious Disease: Detrick facilities have been expressly designed for infectious disease research and its staff has over a quarter of a century's experience in this field. Effective utilization of Detrick's resources in this field require nothing in the way of facilities modification or research staff supplementation. It could, for example, undertake immediate research on cholera, which has recently seen a worldwide resurgence. It also has substantial experience in, and the necessary facilities for the laboratory investigation of vaccination by aerosols.

Ecological & Environmental Problems: Detrick's personnel and facilities are readily adaptable to work on current problems in these fields. For example, without any modification of facilities or change in the research staff, Detrick could pursue studies of: atmospheric pollution and methods to detect it; soil pollution by pesticides; automobile pollution abatement; water pollution by human wastes, detergents, and pesticides; the development of environmental quality standards; the long- and short-term effects of radiation pollution; and the assessment of human, animal, and plant damage from environmental pollutants.

EXHIBIT 2

EFFECT OF AMENDMENT TO H.R. 18518

This amendment would allow the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—in particular, the National Institutes of Health—to assume operation of the main research and development area and adjacent animal facilities located at Frederick, Maryland, which has become surplus to the needs of the Department of Defense. The conversions of these special scientific facilities to peacetime biomedical research would provide a capability for badly needed investigations to advance the state of the Nation's health. Programs would include "Slow Virus" Disease Research; Animal Holding Facilities; Studies on Hepatitis, Fungal Diseases and Latent Viruses in Animals; Tissue Culture Studies on Genetic Defects; Support of National Dental Caries Program; Broad Research on Diseases of the Eye; Production of Senescent Animals Needed in Aging Research; and Study of Cancer-Producing and Related Viruses, Viral Oncology and Chemical Carcinogenesis.

The operating and servicing costs of these programs for a full-year would be \$15 million.

SUMMARY—ESTIMATED NIH SPACE AND FUND REQUIREMENTS AT FORT DETRICK

[Dollars in thousands]

Space needed	Square footage	Annual cost				1st year cost—Jan. 1-June 30, 1971					
		Personal services		Other costs	Total costs	Personal services		Non-recurring costs	Other costs	Total costs	
		Positions	Amount			Positions	Amount				
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES											
1. "Slow virus" disease research—Studies on certain animal diseases having apparent counterparts in human infection, in facilities having adequate provision to protect the staff. Investigations will involve naturally occurring slow viral diseases of animals, to ascertain whether these viruses are the cause of certain chronic diseases of man. Scrapie and progressive pneumonia of sheep, Aleutian mink disease, and encephalopathy of mink are the currently known animal diseases in this category. Studies will include isolation and characterization of etiologic agents, the mechanisms of infections, pathologic processes, and immunologic mechanisms. Human specimens from patients with comparable chronic diseases will be included in the studies. Characteristic also of such studies is the need of secure facilities for the long-term holding of experimental animals from rodents to primates.	Building No. 560	130,155	20	\$240	\$130	\$370	20	\$90	\$13	\$60	\$163
2. Hazardous virologic research—Studies on virologic diseases, the agents that are dangerous to the health and lives of the staff and require containment facilities for the holding of experimental animals. The projects selected are those infectious disease studies which have been handicapped or in some cases almost impossible, due to a lack of suitable biohazard containment facilities. Projects will include (1) Hepatitis—the recent discovery of the Australian antigen has stimulated research interest in this important disease; (2) Arboviruses—this large group of viruses includes a number that are highly infectious to man requiring special containment facilities, in addition, comprehensive studies with many strains present problems of preventing cross contamination; (3) Hemorrhagic fever and other exotic viruses—studies of these viruses in segregated suites of laboratory and animal holding facilities will avoid unfortunate fatality experiences such as those with the Marburg, and Lassa viruses; and (4) Exotic agents of unknown pathogenicity—newly discovered agents, and usually viruses, are recovered from animals and man which turn out to be more hazardous than anticipated.	Building No. 539	96,778	55	660	581	1,241	55	255	55	200	510
Ability to study such new agents immediately, safely, and effectively is of utmost importance.	Building No. 376; building No. 539.	25,000	35	420	400	820	35	150	45	180	375
3. Other research requiring special facilities—Studies in this area are characterized by their need for facilities that protect the staff from the organism being studied, protect the experiments from contamination, require aerosol and controlled environment equipment, and provide for long-term holding of experimental animals in protected facilities. Studies will include viral respiratory disease research, special research in tuberculosis, and research on antiviral substances including interferon and interferon inducers.	Building No. 560	10	120	78	198	10	50	10	30	90	
4. Supporting—Laboratory direction and administrative support for the above three programs, increased staff in the office of the Institute Director, and the maintenance of the agent, storage and distribution facility.	Total NIAID programs	251,933	120	1,140	1,189	2,629	120	545	123	470	1,138
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASE AND STROKE											
1. Relocate the Patuxent Laboratory—with its "slow virus research" program. There are 12 positions and \$200,000 in the 1971 budget for this program. No additional funds or positions are being requested.	Laboratory Animal	6,500 7,000									
2. Relocate animal holding facilities—There is \$300,000 in the 1971 budget which supports animal holding contracts. The efforts could be moved to Fort Detrick, but only with the provision that the positions would be made available to perform the services. No additional funds are needed at this time.	Laboratory Animal	5,000 17,000	15					15			
3. Epidemiological and infectious disease studies—Studies of the immuno-pathogenesis of subacute sclerosing panencephalitis, multiple sclerosis, and Creutzfeld-Jacob disease, etc., and of the role of simultaneous chronic virus infections in such diseases.	Laboratory Animal	200 3,300	6	72	8	80	6	24	7	4	35
4. Genetic engineering research—Utilizing the tissue culture and fermentation facilities, take over the ongoing Fort Detrick operation. Utilizing the knowledge, skill, and facilities of a group of geneticists and tissue culture specialists now at Detrick, change their direction of research to health-related studies toward the curing of hereditary diseases by genetic transfer.	Building No. 376; building No. 539.	15,000	14	168	112	280	14	84	76	160	
Total NINDS programs		54,000	35	240	120	360	35	108	7	80	195
DIVISION OF BIOLOGICS STANDARDS											
1. Study hepatitis in primates, smallpox and monkey pox, tuberculosis and B.C.G. and other vaccines, fungal diseases, plague and tetanus, cytomegaloviruses, and latent viruses in animals used as the sources of cells for vaccine development. Utilize facilities for large-scale tissue culture production. Acquire expertise on problems involving the possible oncogenic viruses of human beings and the "slow" viruses.	Laboratory Animal Contamination Office Cold storage Also animal center space. Building No. 539.	6,800 6,800 1,000 1,500 4,000	41	492	208	700	41	127	20	78	225
Total DBS		20,100	41	492	208	700	41	127	20	78	225

[Dollars in thousands]

Space needed	Annual cost					1st year cost—Jan. 1–June 30, 1971					
	Square footage	Personal services		Other costs	Total costs	Personal services		Nonre- curr- ing costs	Other costs	Total costs	
		Positions	Amount			Positions	Amount				
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASES											
1. Large-scale pilot plant production of bacteria and viruses, and from these and from normal animal tissues the isolation of large quantities of pure proteins and nucleic acids (such as DNA, the genetic material).	Building No. 431.....	25,600	45	\$540	\$540	\$1,080	45	\$145	\$100	\$215	\$460
Building No. 470.....	37,600										
Building No. 472.....	6,500										
2. Tissue culture—It is now possible to grow outside the body tissues from patients with diseases of genetic origin. Detrick's facilities are outstanding for this purpose. When these human tissues are grown in the test tube, it is usually possible to pinpoint the exact chemical defect which causes the disease; and these cultures provide a rapid and convenient means of evaluating possible treatments.		15	180	180	360	15	60	50	60	170	
Total NIAMD programs.....		69,700	60	720	720	1,440	60	205	150	275	630
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH											
1. Laboratory research and control activity in support of national caries program—A new laboratory base must be created in support of the national caries program. Enlarged microbiological facilities are needed where the identification, characterization and manipulation of microorganisms known or thought to be pathogenic in the caries process can be performed. Large volumes of oral plaque samples can be microbiologically screened. Of equal importance to adequate laboratory support for the National Caries Program would be facilities and resources for biochemical and chemical analyses, especially those relating to trace elements in tooth samples and body fluids. Elimination of dental caries is primary; however, the need to remedy the ravages of dental disease in the existing population is needed. The Detrick primate facilities have great potential for use in screening candidate material for implants.	Building 560.....	5,000	20	240	340	580	20	108	30	140	277
2. Viral etiology of oral soft tissue lesions—Research relating to the role of viruses in the etiology and pathogenesis of infection. Focused new studies concern (1) the viral etiology of aphthous ulcers of the mouth, and (2) systematic exploration of possible viral etiology of oral tumors, particularly defining the oncogenic impact of herpes simplex.	Building 560.....	9,000	10	120	200	320	10	52	20	85	157
Total NIDR programs.....		14,000	30	360	540	900	30	160	50	225	434
NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE											
1. Laboratory for animal models of diseases of visual system—Simulating a number of diseases of the eye and visual system in experimental animals, study in mechanism of these diseases in animals which have a counterpart in man, including retinitis pigmentosa in C ₅₇ BL strain mice, galactose cataracts in weanling rats, glaucoma in congenital buphthalmic rabbits, etc. Develop new animal models for other diseases in man such as diabetic retinopathy, retinal detachment, and uveitis.	Animal space building 1021-1040-1043-1049.	3,825	8	60	150	210	8	20	18	65	10
2. Laboratory for ocular tissue research—Establish a regional distribution point for biological material used in vision research utilizing the large abattoir in Frederick which would result in having available large quantities of purified photopigments and enzymes from ocular tissues.	(2) Cold rooms (2) laboratories building 560.	900	6	68	67	135	6	24		35	59
3. Tissue and organ culture laboratory—Recent advances in growing cornea and retina in tissue culture as well as the organ culture of lens make possible the study of such disease processes as herpes complex keratitis, retinoblastoma *** cataracts. The availability of *** ocular tissue from the *** in Frederick and the isolation and decontamination facilities at Detrick makes this type of research possible.	(3) Laboratories building 560.	1,350	4	58	47	105	4	24		21	45
4. Regional toxicology unit-mechanism and treatment—Establish the first facility in the *** where vision research is being conducted in the broad area of toxicology of air pollutants, household plants, insecticides, herbicides, *** and medicinals. The aerosol units and other specialized *** devices for the handling of *** materials *** are available at Detrick for performing this type of research.	(6) Laboratories animal operating room building	2,700 900 450	9	121	195	316	9	55	20	30	155
Total NEI programs.....		10,125	27	307	459	766	27	123	38	201	362
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT											
1. Gerontological research—Establish a source for senescent animals critical to the goals of the Gerontology Research Center. Such sources are unavailable at this time. The ability to support species other than rats in an outside facility would provide major assistance and permit full activation of the gerontological program.	Building 539.....	539	6,000	15	111	34	145	15	48		15
Total NICHD programs.....		6,000	15	111	34	145	15	48		15	68
NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE											
1. Engineering and consultation for containment of bio-hazards—To provide consultation in the effective utilization of facilities, equipment and procedures for containment of biohazards to assure that investigators are following optimal procedures of safety.	Building 560.....	13,500	21	252	248	500	21	105	30	98	238
2. Tissue culture requirements of cells for optimal virus production.	Joint use of space with NIAMD in buildings 431, 470 and 472.		5	60	90	150	5	16	10	25	50
3. Large-scale production of suspect viral tumor agents.....		+18	216	284	500	18	60	30	70	160	
4. Purification of viral reagents.....		+15	180	220	400	15	54	30	60	140	
Total NCI programs.....		13,500	59	708	842	1,550	59	235	100	253	588

SUMMARY—ESTIMATED NIH SPACE AND FUND REQUIREMENTS AT FORT DETRICK—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Space needed	Square footage	Annual cost			1st year cost—Jan. 1-June 30, 1971						
		Personal services		Other costs	Total costs	Personal services		Nonrecurring costs	Other costs	Total costs	
		Positions	Amount			Positions	Amount				
CENTRAL SUPPORT SERVICES											
1. Research services—This would include production and long-term holding of animals inoculated with hazardous infectious agents; increased production of bacteriological and tissue culture media; development of new approaches in the detection and containment of bio-aerosols, viruses, infectious agents and isotopes; medical library services; medical arts and photography services; and fabrication and maintenance of research equipment.	Shop space in building 1054 plus program space in various buildings listed above.	30	\$240	\$760	\$1,000	30	\$120	\$80	\$380	\$580	
2. Engineering Services—This would include utilities service; building maintenance and alteration; shops service; and grounds and road maintenance.	Same as above.	205	1,640	2,540	4,180	205	820	500	1,270	2,590	
3. Administrative Services—This would include communications; fire protection and guard service; transportation service; custodial service; supply operations; and property management.	Same as above.	65	520	300	820	65	260	40	150	450	
Total support services.		300	2,400	3,600	6,000	300	1,200	620	1,800	3,620	
Subtotal—Operating cost.		687	6,778	7,712	14,490	687	2,751	1,108	3,397	7,256	
Repair and improvements (Buildings and facilities)—This item includes general repair and improvement of a recurring nature such as roofing, painting, laboratory facilities, utility repairs, etc.			500	500				300			
Total.		1,439,358	687	6,778	8,212	14,990	687	2,751	1,108	3,697	7,256

¹ Laboratory space only.**EXHIBIT 3****AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR MICROBIOLOGY,**
*Davis, Calif., October 12, 1970.***Hon. WARREN MAGNUSON,**
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: As you know, the former biological warfare station of the Department of Defense known as Fort Detrick and located in Frederick, Maryland, is an important biological research facility with a large and most capable staff of microbiologists and other scientists. Over the years, since World War II, Fort Detrick has contributed materially, not only to the security of the United States, but also to progress in public health, to developments in fermentation processes, and to unique concepts in apparatus and laboratory design. Fort Detrick is now being gradually reduced in staff, and we may look forward to the loss of a facility with unique human resources and unusual physical equipment.

Many agencies and groups have studied the Fort Detrick situation with a view to its redeployment for research and development directed towards peaceful uses. The most likely successor to the Department of Defense is the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, since the Fort Detrick establishment is particularly adapted to biochemical and related research. The problem, however, is one of funding. Unless supplemental funding is provided for the Department of Education, Health and Welfare specifically for maintaining this unique facility, the NIH and its parent, HEW, will not be able to assume operation of Fort Detrick, since they are unlikely to divert monies from other important and established programs for this purpose.

Now a rider has been added to the Senate Appropriations Bill for HEW and Labor, through the initiative of Senator Tydings of Maryland, which will provide the funding necessary to continue a program at Fort Detrick in the interests of the public health, although, of course, at a reduced scale. It is most important that this amendment be incorporated and approved as part of the appropriation to HEW. Our country can ill afford the loss of a unique team which has been assembled at Fort Detrick, and it seems folly to close these unusual and uniquely equipped laboratories which are the product of more than 25 years of careful and continuous development.

From your comments at the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee hearings on the HEW and Labor Budget I am confident of your support of domestic health-related research and hope that you see in the Tydings amendment an opportunity to further this work. I was also much pleased to know that you are in communication with a mutual friend who is doing so much for the development of science in the Seattle area, Dr. Dixie Lee Ray.

As a native of Washington may I express my admiration and appreciation of your admirable representation of our state over such a long period in the Senate.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. HUNGATE.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE FUNDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-419)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWEIKER) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In today's world, peace is synonymous with the strength of America and her friends.

Economic and military assistance to free nations willing to defend themselves is central to our new conception of American leadership for the 1970's and is crucial to America's hope of working with other nations to bring about the preconditions for peace in the world.

In my February 1970 Foreign Policy Message, I reported that it was our goal to reduce the level of our direct involvements abroad as the capability of friend-

ly nations to provide for defense of our mutual interests increases. At that time I sought the cooperation of the Congress in this task. The provision of support for our friends is a key element in our national security policy. Such support is essential if our policy is to succeed. This is why I ask today for a supplemental appropriation of economic and military assistance funds.

The first six decades of the Twentieth Century taught us that a stable and tranquil world requires American participation in keeping the peace. For us to abdicate that responsibility would be to magnify the world's instability and turmoil for us as well as for our friends, and American strength remains one pillar of our foreign policy.

The United States is not going to withdraw from the world. But times are changing; for us to fulfill our responsibility now, we must link our efforts more closely with those of our friends to build the foundations of peace.

The decade of the 1960's taught us that it is neither necessary, nor even possible, for the United States to bear the principal burden for the defense or economic progress of all our allies and friends. They are now ready and willing to assume an increasing share of the burden for their own defense, and are developing the strength to do so—but they will continue to need our help as they move toward ultimate self-reliance.

The free world looks to this kind of American leadership in the 1970s. It is an American contribution which will encourage and enable other nations to do their part. It is a role for the United States in the world which will enlist the support of the American people, and which America can—and must—sustain.

It is in America's national interest to support the growing efforts of our friends. The overwhelming evidence of the last 25 years—from the Marshall Plan to Vietnamization—is that a systematic program that helps other nations

harness their own resources for defense and development enables them to take on the primary burden of their own defense.

Helping countries that demonstrate the capability to help themselves enables us to reduce our direct overseas involvement; it eases our budgetary and balance of payments burdens; and it lessens the likelihood of the engagement of American forces.

We are already carrying out this policy. Since I took office, we have already lowered our military presence abroad:

—Already, 68 installations abroad have been closed, and 44 more have been reduced.

—By next spring, under present plans, the total number of American military personnel overseas will be at least 300,000 below the number that were abroad in January of 1969.

But our national security requires that we provide friendly nations the military and economic assistance they need to defend themselves.

The change that the Nixon Doctrine calls for—from bearing the primary responsibility ourselves to enabling our friends to shoulder it much more themselves—is not a simple one to carry out. We must make this change in a way that permits our friends to adjust materially and psychologically to the new form and content of American support.

If we were to shift too quickly, without offsetting with assistance what we are taking away in direct American involvement, we would risk undermining their self-confidence. If we were to change too slowly, bearing too much of the burden ourselves too long, we would risk eroding their incentives for self-reliance.

In either case, we would fail to provide our friends with the means and confidence to help themselves, and we might ultimately face the dilemma of either letting down or asserting a direct presence ourselves.

In the Middle East, we see how crucial it is to preserve the military balance so that those who are already willing and able to defend themselves can continue to do so. The interest of all nations would be best served by limiting the shipment of arms to that explosive region, but until this objective can be achieved, we must help prevent a shift in the military balance that would undermine the chances for peace.

In the Middle East and elsewhere, we must strike a careful balance. While we must understand the limitations of our assistance, we must never underestimate its critical value in achieving and preserving such balance.

The supplemental program which I submit today will help achieve this balance, by responding to critical needs that have arisen since my original request for 1971 foreign assistance funds.

1. MIDDLE EAST

Nowhere is our support more necessary or more closely linked with our efforts to achieve peaceful solutions than in the Middle East. Peace will come to the Middle East when all parties feel secure from the threat of military dominance and

recognize that the only permanent way to resolve deep-seated differences is by negotiation and never by war.

We must now act to preserve the delicate military balance in this area, which will encourage those negotiations leading to peace.

A. ISRAEL

Israel has demonstrated a strong will to survive in freedom. We had hoped that recent agreements and arrangements in the Middle East would lead toward peace and make it unnecessary to provide large amounts of military assistance to any of the belligerents in the area. This hope has not yet been realized.

Continued large scale shipments of military equipment by the Soviet Union are a fact that cannot be denied. The buildup of the surface-to-air missile complex in the cease-fire zone west of the Suez Canal, in disregard of the cease-fire stillstand agreement, requires us to redress the imbalance it has caused.

As authorized by the Defense Procurement Act, *I request that the Congress appropriate \$500 million to provide Israel with the credits that will assist her in the financing of purchases of equipment that have been necessary to maintain her defense capability, and to ease the economic strain caused by her expanded military requirements.*

B. JORDAN

A stable and viable Jordan is essential if that nation is to make a positive contribution toward working out an enduring peace settlement which would serve the interests of all nations in the Middle East. The Jordanian government has recently demonstrated its determination and capacity to resist aggression by forces which oppose a peace settlement and threaten to weaken the stability of that country. But Jordan, which has previously paid for its military equipment, cannot afford to meet this new defense burden and has asked us for assistance. *I request that the Congress provide \$30 million toward meeting Jordan's request.*

C. LEBANON

Lebanon, which has also been threatened, has taken a moderate stance and a positive approach in the search for peace. To assist Lebanon to maintain a stable domestic base for responsible engagement in the search for peace, *I request the Congress to appropriate \$5 million toward meeting Lebanon's request.*

2. EAST ASIA

In July 1969, on my trip through Asia, I reaffirmed our determination to provide security support, while calling upon countries which receive our assistance to assume the primary responsibility for their own defense. Equally important, I emphasized the need to provide the help essential for such nations to assume this responsibility quickly. While reducing the direct participation of our forces we must help these other countries develop the capability to carry out the increased responsibilities they are assuming.

In Asia, this approach has provided the basis for a major reduction in our military presence as well as major long-

term budgetary and balance-of-payments savings. Authorized troop levels have been reduced by:

—165,000 in Vietnam; further reductions of 100,000 will be accomplished by next spring;

—20,000 in Korea;

—6,000 in Thailand; further reductions of 9,800 are in process;

—6,000 in the Philippines.

Let us look at the countries in Asia where our help is required as nations move toward greater self-reliance.

A. VIETNAM

United States troop withdrawals in Vietnam mean a reduction in the amount of dollars spent by the Department of Defense, and by our soldiers in Vietnam; and these dollars have been an essential factor in that country's economic stability.

Anticipating that Vietnam would require additional funds this year, my budget message suggested that an extra \$100 million might be required. *I am now requesting an amount smaller than that—\$65 million—but I regard this smaller sum as most important in insuring the success of our Vietnamization program.* It is important because:

The Vietnamese, with United States encouragement, have recently begun a significant set of economic reforms which can be effective only if the stability of the Vietnamese economy is maintained.

The Vietnamese economy will bear an increasing burden of defense as United States troops are removed. That burden could create economic disruption to the point that it would jeopardize that nation's stability, thereby threatening the progress of Vietnamization and future troop withdrawals.

B. CAMBODIA

The operations in the Cambodian border sanctuaries in May and June helped assure the continued success of Vietnamization and of our troop withdrawal programs. As we knew at the time would be the case, the operations seriously impaired the enemy's ability to operate in South Vietnam, and contributed to the progress which has reduced our casualties there to the lowest level since 1965. Continuing operations by South Vietnamese and Cambodian forces in the border areas will make possible continued progress.

Cambodia itself has mobilized its own manpower and resources in defense of its independence and neutrality. The Cambodian armed forces have grown from some 40,000 before North Vietnam's invasion in April to more than 150,000 today. It is essential that we supplement Cambodia's own efforts by providing resources which are critically needed to enable it to continue to defend itself. Its ability to do so is a vital element in the continued success of Vietnamization.

Cambodia's needs have been urgent, and as Congress has been informed, I have directed that funds be transferred from other already severely limited programs to meet these critical needs. *I am*

requesting \$100 million to restore funds to such vital programs as those for Taiwan, Greece and Turkey.

The need for these programs—to support our NATO allies and to assure stability in the Mediterranean and in East Asia—are no less urgent today than when I originally requested the funds to implement them; it was only because of the extraordinary urgency of Cambodia's needs that I directed this temporary transfer.

To meet Cambodia's urgent needs for the remainder of this fiscal year, I request that the Congress provide \$155 million in new funds to be directly allocated to the Cambodian program (\$70 million for economic support; and \$85 million for military assistance). Seventy percent of the military assistance will be for ammunition.

C. KOREA

I have announced our intentions to reduce by 20,000 the authorized level of United States forces in the Republic of Korea. This has placed a greater defense burden on the Koreans.

Our present assistance to Korea is mostly in the form of operation and maintenance items for their military forces. These items do not help to modernize the Korean force structure as we must do if we are to help Korea improve its own defense capability. I therefore request authority to transfer to Korea equipment currently being utilized by United States forces scheduled to be withdrawn.

Additional assistance is required this year as part of Korea's major five-year program to modernize its defense forces and to enable it to effectively meet outside threats as we reduce the level of direct U.S. involvement. These funds are needed now to insure that the needed equipment will be delivered in good time. I request that the Congress provide \$150 million in support of this modernization of South Korea's defense.

3. OTHER PROGRAMS

There are two additional needs for the military assistance program that have arisen since the Congress considered my request earlier in the year.

First, I directed that the Indonesian program be increased by \$13 million from the previous level of \$5 million for fiscal year 1971. Indonesia—with its population of over 110 million—occupies a key position for the future peace of Southeast Asia, and has shown a strong determination to resist threats to its security and stability. It is in our interest to support such encouraging developments in a nation which can play a key role in the stability of its entire region.

Second, anticipated recoveries of funds from past years' programs in various parts of the world are not materializing; a shortage of \$17 million in these resources is now expected. These funds are needed to continue our assistance programs at necessary levels, and have been recognized as such by the Congress. Any shortfalls in these recoveries therefore would require reductions in already severely limited programs, and must be offset.

I request that this \$30 million be re-

stored to the military assistance program.

The funds requested represent a considerable sum. But the growing strength of our friends and their willingness to accept a greater responsibility for their own defense will mean increased effectiveness of our own efforts, and a lessened possibility that our men will have to risk their lives in future conflicts.

At this time, in light of certain extraordinary needs and in order to continue the success of the approach outlined in the Nixon Doctrine, we must provide additional resources to those of our friends whose security is threatened. The expenditures are essential to the support of our national security goals and our foreign policy interests, as we reduce our direct involvement abroad.

We must signal clearly to the world, to those who threaten freedom as well as those who uphold freedom, that where our interests are involved the United States will help those who demonstrate their determination to defend themselves. Our foreign policy cannot succeed without clear evidence that we will provide such help.

I believe the American people deeply understand the need for secure friends and allies to provide the foundation for a stable peace.

I believe the American people are prepared to accept the costs of assistance to these nations, to reduce the political and economic costs of maintaining a direct United States presence overseas—and thereby to avoid a possible cost of American lives.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 18, 1970.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL- FARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18515) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at the outset I want to commend the senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) for the excellent bill which his committee has developed on Labor-HEW-OEO appropriations. As usual, Senator MAGNUSON has given close and thorough attention to every important program in this bill, and the Appropriations Committee has strengthened the bill considerably by adding vitally needed money to most of the underfunded programs. The ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), has also contributed to substantially improving H.R. 18515 in committee.

Mr. President, I had the privilege of presenting testimony to the Appropriations Subcommittee on this legislation.

I appreciate the consideration which was given, and I am pleased that several of my recommendations have been adopted in committee. Rather than going through the bill in detail at this

point, I would like to discuss some of the major concerns I have in the context of H.R. 18515.

First, in the area of health services, I am pleased that the committee increased funds for the community mental health centers by \$20 million. The program has been enormously successful, and these increases will permit some of the needed expansion.

The committee bill also increases the funds for the regional medical program by over \$18 million.

RMP is designed to bring the results of medical research closer to the local practitioner and his patients. The regional program has completed its planning stage and is now moving into the operational stage in high gear. A substantial increase in operational funds is required if the program is to meet its promise but no such increase is being requested by the administration. In my opinion, the regional medical program has demonstrated its value. It deserves to be adequately funded.

In the area of drug abuse and dependence, the committee has accepted modest increases above the administration request. I commend the committee for its interest. And I would like to emphasize that subsequent to initial consideration of H.R. 18515 Congress enacted into law a drug control bill which includes authorizations for special and emergency projects in the area of rehabilitation, treatment, and prevention. This is only a modest program—nowhere near as comprehensive as the programs in S. 3562, which is currently on the calendar—but I would hope that funds could be provided perhaps in a supplemental appropriation later this year. I know that several of the members of the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics feel that this would be appropriate, and we are considering an amendment at a later time.

Also in the area of health services, I am pleased to note that the committee increased funds for the migrant health program.

This is a relatively modest program through which the health needs of many of our migrant agricultural workers are met. At present, however, less than one-third of the migrants have access to these programs of health care. Recognizing the need for increased funding Congress amended the Public Health Service Act this year to authorize the appropriation of \$20 million for fiscal year 1971. Nevertheless, the administration requested only \$15 million—the same amount as was appropriated last year.

I also appreciate the committee's prompt and constructive action in response to the recent enactment of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1970 which I sponsored. This act extends and expands the Federal programs for mentally retarded persons. It was just signed into law on October 30—but the committee recognized how pressing the needs were and responded with modest funding.

Second, I commend Senator MAGNUSON and his committee for their sensitivity to the needs for health research.

I am convinced that America as a Nation is not committing a sufficient pro-

portion of its resources to health research. To illustrate, it is enough to look at what is perhaps the most feared disease in our society today—cancer. In 1969, 323,000 Americans died of cancer. This figure for just 1 year, is seven times the number of our combat fatalities in the entire 9 years of the Vietnam war.

We spend billions on the war, but only a pittance to fight cancer. On an annual per capita basis, we spend about \$125 on the war for every man, woman, and child in America, while our per capita expenditure for cancer research is only 87 cents. Indeed, we spend \$19.50 per person on space research to land three men on the moon, but only 87 cents per person to save 300,000 men from cancer. The same unhappy comparisons can also be made for heart disease and many of the other killer diseases that plague our society.

We simply cannot continue our present unwise allocation of resources. The list of examples of misdirected Government spending and short-changed health programs is almost endless. It is clear that we must begin to align our priorities in a more effective manner, and I can think of no more suitable starting place than the lifesaving medical research supported by the National Institutes of Health.

The sad fact is that NIH research appropriations have leveled off over the past 4 years, after rising substantially during the early 1960's. For fiscal year 1969, the total appropriation for NIH research institutes was \$1,090 billion. Last year the appropriation was down to \$1,028 billion and subsequently, HEW announced its intention of actually spending \$55 million less than this amount. For fiscal 1971, the Nixon administration requested only \$1,032 billion, or essentially the same amount that was appropriated last year.

This apparent leveling off of funding actually represents a sharp decline in Federal support for medical research. The major factor is inflation. It has been conservatively estimated that the cost of conducting medical research is now increasing at the rate of 10 percent per year. Thus, even for the research community simply to stand still with respect to NIH-financed research, the NIH budget should be increased by 10 percent per year. In fact, however, because of inflation, the administration's budget request is the equivalent of imposing a 10-percent cut on research funds.

The current cutbacks in medical research represent a national crisis of immense magnitude. NIH-financed researchers are now fighting a life and death struggle for their scientific lives.

The committee recognizes these needs and took steps to meet them. The bill as reported out contains an additional \$57.5 million for research and treatment centers of the National Institutes of Health. This is far less than needed, but certainly a strong improvement.

Third, I am pleased that the committee has responded partially to our health manpower needs.

One program that lies at the heart of the health manpower crisis is the program of direct loans to students in the health professions. Young Americans in these schools are attempting to secure

the professional training necessary for a lifetime of service to their fellow men. We cannot afford to allow even one of these students to drop out of his studies merely because he lacks the financial resources to complete his training.

Time and again in recent years, students of the health professions have shown their willingness to borrow money to complete their training and then pay back these loans, with interest, after they have begun to earn their living. The schools have requested more than \$43 million in loan funds for fiscal year 1971. The Health Manpower Act of 1968 authorized the appropriation of \$35 million for loans to medical students. Even if fully funded, this amount would cover only 75 percent of the requests already made for such loans. Tragically, the administration is requesting only a fraction of the amount necessary—just \$12 million—for this crucial program.

I would say, Mr. President, at this point, that I think any review of student attendance in many of our greatest medical schools today would show, tragically, that usually only those who are the most well-off financially are able to attend the medical schools. That is really a great tragedy. Even when making funds available for loans, we will be virtually compelling many of our youngest and finest students, in order to gain access to the schools, to commit themselves to years of paying back their loans. What's more, this comes at a time when many of our youngest medical students are moving from the highly skilled areas of practice into the delivery of health services.

Recently, I was amazed to read a poll taken of students in the medical schools in Massachusetts and to see the contrast in the nature of the medical profession over the period of the past 3 to 5 years. Now young medical students are much more interested in going into the delivery of health services rather than into the specialization area—where it is much more lucrative, of course, but perhaps not nearly so satisfying.

What we are doing is placing additional burdens on the young students who are having to borrow the money and thereby go into sizable debt if they want to work in the areas of greatest health need. We are placing additional restrictions on them at the very time when there is a tremendous demand in the medical profession for doctors and technicians to go into the disadvantaged areas of the country, more so than into the traditional and specialized areas which are lucrative and would make it easier for these young students to pay back their loans. So we are penalizing them additionally.

So the Appropriations Committee deserves to be very much commended for making important restoration of funding in this area.

The committee brought the direct loan program up to \$33.5 million, and increased all health student assistance by a total of over \$18 million.

I am hoping that on the floor the committee will also be favorably disposed to an amendment sponsored by myself and several colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to provide emergency relief in the form of

institutional funds for medical and dental schools in financial distress.

Mr. President, let me now turn to the OEO appropriation. We once more are faced with the need to strip away political rhetoric and demonstrate whether or not the Congress of the United States is ready to meet its responsibilities to all of its citizens. This Nation is the wealthiest in the world, with a gross national product which continues to climb over \$900 billion. Our median family income is now over \$8,000 a year and the majority of our citizens are surrounded by the trappings of affluence—60 million automobiles, 70 million television sets, and so on.

Despite our aggregate prosperity and national wealth, however, there remains the unpleasant fact that 25 million Americans live in poverty—lacking the proper food, clothing, shelter, and medical care which most of us take for granted, and locked out from the education and training opportunities that could lead to a better life.

For the past 5 years, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been far ahead of the remaining Federal Establishment in searching for ways to end the misery of poverty. Many of its programs have become the symbols of our Nation's commitment to eradicate the fear and reality of poverty. Headstart, Concentrated Employment, Legal Services, neighborhood health centers—these programs do more than simply provide vital, long-sought services to the Nation's poor. They contain requirements for the maximum participation of the poor, which at least create a basis for the involvement of the poor in the decisions over their own destiny.

In the Nation, 11 million Americans have escaped poverty since 1965. OEO programs have played a key role in yielding those results.

In Massachusetts, community action agencies such as ABCD in Boston have provided ways for poor people to define their need for themselves. Their decisions have taken form and shape in the counseling, job training, education and health programs operated by this community action agency.

In Boston's Columbia Point housing project 6,000 persons receive comprehensive medical care at a neighborhood health center. In Springfield, the concentrated employment program provides Spanish-speaking participants with English literacy courses as well as the job skills that will enable them to obtain better jobs and employment.

In Cambridge and close to a dozen other Massachusetts communities, legal service projects have established strong advocates on behalf of the poor in their dealings with the law. A statewide experimental defender program in criminal law, as well as extremely successful research and demonstration projects on poverty law, have given thousands of persons legal assistance that they could not otherwise afford.

For East Boston and Roxbury, special impact programs have meant the real possibility of a comprehensive development plan, designed and implemented by people themselves.

These are a few of the successful projects in Massachusetts and in the Nation

which demonstrate the potential and impact of OEO antipoverty programs.

I have cosponsored an amendment to increase the appropriations of the Office of Economic Opportunity to \$2.245 billion. This represents a hike of \$181.6 million over the amount recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It would bring appropriations up to the full amount authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969.

The \$181 million amendment would restore the \$42 million cutback by the House in manpower and training programs. At a time when the Nation is suffering a 5.6 percent unemployment rate and when in my State of Massachusetts unemployment is at its highest level since 1958—and I know very well the extraordinary unemployment situation which exists in the home State of my good friend from Washington—I do not believe we can afford to reduce these vital programs which are aimed to provide young and old alike with the skills needed to obtain work.

Already the word has gone out to the manpower training agencies in Massachusetts that a 10-percent reduction in the concentrated employment program would result from the House-proposed reduction in funding. These CEP programs exist in New Bedford, Lowell, Boston, and Springfield—cities whose unemployment levels are among the highest in the Nation.

Mr. President, there are 25 major areas of unemployment in this country at this time and five of them exist in my own State of Massachusetts. We have extensive unemployment in the southeastern part, and in the traditional areas of Lawrence, Lowell, and other cities. To cut back on these programs at this time will bring an additional kind of hardship to those people who want to work. We should provide additional programs to give these people the opportunity to work, particularly if we are in the hopeful situation which the administration talks about as having leveled off in terms of unemployment and the economy generally, moving toward a higher level of employment throughout the country. To reduce manpower training and development programs at this critical moment would be disastrous for thousands of our citizens.

Passage of the amendment also would mean that the young will not be short-changed by the Congress. The national Headstart program has been the focal point of early childhood education efforts. Yet, it served an estimated 150,000 fewer children last year because the shift to the full-year program with its increased cost was not matched by any increase of funds. Now the \$339 million appropriated in the committee version—while an improvement over the House—will still leave another 62,000 children without a chance for Headstart this summer.

I have had a chance in recent weeks to travel around my State, as I am sure many of my colleagues have had in their States, and meet parents and children in the Headstart programs—in Gloucester, Peabody, Fall River, and other communities. It would be a great loss to many thousands of these children if opportuni-

ties for next year are denied. I think it would be a serious detriment to the program and would deny development of the full educational potential of the young.

I believe that we can afford the additional \$60 million to see that those children have an equal educational opportunity. When the Labor and Public Welfare Committee authorized \$398 million, our report read:

A cut back in the number of children served by this program—which currently serves only about 10 percent of the preschool-children in need—cannot be justified.

Perhaps the best and most forceful evidence of the success of Headstart is shown by the more than 500 letters that I have received from parents, teachers, school administrators and experts such as the Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Development, urging the full funding of Headstart programs. They see the children every day and they know what will happen if those children are forced out of Headstart programs. Already, they have been told that in Massachusetts, the \$443,000 sliced from the program a year ago will be followed by another \$633,000 cut if the lower proposed funding level is retained.

When interested Massachusetts parents learned of the possibility of the cut, they organized a Headstart Crisis Day. They contacted their Senators, their Congressmen, their Governor. They believe in the program that they were conducting and they let us know. Letters were written, petitions were signed, and meetings were held to say that disadvantaged children of the State of Massachusetts and across the Nation cannot afford these cutbacks. I could not agree with them more. A nation that is willing to spend billions of dollars in cost overruns in defense programs surely can afford \$398 million to insure that 529,406 disadvantaged children have an opportunity for a decent education.

The amendment also provides additional funding of the Special Impact program which is perhaps unique in the antipoverty effort. In Bedford-Stuyvesant and Hough we already have the proof of this program's potential to create multi-purpose community development corporations which are partnerships between the poverty and business communities. The corporations have involved local residents in their own economic development, reducing economic dependency and lessening community tensions.

The President has slashed his request for the special impact program to \$32.1 million, and although the Senate Appropriations Committee wisely has increased that amount, I believe that the value of this program justifies higher funding at the \$39.1 level. For Congress authorized even more in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969, and the backlog of applications is substantial.

The amendment also brings the appropriations level of other extremely important OEO programs at or near their authorization level. Follow Through, Vista, Special Impact Migrant program, and Rural Loans are brought closer to their authorization level, and Legal Services and Health and Nutrition programs are also brought closer to levels consist-

ent with the need that has been shown through the Nation.

Many of us have returned from campaigns that took us to all corners of our States. We know that poverty exists in every one of our States. We have seen the poverty and we have seen the people. We have heard their frustrations and we have tried to understand their anger. To fail to provide the necessary funding for this OEO program would be to fail in our commitment to the poor of this Nation. We must not allow that to happen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his kind remarks. We have always been very grateful for his appearances before the committee. He has always had well reasoned statements and has given us a great deal of guidance in this complex bill. We appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, we have told all Senators that there would no votes on any amendments today. It is my understanding that we will start tomorrow unless the agricultural conference report is taken up. That, of course, would be a privileged matter and we would have to wait to get back to the HEW bill until after that matter was concluded.

We have no further general statements on the HEW bill. Some amendments have been laid at the desk.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation and admiration of my distinguished colleague, Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, for his statesmanlike and forward-looking efforts in connection with the fiscal year 1971 Labor-HEW appropriation bill, H.R. 18515. Senator MAGNUSON's diligent and enlightened leadership on this bill, particularly in vital health programs, is evident in the much needed increases contained in the committee-reported bill for medical research, health manpower, and health services support.

I also wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished ranking minority members of the subcommittee and of the full Appropriations Committee (Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) and to the other members of the committee for their support of increases above the budget requests for these vital health programs.

Although I am fully cognizant of the need to halt the cruel inflationary spiral which is robbing all Americans of their economic security and well-being, I do not believe this goal can or should be met at the expense of the health of our citizens. In its report on H.R. 18515, the Appropriations Committee stated this principle, as follows:

Reduction in health and health research funding to control inflation is tantamount to balancing the Federal budget by the sacrifice of human lives.

I am very pleased that the committee has seen fit to include in the bill increases for many of the health programs which I highlighted in testimony before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee last June 16. Overall, the committee has been responsive to the urgencies of public and private witnesses for adequate support of medi-

cal research, health manpower, and health services support.

In particular, I am delighted that the reported bill includes an increase of \$40 million above the budget request for staffing of community mental health centers, as recommended in my June 16 testimony and in a September 15 follow-up letter to Senator MAGNUSON, signed by me and nine other members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Other important increases recommended by the committee for programs discussed in my testimony in June include the following.

Health professions and nursing student loans. The reported bill would provide \$21 million, the full authorized amount, for assistance to students in schools of nursing and approximately \$33.5 million for loans to students in the health professions. This total of \$54.5 million is almost exactly the amount I recommended last June:

The level of support requested for FY 1971 for the health professions student loan programs can only work to the detriment of the strenuous efforts now underway to expand enrollments at medical and other health professions schools across the nation, and will particularly aggravate the inequities which continue to result in the exclusion of many students from poor and middle-income families who are qualified for and strongly desire to enter the health professions.

The President's budget proposes a decrease in funds for health professions student loans of \$3 million below the level appropriated in FY 1970, and \$14.5 million below the appropriation level of 1969. The FY 1971 authorized amount is \$35 million, yet the budget request is only \$12 million. The authorization for loans to nursing students is \$21 million; the administration has requested but \$9.6 million.

The present unmet need in these professions is commonly recognized to be approximately 50,000 doctors and 150,000 nurses. I strongly urge that the full authorized amount for health professions and nursing loans of \$56 million be appropriated instead of the budget request of only \$21.6 million.

Construction of health educational, research, and library facilities. The committee has recommended an increase of \$23.9 million over the budget request and the House figure. In light of the backlog in approved, unfunded projects as of June 30, 1970, of \$581.2 million—of which \$86.3 million is for projects in California—this increase is certainly needed and can be very effectively used. The committee report recognizes that "a rapid and significant expansion of these facilities" is essential to the solution of our national health crisis.

Closely related to the need for meaningful levels of student assistance and construction of educational facilities is the need for an expansion of institutional support. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.7 million for health professions institutional support, as well as a small increase in support for schools of nursing. Again, these increases are essential if we are to expand our capacity to train additional health professionals and to enable health education facilities to respond creatively to demands for the training of entirely new types of health personnel. In my testimony I spoke to these needs as follows:

Similarly, the appropriation request of \$113,650,000 for institutional and special

projects grants to medical, dental and related health professions schools, is only 70 percent of the 1971 authorized level, compared with 87 percent of the authorization appropriated in FY 1970. These grants are specifically designed to assist in making the basic improvements cited by Secretary Finch and Assistant Secretary Egeberg as part of their goal to "shorten the time needed for training and to orient their training more towards the immediate needs of the country. . . ." Special project grants provide the basic means of support for the development of programs in new fields and for innovations in curriculum and teaching, as well as for assistance to schools in serious financial straits.

However, according to the AAMC which represents the medical schools and their teaching hospitals responsible for the undergraduate and graduate education of all the physicians this country produces, more than half the medical schools in the nation have been awarded special projects grants on the basis of financial distress. The need to offset that financial distress which has beset so many schools will severely diminish the funds available to finance sorely-needed innovation, curriculum changes, and other new developments. In other words, we will barely be standing still rather than striding forward in the effort to combat the health crisis, unless we provide support at the full levels authorized for FY 1971.

I believe the full \$168 million for project grants for medical, dental, and related schools and \$40 million for schools of nursing which has been authorized for fiscal year 1971, must be appropriated.

The committee has recommended significant increases in the appropriations for the National Cancer Institute and National Heart and Lung Institute. These increases—\$32.6 million and \$32 million, respectively—will make possible a significant expansion of our efforts to find a cure for cancer—the second leading cause of death in the United States—and to improve our knowledge of the causes and cures of the pulmonary diseases and afflictions which are taking an increasingly serious toll on our Nation's health. During my testimony in June I devoted considerable attention to these two major health problems:

There is one other critical area in the health field which I would like to discuss, and that is the federal contribution to basic medical research through the National Institutes of Health. Support for basic research during the past two decades has brought us to the threshold of an era of unparalleled potential for biomedical breakthroughs. The continuation of this progress can be assured only through undiminished support of clinical and fundamental research, of education and training to maintain and enlarge our scientific manpower pool, and of the effective application of laboratory discoveries to the improvement of direct patient care.

In particular, I am deeply concerned about the need for continued support of research into the causes and cures of cancer. I am sure the Subcommittee remembers the moving testimony of Dr. Richard Wolk, of San Rafael, California, last December. Dr. Wolk, whose son, Brian, is a victim of leukemia, showed you a portfolio of sadly beautiful pictures of children who have had their lives tragically and painfully shortened by the onslaught of leukemia. You will be interested to know that Dr. Wolk has given up his general practice in favor of a fellowship in medical oncology at Mt. Zion Medical Center in San Francisco. In his words, "I want to take part in the action as the conquest of cancer is achieved."

Cancer remains the second leading cause of death in the United States, with approxi-

mately 650,000 new cases and more than 320,000 deaths each year. If current trends in cancer incidence and mortality are not abated or reversed, it is estimated that we will reach an incidence of 815,000 new cases and 360,000 deaths by the end of this decade.

Federally-supported cancer research has amounted to nearly \$1.5 billion over the past 10 years and this research has provided promising leads and opportunities in the areas of virus and chemical causation, immunology and chemotherapy. This progress must be vigorously exploited, and in order to meet that goal we must provide for an increase in appropriations of 20 percent, or \$40 million over FY 70, for the National Cancer Institute in order to compensate for the effects of inflation—about 10 percent—and to ensure the availability of additional resources to step up the fight against this killer disease. The administration has requested a level of \$202 million, a \$24 million increase, for FY 1971. I would urge that the Subcommittee provide for an additional \$16 million in order to bring the total FY 1971 appropriation to a level of \$218 million, or 20 percent above that for FY 1970.

I would also like to urge the appropriation of an additional \$5.5 million for the National Heart and Lung Institute. I am concerned over the inadequacy of the resources devoted to the study of pulmonary diseases. While these diseases have suffered a decline in attention and prestige since the achievement of significant breakthroughs in the treatment of tuberculosis, the incidence of other disabling lung diseases, such as emphysema and bronchitis, is on the increase. Environmental pollution's effect on the incidence or aggravation of such diseases has become a subject of deep concern to many scientists and laymen. One doctor in Los Angeles, specializing in lung ailments, has offered the frightening statistic that anyone over the age of 12 in Los Angeles is afflicted with some degree of emphysema. And any damage caused by the environment is further compounded by the effects of cigarette smoking.

Early in 1968, an advisory committee on cardiopulmonary disease was created by the National Heart and Lung Institute to advise on the adequacy of current cardiopulmonary research and on the opportunities and needs for expanded research and training. In their October 1969 report, the advisory committee found that there is a need for "prospective epidemiologic studies of chronic lung disease such as bronchitis and emphysema to determine if their prevalence is actually increasing and to search for clues as to their causation." The committee further found that there was inadequate data available to evaluate the adequacy of research in "occupational respiratory diseases and the effects of air pollution."

These serious gaps in our knowledge about the incidence, cause, and cures of lung diseases can be corrected if adequate funds are made available to develop needed university curriculums in the lung field and pulmonary research centers which can provide a focal point for studies in this area.

It is estimated that only 358 of the 182,000 physicians in private practice today are primarily specialists in pulmonary disease, and that one-half of the medical residencies in pulmonary disease are unfilled because medical schools are unable to obtain pulmonary disease faculty to promote this important field of medicine. There is a need for aggressive assessment of medical school curriculums in the lung field to revise and revitalize them so they will attract the med students to a specialty in lung diseases. The administration budget has allocated nothing for the development of the curriculums in medical schools which could attract the current student body to this specialty. I would urge that \$2.5 million be appropriated for this purpose—this sum when divided among the over 100 medical schools would mean each school would re-

ceive an undergraduate teaching grant of less than \$25,000, little enough when one considers the magnitude of the need.

Another vital method of attracting manpower into this important area, is the establishment of pulmonary centers at university medical centers where there is already a nuclei of activities in research and clinical investigation. Such centers can produce the environment which will attract more physicians into academic research or practice in the pulmonary field. The administration's FY 1971 budget request includes funds to support the establishment of one such center, however, I believe the capability exists in the nation's medical community to implement many more such centers and I urge that an additional \$3 million be appropriated for this purpose. This \$3 million would make possible the establishment of an additional four centers.

I believe that appropriation of the \$5.5 million for the purposes I have outlined—which when added to the administration request would bring the total appropriation for the National Heart and Lung Institute to about \$177 million—would give a much needed impetus to our ability to combat pulmonary diseases.

Finally, I want to congratulate the committee for its emphasis throughout the report on the importance of innovative approaches to health care delivery. For example, the committee provided for an increase of \$18.5 million over the budget request for regional medical programs. Approximately \$4 million of this increase would provide support for programs to evaluate methods of recruiting, training and utilizing new types of health services personnel and to increase the career mobility of allied health workers.

Similarly, the committee directed that \$6 million of that \$18.5 million increase be utilized for a nationwide study of the best manner of initiating and upgrading community systems for early coronary care and related services for cardio-respiratory emergencies. This step parallels my recommendation, in a letter to the chairman on September 14, for the appropriation of \$10 million under a new provision of the Hill-Burton program for project grants for construction and modernization of emergency facilities. In the letter I noted the enormous potential of innovative approaches in emergency transportation systems, such as mobile cardiac care units. It has been estimated that such units could save approximately 20 percent of the 250,000 heart attack victims who now die each year outside hospitals. Thus, I am extremely pleased that this type of mobile coronary care will be supported and implemented through the regional medical programs.

Although I do not agree completely with all of the committee's recommendations, I firmly believe that, on balance, Senator MAGNUSON and the committee have struck a most reasonable balance among many meritorious, competing health programs and interests. These Senators deserve the praise and thanks of all Americans concerned about the methods and quality of medical care in this country. I urge the Senate to give its strong support to the increases in vital health programs' appropriations. The urgency of the crisis in health care has not abated in the slightest during the past year, and it is imperative that

we maintain and, wherever possible, expand those programs which will most effectively contribute to meeting and overcoming that crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the September 14 and 15 letters to Chairman MAGNUSON to which I referred earlier be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.
September 15, 1970.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Labor-HEW Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, we are writing on a bipartisan basis to register our deepening concern over the future of the community mental health center program in this country. It is our strong feeling that a level of support beyond the budget request is needed if we are to sustain the momentum which has been generated in community-based treatment of mental illness since the passage of the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963.

According to a recent article in the *Wall Street Journal*, "The federally-supported Community Mental Health Centers program, begun in the early 60's and counted on to fill a major part of the gap in community care, is in disarray." Increasing numbers of patients are being released from mental institutions—375,000 last year from state and county mental hospitals alone—in keeping with the idea that "after-care" in the society they left is more beneficial than extended confinement in mental institutions. In the absence of such care, patients are too often continued on drug therapy, instead of receiving the counseling and care which would fully restore them to society. Although the community mental health center program held great promise of contributing significantly to the solution of this problem, it has not expanded adequately to do the job.

The Congress recognized and responded to these enormous needs by passing earlier this year the Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1970 (P.L. 91-211). This Act provides for increased federal support of existing programs and authorizes important new initiatives in poverty areas and in children's and other services. It has been estimated that 1½ million children with serious learning and behavior problems require the attention of mental health specialists in order to be able to continue in school. For urban and rural poverty areas, which have a high incidence of mental illness and few local resources with which to deal with the problem, the new preferential funding authorized in P.L. 91-211 is vital if a beginning is to be made in overcoming the handicap of mental illness among the poor.

The greatest need is for more money for staffing grants. The administration originally requested an appropriation of \$60.1 million, which would permit them to make no new staffing grants and would allow for only continuation grants to centers already in operation. The House voted to increase that amount by \$20 million in order to make it possible to fund the backlog of 61 centers whose initial staffing applications were approved but unable to be funded from FY 1970 monies.

The administration has recommended that the Senate accept only \$9.5 million of the \$20 million added by the House for new staffing grants. In the face of an anticipated demand of \$30 million in new requests during FY 1971 and the backlog of \$20 million in approved but unfunded requests

at the end of FY 1970, this amount is grossly inadequate. Moreover, the administration has stated that it intends to allocate the \$9.5 million only to those centers which have already received construction grants. This includes \$6.8 million in approved staffing applications carried over from FY 1970, leaving only \$2.7 million for newly-constructed centers submitting applications for an initial staffing grant during FY 1971.

Communities which have not needed or have not already received a construction grant, but which have worked for months or even years to gain community support and raise the required matching funds, would simply not be funded. This includes \$13.2 million in applications approved but unfunded during FY 1970, as well as any centers submitting new requests during FY 1971 which have not already received a construction grant.

Finally, although P.L. 91-211 provides that up to five percent of the funds appropriated for new staffing grants may be devoted to the initiation and development of programs serving urban or rural poverty areas, no money would be available for this important purpose under either the administration request or the House-passed bill.

We, therefore, strongly urge that your subcommittee accept the full \$20 million added by the House for staffing grants to those 61 centers approved but unfunded at the end of FY 1970, and that an additional \$20 million be included in order to permit a modest number of new staffing awards and the initiation of at least a few programs in poverty areas. We also urge your consideration of an appropriate level of funding within the \$12 million authorization for children's mental health services. We feel strongly that the purpose of the original Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 and the intent of Congress in expanding this innovative program earlier this year deserve a high priority.

We appreciate your commitment to effective funding of health programs and thank you for your consideration of our views.

With best regards,

Sincerely,
ALAN CRANSTON, PETER H. DOMINICK, THOMAS F. EAGLETON, HAROLD E. HUGHES, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, WALTER F. MONDALE, GAYLORD NELSON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

— SEPTEMBER 14, 1970.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Labor-HEW Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAGGIE: I know you are aware of the great rehabilitation work of Dr. Howard Rusk. I had the opportunity of meeting Dr. Rusk and touring his fine facilities at the Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine in New York recently. I have also had the privilege of working with him in connection with the oversight hearings of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on the medical care provided to wounded Vietnam veterans.

Dr. Rusk is also president of the World Rehabilitation Fund, Inc., which has provided leadership and assistance in research and rehabilitation programs around the world. I have reviewed with great interest material provided by Dr. Rusk about the work of the Fund. As you know, the rest of the world is far behind the United States in the use of prosthetics and orthotics, and the international research and demonstration program of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has supported with counterpart funds held in U.S. accounts in dozens of countries vitally important rehabilitation research and service programs in these countries. The availability of counter-

part funds means that there is no cost to the American people for these important programs. The administration has proposed that \$7 million in counterpart funds be made available for international rehabilitation programs of HEW's Social and Rehabilitation Service during fiscal year 1971. However, this amount was reduced by the House to \$4 million.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of an article by Dr. Rusk which appeared in the *New York Times* after a similar cut was made in this program last year. I hope that, upon reading Dr. Rusk's article, which details the enormous success of these overseas programs, you will agree with me that the full \$7 million of the budget request should be restored by the Senate in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, H.R. 18515. In light of the fact that no new expenditure of funds is required, I believe this is the minimum level of support which this excellent program should receive.

I also wish to request that you give serious consideration to including in H.R. 18515 an appropriation of \$10 million for project grants for construction and modernization of emergency room and transportation facilities. This new five-year project grant program was recently added to the Hill-Burton program by the Hospital and Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970 (P.D. 91-296). The appropriation of \$20 million during each of the next five years for matching grants of up to 50 percent of the cost of the project was authorized.

It was noted in the Senate report on this bill that emergency room usage, particularly in urban hospitals, has doubled and tripled in recent years imposing serious strains on the ability of the hospitals to provide care. In addition, improvements in the delivery of health care can be made through innovations in emergency transportation systems. One example of this is the possibility of including, at a modest cost of \$1,000 to \$1,500 apiece, mobile cardiac care units in ambulances. It has been estimated that such systems could save approximately 20 percent of the 250,000 heart attack victims who now die each year outside hospitals.

The new project grant program would also cover procurement of helicopters and related equipment. Our investigation into the medical care provided to Vietnam veterans has graphically illustrated the unprecedented role that helicopters have played in saving the lives of men wounded on the battlefield. This promising new technological application could be equally beneficial in civilian situations such as traffic accidents or in remote rural areas.

I strongly urge that the sum of \$10 million be provided this year so that innovations in providing emergency medical care like those I have described above may be implemented.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ALAN CRANSTON.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, at the time we became aware that the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were seriously considering cutbacks in the Headstart program and other locally planned community action programs, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty surveyed community action and Headstart programs around the country.

As the Senate begins consideration tomorrow of H.R. 18515, the Labor-HEW and related agencies appropriations, it will consider the level of appropriations for Headstart and similar programs. Senator JAVITS and I, together with a bipartisan group of 12 additional Senators,

have introduced an amendment to raise OEO appropriations from the \$2,064 billion recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee to the \$2,245 billion level.

All across the country, Headstart programs report cutbacks of 7 to 18 percent in their Headstart allocations at a time when they would require a 10- to 12-percent increase simply to continue serving as many children as they served last year. This at a time when by and large they are serving less than 20 percent of the children in their areas in need of Headstart services.

In order that the Senators may have a chance to evaluate this information for themselves, I am asking that there be printed in the RECORD a selection of letters from Headstart programs and others. This is merely a sampling of letters so that Senators can see the impact at the local level of the administration's action in cutting Headstart programs. I particularly want to draw the Senator's attention to the number of letters which say that the Office of Economic Opportunity puts the responsibility for Headstart cuts on the Congress.

The fact of the matter is that even the amount of money already appropriated this year by the House is \$98 million more than was appropriated last year. Last year the OEO appropriation was \$1,948 billion; this year the House allowed \$2,046 billion. Therefore, any cut below last year's dollar figures for Headstart is caused by the administration's own priorities.

Congress already has authorized \$398 million for the Headstart program for fiscal 1972. The amendment Senator JAVITS and I are sponsoring will provide this level of funding, so that Headstart programs need not be cut back.

The administration has requested \$802 million for manpower programs, which are especially crucial in view of present high unemployment figures. The amendment Senator JAVITS and I are sponsoring will provide this level of funding, so that manpower programs need not be cut back.

The administration in OEO has some new innovative projects which it would like to develop under the heading of research and evaluation. The amendment Senator JAVITS and I are sponsoring will provide sufficient funds so that OEO may carry out those projects, without cutting back on Headstart and manpower programs in order to do it.

The attached letters give a feeling of what the attitude all across the country is on this issue.

They demonstrate a sense of shock and outrage that, at this moment in history, the Congress and the administration would cut back on funds for these vital programs which are presently serving only a fraction of those who are eligible and who need this assistance.

I hope these letters will be helpful to Senators in assessing the urgency of this very important matter.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a factsheet, a survey table, and the letters I have discussed.

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

FACT SHEET.—JAVITS, NELSON, MONDALE, AND CRANSTON AMENDMENT (NO. 1068) TO H.R. 18515 (HEW-LABOR-OEO APPROPRIATIONS)

[In millions of dollars]

	Work training	Head start	Total OEO
Javits amendment	802	398	2,245
Appropriations Committee	760	339	2,064

Background: Although the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969 ear-marked \$398 million for Headstart, \$910.3 million for Work and Training programs, and specific sums for other Economic Opportunity Act programs, the Administration budgeted sums far short of the demonstrated need for programs providing services of direct benefit to poor people while substantially increasing research activities. The Senate Appropriations Committee accepted the Administration requests for greater funds for research but then wrote into the reported bill sums at far lower levels than are needed particularly for Headstart and Work and Training programs.

Headstart: The reported bill would accept and write into the law the budget request level of \$339 million for Headstart rather than the basic authorized level of \$398 million. For Headstart the reported bill would result in fewer children served than last year—because of less-than-anticipated carry-over funds and higher costs—whereas the Amendment would provide for a modest increase in program services, as shown in the following table:

	Cost (millions)	Children, year-round	Children, summer
Fiscal year 1970	\$326	262,900	208,700
House allocation	321	251,000	125,000
Senate Appropriations Committee	339	262,900	145,900
Javits amendment	398	320,706	208,700

Work and training: The Senate Appropriations Committee also wrote into the reported bill an even lower level than the Administration's original budget request for Work and Training programs. The original budget request of the President was \$802 million for Work and Training, but out of the total OEO appropriation amount the House Appropriations Committee report allowed \$760 million for Work and Training and the Senate Appropriations Committee wrote into the bill itself that figure, a cutback of \$42 million from the original budget request of the President. The Amendment would restore the original requests and prevent the following cutbacks:

Concentrated employment program	\$6,500,000
Public Service careers program	5,200,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school	3,300,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps summer	7,830,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school	7,200,000
Job Corps	9,610,000
Operation Mainstream	2,200,000

Total 41,840,000

Other OEO programs: In addition to increased funding for Head Start and Work and Training, the Javits-Nelson-Mondale-Cranston Amendment would—

Allow increased funding for health and nutrition programs, including Alcoholism and Drug Abuse programs and Emergency Food and Medical Services;

Enable the Administration to expend the funds it plans for research development, and evaluation, without cutting back on proven anti-poverty programs;

Provide funds to allow other anti-poverty programs to meet increased costs without retrenching on services.

FISCAL YEAR 1971 FUNDING FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT PROGRAMS (HEW-LABOR-OEO APPROPRIATIONS BILL
H.R. 18515)

[In millions of dollars]

	President's January budget	Current administration budget at House-passed level	Senate Appropriations Committee report	Javits-Nelson- Mondale- Cranston proposed amendment to appropriations bill in Senate
Work and training (pts. A, B, and E of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act)	802	760	760	802
Headstart	339	321	339	398
Other OEO programs	939	965	965	1,045
Total OEO budget	2,080	2,046	2,604	2,245

ALABAMA

CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER,
CAVE STREET SCHOOL,
TUSCALOOSA, Ala.

1. In August 1970 we were told to submit a budget for the 1970-71 year showing a 6% cut in our funding level.

a. Present funding level: \$137,272.00.

b. OEO's reduced funding level: \$129,036.00.

c. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds: Lack of funds.

d. Impact on your program; for example, number of children who will be cut out of Head Start or trainees eliminated from Manpower program.

Loss of one teacher and a 6% reduction in all services (medical, dental, food etc.) to the children.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget.

With costs rising in all categories it would require a 4% increase to maintain our present program.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving? 97%.

Mrs. VIRGINIA W. CLARK,
Director.

ORGANIZED COMMUNITY ACTION
PROGRAM, INC.,
Troy, Ala.

1. OEO has not yet notified us regarding budget cuts; however, we expect a cut of from three to ten percent of our current federal funds (\$573,000), on the basis of other cuts in Alabama.

2. To maintain our *present* program, we would need a seven percent increase, to cover area cost-of-living increases in salaries, rents, supplies, and utilities.

3. We are now serving approximately sixty percent of the needy population; the services we offer, however, are not sufficient for any of those we serve (total population: 68,500; poverty population, 34,000).

Yours,

HUGH KILMER,
Director of Planning.

SUMTER COUNTY OPPORTUNITY, INC.,
Livingston, Ala.

1. We have not been officially notified that our budget would be cut by O.E.O., but in a discussion via telephone with our Budget Management Officer in Atlanta, we were advised that our budget would probably be cut by some \$200,000.

a. Our present funding level is \$548,815.

b. If we are reduced by \$200,000, our funding level would be \$348,815.

c. As forecasted we have not received an official letter stating that our funding level would be reduced as of this date.

d. If, our Regional Budget Management Officer is correct in his prediction that our budget will be cut some \$200,000 or more, approximately 150 children of the 365 that we are now serving will have to be dropped from our program. About 25 of the 59 target area

non-professional workers who are on the poverty level would also be without jobs.

2. We would need \$548,815 our present funding level to maintain our present program.

3. We are serving about 1/2 of our eligible and needy population at the present.

May I also state that our central PAC has requested that we expand our program for fiscal year 1971-72, to include 200 additional needy children Head Start age. Unless more money is available, this will of course, be impossible.

EUNICE OUTLAND,
Head Start Director.

MONTGOMERY COMMUNITY
ACTION AGENCY,
Montgomery, Ala.

For program year "F", beginning March 1, 1970, we were advised on October 5th that our maximum funding level would be \$723,000 as compared with a current level of \$755,000 in OEO programs.

Mr. Roy Batchelor, Regional Director, has stated that the Southeastern Region is being cut an average of about 8%; the reason given is that carry-over funds have been declining—that projected carry-over is now about 3% where it has been about 11%.

Additionally, HEW/Atlanta has advised us that our federal share for Head Start will be reduced by 10%—from \$1,370,000 to \$1,233,000. No specific reason has been offered other than anticipated reduction at the Washington level.

The impact of reduction in OEO funds will be felt principally in reduced services to target areas by Neighborhood Service Centers. Programs in Adult Basic Education, Home Economics and Vocational Training will be affected as well as our efforts toward community organization—the attempt to establish viable incorporated groups in target areas.

The impact of reduction in HEW funds will be reflected in reduction of Head Start classes by about 100 children, and postponing further effort in New Careers Development.

In order to maintain the present program with a normal increase in salaries and resulting fringes, we would need increase from present funding levels as follows: OEO Programs, 5%; Head Start, 4%.

We estimate we are serving about 1/3 of the needy population in this county in the following programs:

OEO—Conduct and Administration, Neighborhood Service Centers (9), Adult Literacy, Emergency Food, Family Planning, Comprehensive Health Services.

HEW—Head Start.

DOL—Neighborhood Youth Corps, Mainstream.

JOSEPH A. GANNON,
Executive Director.

CULLMAN-CITY
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER,
Cullman, Ala.

1. OCD has notified us that our Budget must be cut for the coming Program Year.

A. The present funding level is \$177,661.
B. And the reduced funding level will be \$172,331.

C. The reason given was that Congress had cut the overall appropriation.

D. The impact on the Program will be, no salary increase's for the third straight year, and it almost resulted in a salary decrease, due to this, we continue to loose degree personnel.

We will not cut back the number of children served. We had to cut the number of auxillary employees by attrition and by the release of the part time Speech Therapist and Psychologist.

Equipment and supplies must be held to a bare minimum.

We will keep the highest possible Program quality, regardless of the funds cut.

2. The funding level necessary to maintain the present Program would need to be at least five percent (5%) higher than the present funding level because of the rising cost of operation.

3. We are now serving approximately 80% of the eligible population.

Yours truly,
JERE R. ALDRIDGE,
Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, SELMA
AND DALLAS COUNTY ECONOMIC OP-
PORTUNITY BOARD,

Selma, Ala.

1. Has OEO notified us that our budget must be cut for the coming year? Yes.

a. Present funding level: \$524,000.

b. Reduced funding level: \$469,000.

c. Reason for cutback: 1. Reduced appropriations for OEO.

d. Impact on our programs: The Dallas-Selma Economic Opportunity Board serves the indigents of Dallas County, Alabama, which has a population of 57,000. This agency also administers the Emergency Food and Medical Program in seven surrounding counties: Wilcox (15,726), Marengo (22,793), Choctaw (16,014), Sumter (16,002), Greene (10,336), Hale (15,580) and Perry (15,014). The reduced funding level (\$55,000 plus) will hamper the overall operations of the agency but the Emergency Food and Medical Program will suffer most. This program gives direct assistance to 40,000 persons for Food Stamps or voucher purchase of food and 11,000 indigent school children for school lunches. It is estimated that this combined number may be reduced to 39,000 persons. Also several persons may be terminated because of the lack of funds.

2. Estimated funding level necessary to maintain present programs: The costs of goods and services is ever increasing; hence, the funding level should increase. We feel that at least a 15% increase to \$602,000 would be justifiable.

3. The percentage of the needy population presently served by this agency is 51%.

Another situation that we feel needs to be brought before the proper authorities is the fact that the funding level of community action agencies is based on initial funding and frozen at that level pending initiation of additional projects, which means that projects in operation since 1965 must operate in 1970 on the same amount of funds. This in itself tends to weaken a project in either one of two ways; namely, no increase in salaries, fewer fringe benefits, no incentive, loss of efficient personnel, salary schedule and wages unattractive to prospective employees, but adequate services are maintained for those served on a decreasing basis from year to year because of the increasing cost of goods and services. Cost of living increases given employees annually, incentive step raises given employees on merit system, adequate fringe benefits for employees securing and maintaining efficient staff, and attractive salaries for prospects. However, this is accomplished by si-

phoning funds from categories other than personnel costs annually from within budget which decreases funds used for providing services. (This plus the increasing costs of goods and services.) Neither of these are very attractive, because they both defeat the purposes of OEO Community Action and the alleviation of poverty.

It seems that OEO should attain the same status as "old line" Federal agencies wherein program appropriations and allocations are made in accordance with the cost of living index, that normal increases would be built into funding levels.

E. JOHNSON,
Acting Executive Director.

HUNTSVILLE-MADISON COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE, INC., HEAD START CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Huntsville, Alabama.

1. We have been notified by the DHEW (not OEO) Regional Office that our budget must be cut.

a. Funding level for "D" year was \$297,130 (our beginning date is September 1 and end date is August 31).

b. Reduced funding level was set at \$288,216. However, we have still not received final approval at this level despite the fact we are two months into our new funding year. Rumor has it that we may be cut still further.

c. The reason given (verbally) for the cut in funds was that the South-East Region was cut by eight (8) million.

d. Impact on our program: No children have been cut out at this point—this will be done as *only* a final resort. However, medical and dental treatment must be significantly reduced if local sources of funds fail to materialize. Planned expenditures for consumable supplies and equipment have been reduced to far below the needed level. The same applies to travel which will mean fewer and shorter field trips. The food budget has been cut significantly—we hope we can live with it.

2. Funding level necessary to maintain present program: \$323,000 (approximate).

3. We are serving 200 children out of an estimated 2,700 in need.

It is heartbreaking to see our already pitifully inadequate funding be reduced just at the point when we believe both staff, parents, and resident boards have developed the expertise necessary to make the program function in the way we had hoped it could.

JANE REED, Director.

ALASKA RURAL ALASKA COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,

Anchorage, Alaska.

Present funding level for Head Start is \$813,800 and will be reduced by 5%, or \$40,690, to a level of \$773,110. Nationwide funding cut was reason given. 60 children will be eliminated as well as a number of staff people. 38% of the eligible population is now being served, and the full \$813,800 is needed to maintain current level.

BYRON I. MALLOTT,
Executive Director.

ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, HEAD START PROGRAM,

Anchorage, Alaska.

Present funding level is \$212,500 and will be reduced by \$53,000, eliminating services for 15-20 families. Reason given by OEO: "cost per child in Anchorage was more compared to the other areas of the state." 90 children, or 1/20 of eligible children are now being served, and for present program to continue, an estimated budget of \$226,000 would be necessary.

JESSE KINARD,
Executive Director.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

ARKANSAS

BLACK RIVER AREA DEVELOPMENT CORP.,

Pocahontas, Ark.

Summer Head Start present funding level is \$82,000 and will be reduced to \$65,600, resulting in the elimination of 68 children from that program. Full year Head Start is presently funded at \$142,000 and will be reduced to \$127,800, resulting in the elimination of 44 children from program (a total 112 children will be dropped). Summer Head Start now serves 95% of eligible population, and full year 13%. An increase of 5% in each program would enable them to continue at present level.

JIM JANSEN,
Director.

SOUTHWEST-ARKANSAS DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.,

Texarkana, Ark.

Present funding level for Head Start is \$155,000 and may be cut 7% to 10%, down to \$124,000 or \$140,000. Summer program this year served 740 children and provided 148 jobs for area residents. At the present funding level 40 children have been dropped, and if the cut becomes effective, 200 more children will be affected.

THOMAS L. HUDMAN,
Executive Director.

ROGERS COMMUNITY DAY CARE CENTER, INC., CENTRAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH,

Rogers, Ark.

This Day Care Center is supported by the First Christian Church, St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, Central United Methodist Church, and the Rogers Community Fund. The program uses volunteer help and several Neighborhood Youth Corps people.

CHARLES P. McDONALD,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

ARKANSAS MID-DELTA OEO, INC.,

Helena, Ark.

Present funding level for Head Start is \$509,599 and will be cut by 6%, with a "cutback at the National level" as the reason. 20 children will be dropped from program. Program now serves 20% of the needy population, and the program would have to operate at \$560,559 to maintain present level.

MARGARET STAUB,
Director.

HEAD START CHILD DEVELOPMENT, CROWLEY'S RIDGE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.,

Arkansas.

Present funding level for Head Start is \$420,000 and will be cut back 7-10%, resulting in the loss of 50 or more children from the program. About 65% of the eligible population is now served, and a 5% increase in funding level would be necessary to maintain present program.

DOROTHY BOOK,
Director.

NORTHWEST ARKANSAS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AGENCY,

Rogers, Ark.

Preset funding level for full year Head Start is \$171,428 and will receive a 7-10% cutback; present funding level for summer Head Start of \$50,000 will be cut back by 20%. 75 youngsters will be dropped from program. About 10% of the eligible population is now being served, and if budget could be maintained at present level, program could continue to operate without reductions in children or services.

WALLACE E. SMITH,
Executive Director.

IDAHO

EL-ADA, INC.,

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY,

Boise, Idaho.

We have been notified by our regional office that a cut is being made in our funding level. The information you requested is as follows:

1. a. Present funding level—\$144,969.
- b. OEO's reduced funding level—\$130,000.
- c. No reason for the cut has been offered other than that because of the pending cuts the National Office has been forced to set interim guidelines.

d. Impact on our program—the possibility of not having any program in two rural areas. Each program would serve 50 children—primarily migrant—and would employ 8-10 low income people.

2. We have been able to plan a budget for 1971 at the same funding level as 1970—\$144,969. An increase would be welcome but lack of one would not jeopardize the program. However, a cut would leave us in a precarious position.

3. At our present funding level we are serving approximately 50% of the eligible needy population for the Day Care Centers.

The El-Ada Day Care programs are operated for low income underemployed or in-training mothers. There are two centers in Boise serving 50 children. Other centers are day care center in Homedale (Owyhee County) for 50 children—95% of them are migrant farm worker's children. In Elmore County a center will operate in Hammett for 50 children from migrant families. These have been planned for 5 month programs, with a possibility of becoming 8 month programs.

Most of the programs in Idaho would suffer from a cut in funding. Our El-Ada program would be definitely handicapped with a loss of \$15,000. An increase in our funds would mean that we could serve more eligible low income people in a much wider area of need—and this is why we are in existence.

We in Idaho have seen positive results of the Headstart and Day Care program operations. Hundreds of youngsters have had dental care—many for the first time. All are given nutritious meals. Those with different ethnic backgrounds have not had to change—our meals have been planned around their own food preferences. Migrant mothers have realized a peace of mind about their young children. By using a Day Care Center they don't have to take their children to the fields with them or worry about the competence of a baby sitter. All of the parents are encouraged to participate in the program. They are able to become a productive part of the community through their efforts to achieve a successful social and educational experience for their children.

In many areas people who have been migrants are now choosing to live permanently in Idaho's rural communities. Their children are the potential community leaders of tomorrow. Headstart and Day Care will be the first step toward their preparation for this role. These programs are helping the parents assume a responsible place in the community now.

JOAN LINGENFELTER,
Director, Child Development Program.

ILLINOIS

PROJECT HEAD START, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION OF SAINT CLAIR COUNTY,

East St. Louis, Ill.

We too have been advised by the Regional Office of Health, Education and Welfare (Office of Child Development) of a possible 7-10% reduction in funds allocated to our East St. Louis Headstart Program.

At our current funding level of \$436,000 this could mean a loss of up to \$43,600. Reasons for the cut are a reduction in funds allocated to our region.

Such a loss of funds would result in the forced closing of at least two classrooms. Fifty children would therefore be eliminated from the program. In addition, six jobs all held by Headstart parents would also be cut out of our operation.

A funding level of \$436,000 will sustain our operation for the next year. We now serve 17% of the total eligible population.

DENNIS STOKES, *Director.*

PROJECT HEAD START,
Quincy, Ill.

We have not been "officially" notified of any budget cut however, through personal contacts at the upper level, it has been strongly hinted.

a. This year's approved budget—\$107,028.
b. See Item (1).
c. Major cuts in congressional funding.
d. 30 children will need to be dropped if purported cuts of 10%—14% is to be put into effect.

2. To maintain next year's program, \$115,000.00 minimum.

3. We are now serving approximately 90%.

WILLIAM SACADAT, *Director.*

JOLIET-WILL COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM,
Joliet, Ill.

Our present funding level is near \$500,000. We have been informed by both OEO and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that there will possibly be a 10% cut in our budgets for the coming year.

This was not a statement given directly to this agency or its administration but a statement that was made in general to the 25 CAP's within the State of Illinois. The reasons given for the OEO cut in funds was that the Regional Office is going to be faced with an appropriate 10% cut in the funds available to them plus the loss of carry over funds that had been available in previous years due to the fact that CAP's were not spending all of the funds allocated to them because of poor management, late funding and a number of other reasons.

Although this statement was not made directly to us as an individual agency, we feel that it would be a grave deterrent to the future success of our agency which has just emerged from caretaker status if our programs were cut in the coming year. Presently, we have more programs than we have ever had and it appears as though the problems of the past will be greatly overshadowed by the successes and gains that we are presently making.

We feel certain that if the budget is to be cut within the next year, it will represent a slap in the face to the people we are serving but also to our board, staff and other agencies who have worked so hard to revitalize an agency that had slid downhill because of misinformation, some poor planning and lack of adequate participation by local agencies and governing bodies.

We presently feel that we have overcome these difficulties and if we are allowed to function for another year, at least our present funding level, our agency will have made great strides towards breaking the cycle of poverty that exists within our area. Examples of how programs will be hurt if a 10% cut were to occur include the following: The loss of at least one Head Start class which includes one teacher, one teacher aide, one bus driver, 20 students and possibly one other member of our supportive service team. In Day Care, the loss of 10% of our revenue would result in a loss of 10 children, one teacher, one teacher aide and possibly our kitchen staff. In NYC, it would mean a loss of at least 12 slots and one staff member.

For each program, we could go right down the line and subtract at least 10% of the number of participants and approximately two to three per cent of the supportive services that are provided for each program. This would be a disaster because we know we are already grossly underfunded.

THOMAS L. BRADLEY,
Executive Director.

COOK COUNTY OFFICE OF
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
Chicago, Ill.

We have received notification from Region V, OEO, that our budget would be cut during its program year (F), April 1, 1971 through March 31, 1972.

a. CCOEO's present federal funding level is as follows:

Local initiative: 979,835 (Administration, Planning, Community Service Centers, Housing Development, Youth Development).

Earmarked: 689,958 (Family Planning, Emergency Food and Medical Services, Legal Services, VISTA).

Headstart: 1,371,000 (Full Year Part Day, Day Care).

Manpower: 912,710 (NYC, OJT).

b. CCOEO's reduced funding level is as follows:

Local initiative: 790,000 for a reduction of: 189,835.

Earmarked: 550,617 for a reduction of: 139,341.

Head Start: 1,234,000 for a reduction of: 137,000 (expected but not official).

Manpower: unknown; On the Job Training probably to be eliminated in February, 1971.

c. The reasons for the cut in local initiative funds is explained in the attached letter from Mr. W. Verduin, Regional Director dated, September 2, 1970. The reasons for cuts in the earmarked funds are also explained as having to do with substantially reduced carry-over balances. Recent information indicates that Legal Services and Head Start will be cut, but the announcement is not official and the reasons have not been made clear. As of the date of this letter, information has been received that some of these reductions will not be as great as previously announced, but this word is not official.

This Agency's programs in Housing Development, Medical Services, and Child Feeding and Nutrition—all pilot programs with excellent evaluations—all being reduced or eliminated. Again, the lack of carry-over funds, together with no substantial increase projected in community action program funds, accounts for these reductions.

d. The impact of these reductions on the programs of CCOEO will be widespread probably resulting in:

(1) Elimination of the youth development program.

(2) Elimination of the low-income housing production program of the Agency with the resultant loss of the production of several hundred new low-income housing units in one depressed community.

(3) Elimination of the Maywood Comprehensive Health Care Clinic with an average patient load of over 1,000.

(4) Elimination of the child feeding and nutrition program serving over 350 children daily, and substantial reduction in the supplemental food distribution program now reaching about 7,000 individuals.

(5) Reduction in the number of Head Start children by 10 to 15%.

(6) Curtailment of the Agency's planning, research, training and evaluation components.

This Agency would need about an 8 to 10% annual increase to maintain current operating levels taking into account tenure salary increments, and inflationary cost increases in goods and services.

CCOEO, Inc. reaches approximately:

(a) 16% of eligible population in Community Action Programs

(b) 10% of eligible Head Start children

(c) 2% of population eligible for Manpower and Youth-training services. (On a year-around basis; percentage approaches 70% in summer).

BENJAMIN T. SCOTT,
President.

CHICAGO COMMITTEE ON
URBAN OPPORTUNITY,
Chicago, Ill.

We were informed by the Great Lakes Regional Office of the Office of Economic Opportunity on August 14, 1970 that our versatile funding level for program year "G" was to be 8.8% less than the previous year's level. The primary reason given for this reduction was that the Regional Office had experienced a decrease in carry-over funds from the previous years. This cut represented a reduction from a funding level of \$13,062,000.00 for program year "F" to \$12,570,000.00 for program year "G".

In addition to this cut, we were informed that our Emergency Food Program funds were being reduced to \$250,000.00, a decrease of 23% from last year's level of \$325,000.00. We were further advised of a reduction to \$90,000.00 from \$100,000.00 the previous year's funding level for our Senior Opportunity Service Program. This represented another 10% cut in our funds.

On October 7 we received telephone notification from the Regional Office of the Office of Child Development that we should start immediately to identify areas where we could absorb a 10% cut across the board in our Head Start Program. We were informed that a letter of instructions for implementing these cuts would be forwarded shortly.

We immediately proceeded to follow these instructions by scheduling exploratory conferences with each of our delegate agencies. Subsequent to these conferences, our delegate agencies organized for protesting these cuts. As they were gaining impetus, we, fortunately, received both a verbal and written communication from the Regional Office of the Office of Child Development, advising that we were authorized to maintain our program at the current funding level and that we will be notified if any cuts will be required later.

(Mrs.) MURRELL SYLER,
Executive Director.

PEORIA CITIZENS COMMITTEE
FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, INC.,
Peoria, Ill.

Our present funding level for the areas to be cut is \$267,000.00. The area to be cut in our program is identified as local initiative funds. There are four program accounts which are funded under local initiative at our agency. They are: Central Administration, Neighborhood Service System, Planning Development and Youth Development.

These accounts which total \$267,000.00 have been cut by \$15,000.00. More specifically, the Youth Development account which was budgeted at \$40,000.00 has been cut to \$35,000.00, a reduction of \$5,000.00. The other three accounts, Central Administration, Neighborhood Service and Planning had a total budget of \$227,000.00, and our instructions were that these would be cut in the aggregate of \$10,000.00, with the discretion left to the local community as to where to realize the cut.

The reasons given by OEO for the cut in funds is stated in a letter submitted to us and dated September 2, 1970, from Mr. Wendlle Verduin, Director of the Region Five Great Lakes Office of Economic Opportunity, Chicago. A copy of this letter is enclosed with the information we are supplying. The basic concept seems to be that the local initiative

resources allocated to OEO Region Five from Headquarters are \$5,481,000.00 less than the amount needed in this region to continue funding Community Action Agencies at their present level. This letter was one which was sent to all Community Action Agencies, and we did not receive a written indication of the amount which would be cut from our programs, but were informed from Regional OEO via the telephone that our local initiative funds would be cut \$15,000.00 and specifically the Youth Development \$5,000.00, and the other three accounts, an aggregate of \$10,000.00 for the three.

The impact on our program here in Peoria, of course, will be significant. In addressing ourselves to the full meaning of the cuts, as related to our agency, the staff prepared a list of alternative ways to approach these impending cuts. These were submitted to our Executive Committee and ultimately to our Board, and no official action has been taken on these as yet in that our programs will not be affected until January 1, 1971. However, for your information, also enclosed with this reply is the narrative concerning the alternatives presented to our Executive Committee, as well as the progress report which was ultimately submitted to our Board with regard to this.

The second item in your request asked to estimate the funding level necessary to maintain our present programs, in terms of a percentage increase and percentage in present budget. Actually, the restoration of the \$15,000.00 would maintain our present program at the proper level. The cut of \$15,000.00 in our local initiative would create some problems. We do not see an absolute need to increase our budget beyond the present level, excluding the cuts. Of course, like many agencies, we feel that additional funds over and above our present allocation could enhance our capabilities to deal with the problems of poverty. However, this would take more than a superficial response in terms of indicating these areas of need.

Item three asked what percentage of the eligible or needy population our agency is now serving. Our present agency structure including the Legal Service and Head Start accounts, which are of course ear-marked funds, as well as the local initiative program accounts, would serve people in the following categories: Legal Services probably will end the year with an active case load of something like 1300 to 1400 clients; the Head Start Program serves 540 children and their families, this is Summer Head Start; our Neighborhood Service System is actively working with some 1300 families in the poverty community. By way of indication of what the percentage of that is, the recent State of Illinois Annual Poverty Report indicates that some 28% of the total Peoria County population of 205,000 persons is at the income level between three and five thousand dollars annual income. In that regard, other figures which we have indicate that there are approximately between sixteen to twenty thousand persons in the City of Peoria in the target communities who are in the low-income and poverty categories. We would estimate then that this would constitute some four to five thousand families, and in that regard, our agency probably is addressing itself to the needs of about 30% to 35% of these persons.

KENLEY R. WADE,
Executive Director.

IOWA

SOUTHEAST IOWA HEAD START,
Burlington, Iowa.

Southeast Iowa Head Start operates ten part-day Head Start classes for 172 children in five centers located in Washington, Henry, Lee and Des Moines Counties, with the Southeast Iowa Community Action Org., Inc., as the grantee.

1. OEO notified us through a letter from

Mr. Kenton Williams, Assistant Regional Director, Office of Child Development, HEW, Kansas City, dated October 12, 1970, that our funds would be cut 7%.

- Our present funding level is \$170,887.
- The 7% reduction would make our funding level \$158,925, a cut of \$11,962.
- The letter from Mr. Williams gives the following reasons for the cut:

"The Region VII funding plan is based upon our Region's share of the Head Start earmarked funds and our Regional projection of 1970 carry-over funds. The total of the anticipated new funds and the carry-over represents our total Regional funding level.

"The current Regional plan is based upon each agency's Fiscal Year 1970 funding level less a percentage cut, uniformly applied, necessary to adjust to the fiscal 1971 projected Regional funding level."

- If we were to absorb this loss by a cut in number of children, it would be necessary to close 2 of our 10 classes. To save the money by cutting out trainees or low-income employees would be impossible for two reasons:
- (1) We need the present number to operate the program, although a cut of two classes would eliminate two low-income teacher aides.

(2) The savings from cutting the low-income people would be impractical since it would not cover much of our loss.

Actually, we are planning to absorb the loss in the following ways: We intend to operate a quality program for the present number of employees, of whom 50% are low-income, up to two or three weeks before the close of the eight-month funding period.

We are embarking on an area-wide fundraising program in the hopes that we can continue for the full 34 weeks. We are incorporating Title I employees wherever openings allow, and we are appealing for volunteer help with our enormous children's transportation costs.

The main impact on our program is the tension, fear, and insecurity suffered by both staff and parents since we were already funded when the cut was announced, our people were all hired, and we were beginning with the highest hope and greatest pride in the history of Southeast Iowa Head Start. With enthusiastic community cooperation we had enlarged our program by one class of 16 children on the same funding that we had in 1969-70.

2. To maintain our present program, we need a 5% increase over the 1970-71 funding of \$170,887.

3. Because of the transportation difficulties, we are able to serve less than 50% of our rural poor. With present unemployment and inflation circumstances, we are probably not reaching more than 50% of the urban low-income population.

CAROLYN A. FRIEDSON,
Director, Head Start.

MATURA ACTION CORP.,
Creston, Iowa.

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year? If so, supply: Yes.

a. Present funding level; Local Initiative—\$177,000. Summer Head Start—\$57,072. NYC—\$159,250.

b. OEO's reduced funding level; Local Initiative—\$173,770—2% reduction. Head Start—\$52,905—7% reduction. NYC—\$130,250—19% reduction.

c. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds; Regional Office states Congress did not appropriate adequate funds.

d. Impact on your program; for example, number of children who will be cut out of Head Start or trainees eliminated from Manpower program. In-school NYC—Same 48. Could use 100 additional slots to fill the need. Out-of-School NYC—Cut from 48 to 14. Because an experimental program was not re-

funded. Summer NYC—125. Could use an additional 100 slots. Head Start—7% cut in Head Start, from last year to this year represents reduction of services to 6 children. Local Initiative—The reduction in Local Initiative funds makes it necessary to reduce outreach.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget. At least 20%—(Since inception of our program we have lost approximately 35% of our funding.)

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving? 13% of the potential due to budgetary limitations.

JOE PALS,
Executive Director,
MATURA Action Corp.

UPPER DES MOINES
OPPORTUNITY, INC.,
Emmetsburg, Iowa.

Regional O.E.O. notified us on September 15, 1970, that our O.E.O. funds would be reduced from \$154,956 to \$152,260 for the next funding year.

On October 27, 1970, our regional O.E.O. field representative verbally informed us that the funds would not be reduced from last years level.

Regional H.E.W. informed us on October 12, 1970, that our Head Start funds would be reduced by 7% for the next funding year. We estimate that a funding level of \$160,379 for O.E.O. and \$222,888 for H.E.W. would enable us to maintain our present programs. A reduction in H.E.W. funds will mean we will serve 165 instead of 200 children. We are now serving 11% of the eligible population.

D. CRAIG FORD,
Deputy Director.

NORTHEAST IOWA COMMUNITY AC-
TION CORP.,
Decorah, Iowa.

1. a. Present funding level O.E.O. 221,151; Headstart 134,788.

b. O.E.O.'s reduced funding level: O.E.O. 217,920; Headstart 124,353.

c. Reason given by O.E.O. for cut in funds: Lack of money.

d. Impact on our programs: We may have to choose between being understaffed or serving fewer people, possibly both. In addition to the across-the-board cut in Headstart funds, we are told to expect a 20 percent cut, unless we transfer the Summer Headstart Program to a year round program. This means a reduction of from 15 summer classes and 3 year round classes to 8 year round classes, since it must be done with less money than we are presently allowed.

Of the approximately 250 children who could be served in the summer class only 75 of them can be served in the year round classes. Also the 3 current year round classes will have to be cut from 10 months to 9 months and will have to be limited to one age group instead of the present two.

2. Funding level necessary to maintain present programs: Summer Headstart 140,000. If converted to full year Headstart 225,000; O.E.O. 223,000.

3. Percentage of eligible or needy now being served: Approximately 17%.

JAMES R. KRAMBEER,
Deputy Director.

HACAP HEAD START PRESCHOOL,
Iowa City, Iowa.

1. The regional OEO-HEW office has notified us that year round budgets must be cut 7.3% (year round programs), 30+ % (summer programs).

a. Our present funding level is \$182,037.

b. The reduced funding level is \$169,094.

c. Reason given for cut is that more carry over funds were anticipated than there actually will be.

d. Impact on our program: in Johnson County increased community cash support will be used to cushion the cut, instead of being used to expand the program as planned. In Jones County cut back in number of children served. In Linn County cutback in quality.

2. A 5% funding increase would be necessary to maintain our present program.

3. We are serving in full year full day groups: Johnson County—50% of eligible children; Linn County—None; Jones County—None.

We are serving in summer groups: Johnson County—None; Linn County—75%; Jones County—90%.

We are serving in full year part day groups: Johnson County—60%; Linn County—25%; Jones County—None.

We are part of the Hawkeye Area Community Action Program, 105-8th Avenue S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 52401, Grant #6114, Executive Director, Russell Proffitt.

(Mrs.) CAROL FRACASSINI,
Head Start Center Supervisor,
Johnson County.

GREATER OPPORTUNITIES, INC.,
Des Moines, Iowa.

Greater Opportunities has received word that we will definitely get a cut in funding of our 1971 Head Start budget.

1. a. Present funding level: Our present funding level of \$286,036.00 will be converted to full-year Head Start programs.

b. OEO's reduced funding level: The reduced funding level as suggested to our agency will be 7% of our total allocation (\$20,022.52).

c. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds: The reason given was that the Region VII funding plan, based upon the regional share of Head Start ear-marked funds and the regional projections of the 1970 carry over funds dictates that our regional allocation will not be enough to fund existing Head Start programs for 1971 as they did in 1970. Hence, our agency will experience a 7% cut in funds.

d. Impact on your program; for example, number of children who will be cut out of Head Start or trainees eliminated from Manpower program. First of all, to experience the suggested cut, it will be necessary to close two classrooms (40 children). In each center we have approximately 10 low-income persons who would lose employment because of proposed reduction in funds.

We will need approximately a \$300,000 funding level to maintain our present program. This is a reflection of the rising cost of goods and services. There are approximately 1200 eligible Head Start children in our quad-county area. Hence, we will actually need a budget of approximately \$960,000 for a total funding to take care of unmet needs of our pre-school impoverished children. This figure is approximated from a sum of \$800.00 per child per year.

We are now serving about 33% of the eligible Head Start Children.

ALFRED B. BROWN,
Executive Director.

KANSAS
S.E.K.-C.A.P. INC.,
Girard, Kans.

The following information concerns the Southeast Kansas Community Action Program's funding status.

DOL	\$589,530
HEW	522,000
OEO	407,929
Total	1,519,459
DOL	\$589,530
HEW	485,460
OEO	398,389
Total	1,473,379

DOL—No cut.
HEW—Regional 7% cut for all Head Start Programs in Region 7.

OEO—No reason stated.

This is very hard to estimate but in order to operate at this reduced funding level, there will be less people involved.

The necessary funding level to maintain the present program would be a 7% increase in our funding level.

DOL=25% (Work/Training).
HEW=25% (Head Start).
OEO=34%.

GARY L. PETTUS.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

FOUNDATION, INC.,
Kansas City, Kans.

Current O.E.O. Funding, \$669,000.

Head Start Funding, \$909,000.

OEO reduced funding level:

O.E.O., \$579,000.

Head Start, \$845,000.

Elimination of a Training and Technical Assistance Project directed at Advisory Board members in cooperation with the Model Cities effort.

2% general reduction of funds.

Elimination of the Training and Technical Program listed above.

No new or innovative programs.

Elimination of one Head Start Center, i.e. approximately 30 children.

O.E.O., \$720,000.

Head Start, \$1,000,000.

Approximately 25-30% of the eligible population is currently being served.

These statistics are from the Research Department of the Economic Opportunity Foundation, central headquarters located at 1707 N. 7th, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. This agency operates under Grant No. 0694.

JOHN L. ZUMWALT,
Managing Director.

KENTUCKY

FAYETTE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

Lexington, Ky.

Our funding level for the Full Year Head Start program was cut \$8,329.00. This amount was transferred from Summer 1971 program. Our funding level is \$169,742 with the \$8,329 added to comply with our proposal. Our Summer 1971 allocation is \$91,225 and \$99,554. We are being encouraged to convert the summer allocation into the Full Year program so we can dodge another cut.

The cut for this year did not eliminate any children because of the transfer of funds. However, we will eliminate approximately 250 children from the summer program due to conversion. We feel that the summer program is not sufficient, and conversion should take place.

To fund our present program with 15 children per class and not 20, as we now have, would take an additional 15% funding.

We are serving approximately 35% of the eligible children. To serve the entire group with adequate housing, staff, etc., would cost approximately \$500,000 or more.

The Head Start program is excellent. We cannot finance a kindergarten program, therefore, this is the only program for these children.

FRANKLIN W. SANDERS,
Associate Superintendent for State
and Federal Programs, Division of
Community Relations.

KNOX COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL, INC.,

Barbourville, Ky.

Last year's funding for the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council's Program year was \$242,867. For the present 1970-71 program year our funding will be \$235,581. The reason given by OEO for this reduction was simply that a shortage of OEO funds necessitated a percentage cut in fund for community action agencies.

The most obvious impact such a reduction has had on our program is the elimination of some staff positions within the Early Childhood and Economic Development Programs. To maintain the program level of the 1969-70 year, we would require \$279,200, which is a 19% increase over the amount we are presently funded. We are presently serving approximately 50% of the eligible or needy population of this area.

HOLLIS D. WEST,
Executive Director.

JACKSON-CLAY CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM,

Manchester, Ky.

We were first told that the Jackson/Clay CAA would sustain an across-the-board cut of 7%. This was later increased to 14.5% for the Community Action part of the funding. This included approximately 22% cut in Emergency Food and Medical Services, a 40% cut in Account 62, or our Economic Development component. We are one of the few CAA's that had its Headstart Program cut only 3%.

In answer to specific questions, please note the following: a) present funding level of both OEO and HEW administered funds \$563,000, b) OEO's reduced funding level \$516,000, c) reason given by OEO for cuts—cuts ordered by national OEO headquarters, d) impact on our program: Had to reduce 8 weeks for full-year Headstart; eliminate all except extreme emergency help for malnutrition cases; and cut in monies used to create permanent employment and job development.

This agency would need double this amount of current funding in order to increase substantial services in the various programs. Seventy per cent (70%) of our population fall within the federal government guidelines.

We are now serving in some capacity approximately 20-30% of the citizens in need of our agency.

Headstart in Clay County is desperately needed to limit the per cent of retainees in the first grade, and provide nutritional and health services. Most of us know schools today are middle-class oriented and our children living 24 miles up hollows are not middle-class. They need broad experiences so they may be able to adjust socially, emotionally, physically and mentally.

PADUCAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

Paducah, Ky.

OEO has notified us that our budget has been cut for our 1970-71 program year.

(a) Present funding level: \$122,001.00.

(b) OEO reduced funding level by 15%.

(c) We were told that there had been a cutback in the funding level by the House for fiscal 1971. Most surprised to see in your letter that in fact there has been a \$98 million increase over the \$1,948 billion appropriated for fiscal 1970.

(d) We have cut our operation from 9½ months to 9 months of operation in order that we not drop any children. This 15% reduction in funding had forced us to reduce all categories in our budget by 15%.

We could operate well on our original request of \$143,428.00. This is a 15% increase over our present budget.

We are serving 75% of those eligible for this program.

RICHARD B. BROWN,
Assistant Superintendent.

HOPKINS-MUHLENBERG COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE, INC.,

Madisonville, Ky.

In answer to your letter of October 20, 1970, OEO has notified us that our budget must be cut for the coming year. Our funding level for the year 1969-70 was \$214,542. OEO has informed us that our versatile funds will be reduced by approximately \$1,000.

Several attempts were made to determine why this reduction but we were unsuccessful.

HEW has informed us that our budget for the 1970-71 year will be cut \$2,500. This was an overall Head Start cut.

Only yesterday we were informed that our Summer Head Start Program may receive an additional 20% cut. Our feeling here is that this is a means of phasing-out Summer Head Start Programs. The impact on our program basically would be a loss or elimination of approximately 60 Head Start children. We regard this a step into the past. To maintain only our present program we would estimate an increase of 3% of our existing funding level.

JOE LOVELL,
Acting Director.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL, INC., COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM,

Fulton, Ky.

OEO has informed us that our funds must be cut for the coming program year. This cut will affect all initiative funds and Headstart funds will possibly mean eliminating some staff. We have tried with the small amount of funds to serve four counties with approximately 950 square miles and 32,229 people.

Our present funding level for Community Action is \$134,000 divided into three components:

Conduct and Administration	-----	\$31,576
Community Organization	-----	87,651
Senior Citizens	-----	14,773
Emergency Food and Medical	-----	20,000

Total ----- 154,000

\$154,000 but we have never received a Manpower Grant.

OEO's reduced funding level is uncertain to us because from the memo from OEO because of limited federal appropriation the maximum level for next program year will be \$163,000 broken down into the following categories:

Conduct and Administration	-----	\$31,576
Community Organization	-----	86,651
Senior Citizens	-----	13,773
Emergency Food and Medical	-----	30,000

Reason given by OEO for anticipated cut, congress has not appropriated the money.

The impact on our program this will have, it will eliminate any chances of us ever getting a Manpower program here. OEO has never helped us by giving us a grant for Manpower. We do not have a Neighborhood Youth Center Slots, Mainstream or Green-thumb.

We can truthfully say that because of lack of funds, no Manpower funds, no manpower programs. We are not serving 5% of the needy population in the four county area, of the 32,229 people that live in the four county area, 65% are below the poverty guideline.

Our Headstart budget for the funding level for last year was \$81,999 for eight weeks. OEO has reduced this to \$79,537 and have required that we go to a full year Headstart Program, the reason given by OEO for cutting funds is listed in their letter. Due to reduction in Headstart appropriation there will be an additional decrease in federal funds. The impact this will be on our program will be that we must serve less children, from 325 to 60. We have requested money to serve all 350 in this area, but the response we get is that Headstart appropriation has been reduced by congress. According to OEO figures we will need \$350,000 to serve a full year Headstart program as it takes approximately \$1,000 per child.

RUFUS ADKINS, Jr.,
Executive Director.

LOUISIANA

ST. MARY PARISH HEADSTART,
Franklin, La.

In the St. Mary Parish Headstart, after having our children's physicals done ninety per cent (90%) of two hundred (200) children was suffering from anemia, and to cut off some of their health care could be damaging for their entire life.

OEO has notified me that there would be a seven to ten percent (7-10%) cut in our budget for the coming year.

a. Our present funding level is \$222,789.
b. Our reduced funding level is at the present unknown.

c. The reason that OEO gave for the cut in funds is that there is a shortage of funds.

d. The cutback of funds would have a great impact on my program. I cannot say exactly the number of children who will be cut off of Headstart, but I do know if there were a cut the very needy children would suffer, because for some children this is the only well balanced meal they will get.

Of the two hundred (200) children, not one had had a physical examination or had ever seen a dentist.

This would be the worst thing ever to happen to the poor families and their children. Instead of a cut back of funds we could use an increase of about twenty per cent (20%) of the present budget.

We are now serving twenty-five per cent (25%) of the needy population in St. Mary Parish.

MRS. CALDONIA B. LEE,
Headstart Director.

AVOYELLES PROGRESS ACTION COMMITTEE,
Marksville, La.

We have been alerted by H.E.W. to expect a cut in Head Start funds in the amount of a 7% to 10% decrease. At present, the budget we work under allows us to serve about 20% of the children's needs. We can readily see that we need a substantial increase in funding level rather than this proposed cut.

If this 7-10% decrease is definite, we would have to decrease the number of children by about 75 to 100.

Our grant number is 5109, and we are the Avoyelles Progress Action Committee, Inc., located in Marksville, Louisiana.

RODNEY L. JUNEAU,
Executive Director.

CENLA COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE, INC.,
Alexandria, La.

In accordance to information received from the desk of the Assistant Regional Director of the Office of Child Development, the HEW Dallas Regional Office, dated September 21, 1970, reduction in Head Start's funding level, CCAC, Inc., makes the following report based upon the Summer and Full Year Head Start remaining separate programs.

Summer Head Start total funding, federal and nonfederal:

Total \$223,953. Anticipated loss (20%) 44,791. Total after reduction \$179,162.

Total number of children this program year: 920. Anticipated loss 53. Total after reduction 867.

Full Year Head Start total funding, federal and nonfederal:

Total \$893,716. Anticipated loss (7%) 62,560. Total after reduction \$831,156.

Total number of children this program year: 650. Anticipated loss 59. Total after reduction 591.

The total funding level for Cenla Community Action Committee, Inc., "2,509,036". Anticipated loss 107,351.

These are the only official reductions in funds that have been received by this office to date.

The effect this will have on our program and community will be a loss of 112 children from our current programs. This will also

mean additional expenditures upon families that are already experiencing tight money problems. As of this date, we are only serving approximately 44% of the eligible families now.

In our Full Year Head Start Program there is a waiting list for placement for some of our services. In order to serve the ones that we are serving, we had to re-establish criteria because of the large number that made applications for services to this program.

There is a slight possibility that the Policy Committees will concur and merge Summer and Full Year Head Start Programs. If so, this will ease the additional loss. This agency has received no other official notices; unofficially, we have been informed of a 5% reduction of the total programs.

Once again may I re-emphasize that the above figures that were given on the programs represent the total federal and non-federal shares. Our federal share in Summer Head Start is 174,281. The federal share of Full Year Head Start is 696,716.

W. A. GRIFFIN,
Director.

ST. MARTIN IBERIA LAFAYETTE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Lafayette, La.

Our Regional Office has notified us of a possible cut in funds for the coming year. A copy of that correspondence is attached.

The present Head Start funding level is 784,653. The reduced funding level would be approximately 700,000.

Any reduction in our present funding level would result in one or several of the following:

1. Reduction in number of children and families served.
2. Reduction in number of persons employed.
3. Prevention of expansion to areas not yet served.
4. Dissatisfaction among the populous that taxpayers money is not being used for programs needed and wanted in the area.

The reason for this cut was caused by reduction in funding level for the Program Year 1970.

Our program presently serves only about 30% of the eligible Head Start children in the area. The Policy Council has previously set as a priority the expansion of Head Start to other needy areas that are requesting it but have not been able to be served because there has never been enough funds. Now, what could we do with increased funds?

This is our situation:

In our present Head Start Programs—namely, St. Martin, Iberia, Lafayette Parishes, we are serving 870 children. However, we have a current waiting list of 550 eligible participants who we cannot serve because of lack of funds. With an increase of 50% over our present level we could maintain our present program and increase the participants and make provisions for salary increases according to our Career Development Program.

Head Start is one of OEO Programs sponsored by S.M.I.L.E. CAA, Inc., along with Administration, Neighborhood Service Center, Emergency Food, Human Resources and Youth Enrichment. We have also been notified about across the Board cut on all funded programs, when we cannot financially meet program needs as present conditions exist.

Funding cutbacks would seriously hamper efforts already limited by funding shortages. In St. Martin Parish alone for example, approximately 4,396 persons left the parish during the period 1950-60, mainly for economic reasons.

57.7% of the 6,504 families earn less than \$3000 annually. 1263 families earn less than \$1000 per year.

Head Start and the other anti-poverty programs have reached the people. The Emergency Food and Medical Program has bridged

the gap between hunger and food stamps in many instances.

Ills of children and families have been treated and services provided for such things as severe rickets, parasites, tuberculosis and other diseases.

KEN MALVEAUX,
Executive Director.

ACTION ASSOCIATION, INC.,
LASALLE MULTI-PARISH COMMUNITY,

Harrisonburg, La.

The Southwest Regional Office through which the LaSalle Community Action Association, Inc. receives its OEO funds has not established a definite guide on budget cuts for the next program year. Mr. Griffith, the Regional Director stated in a meeting in Baton Rouge on October 12, 1970 that there would be a cut back in the CAP programs funding for the State of Louisiana. Since that time no action has been taken regarding the situation.

This CAA's total funding level (Federal funds) is approximately \$544,000 per year. The only area in which we have been given explicit indication of a cut back is in our Head Start program. This program is funded for \$30,848. The cut back is to be approximately 7 to 10 percent of this figure.

Any cut back on any of our programs would so seriously hinder our impact on the problems of poverty as to make the program almost totally ineffective.

The funding level necessary to let this agency operate next year at the same program level would have to increase by approximately 10 percent. This would not expand any of the present programs nor the out reach. It would only make possible the same level of activity that is presently in progress.

This agency serving a five-parish area has a total population of approximately 70,000 people. Of this number 56.1 percent fall below the national poverty guideline. Due to lack of funding to involve programs and the number of staff available to meet the needs in this area, we are only able to reach about 50 percent of those who are qualified for and need our services.

NORMAN E. TISON,
Executive Director.

MARYLAND

COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE OF
ALLEGANY COUNTY, MARYLAND,
INC.,

Cumberland, Md.

I. A. Present funding levels—HEW \$142,000, OEO 71,400.

B. Threatened reduced funding levels—HEW \$133,060, OEO 63,067.

C. Reasons given by OEO for reduction based on pending appropriations.

D. 1. With the HEW reduction at least fifteen (15) children would be eliminated from our program.

2. With the OEO reduction the number of persons who are participants in our program would be reduced by at least 800. This number primarily are out-reached through OEO efforts and placed in labor programs, i.e., O.J.T., MDTA, Small Business, etc.

II. In terms of a percentage increase in our present funding level, we would require a 20% increase to maintain our current program activities.

III. With the present funding level which limits our staffing, only 4 to 5% of the needy population is being served;

Therefore this agency and the residents of Allegany County would sincerely hope the Senators realize the impact a reduction would make in our activities. Hopefully, also they will recognize the need for increased funding to areas such as ours, which has 20.6% of its population living on income less than \$3,000 and has an unemployment rate of well over 7 per cent. Also, in this county, shamefully, data indicates that 27% of the population 25 years and older have less than

an eighth grade education. The funds we receive from OEO go into programs designed to combat these conditions.

LUCILLE J. METHENY,
Executive Director.

ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE, INC.,

Annapolis, Md.

The program of the Anne Arundel Economic Opportunity Committee, Inc., serves the entire county.

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year?

Yes.

1970	
a. Agency Versatile funds, Account #CG2160 -----	\$92,986
Head Start -----	143,000
1971	
b. Agency Versatile Funds, CG2160 -----	92,986
Head Start cut 7% -----	132,990

In addition to the overall cut, there was a deficiency of \$9000 in the 1970 Head Start Grant for food, due to uneligibility of these children for food supplement from Department of Agriculture.

c. The reason given for the cut was that insufficient appropriations required a 7% cut in Head Start across the board.

d. The 7% reduction of Head Start funding along with previous deficiencies means that one teacher and two aides must be dropped, thus eliminating one class of 15 children. This reduces the total program from 105 children to 90 children.

In-place funding for the general CAA programs (agency versatile funds) means that necessary activities must be reduced to provide for normal increases in salaries and inflation. This is our third year of in-place funding, while our program needs continue to expand.

2. Please estimate what funding level is necessary to maintain your present program.

To maintain our present Head Start Program an increase of 15% in Head Start funds is needed.

To maintain our present program (other than Head Start) an increase in our versatile funds of 7 1/2% is necessary.

3. What percentage of the needy population are you now serving?

The 1970 census regards 11% (32,043) of the 291,300 residents of Anne Arundel County as having incomes of less than \$3000. Our various programs reach 6,000 of the poor scattered over the county.

In regard to Head Start, about 1000 children in the county are eligible and would participate if our program could accommodate them. This year we are providing for 105, next year for 90. We have available space provided by public and private in-kind contributions to take care of 300 Head Start children, but additional staff members are needed to operate these facilities. Staff can be obtained only with more cash resources to pay their salaries. Local funding sources have already been tapped to support our low-cost day care program for children of low-income working mothers. This program is partially self-supporting through fees paid by their parents. It provides activities similar to Head Start for 67 pre-school children.

We feel that our program, which was originally under-funded because of a late start, has been stunted by refunding "in place". Selectivity in funding, rather than across-the-board controls, would enable successful programs such as ours to extend their effectiveness.

ARTHUR H. FAWCETT,
President, Board of Directors.

SHORE UP, INC.,

Salisbury, Md.

Our present funding level: \$152,000 for youth development in program year ended April 1.

\$113,000 for local initiative funds for program year ended September 30.

Last year we were authorized \$398,000 in Head Start funds from HEW.

Reductions are as follows: Youth development to \$132,000.

Local initiative funds to \$94,000.

Five percent cut in Head Start.

OEO has not given specific reasons for the cuts. Such problems as headquarter's demands for experimental money, instructions for programs in place and the like have been offered.

The impact has been felt most keenly in Head Start. Overhead costs remain constant while a 5% reduction has prevented us from opening a center that would serve between 15 and 45 children. Differences in other funds has caused us to eliminate 20 enrollees from training and related programs.

A funding level necessary to maintain our present program should be increased by 5 to 7% rather than decreased by 5%.

In answer to your question about the percentage of eligible or needy population we are now serving, I would say that Head Start is serving 20% of eligible children, and our other programs are serving approximately 15% of the eligible population.

R. SCOTT WILSON,
Executive Director.

MASSACHUSETTS

SPRINGFIELD ACTION COMMISSION,
PROJECT HEAD START,

Springfield, Mass.

OEO through DHEW-OCD has informed us that our budget will be cut between 9-11% amounting to approximately \$13,000.00. We are presently funded for \$112,967.00. The cut will reduce that to \$100,000.00. This reduction will force us to drop 40 children from a program serving 125 children. 6,000 children in our target communities are potentially eligible for our program and we have over 200 on the waiting list.

In order to provide staff with step-level and cost of living increases and maintain quality service in service areas such as psychological, health, dental and speech and hearing, it is necessary for us to be funded at a level of at least \$130,000.00. But that level is for a 35 week program. Since we are providing day care services to children of working mothers too, we need to be funded at a level sufficient to operate a twelve month program.

ROBERT S. SWAN,
Director, Project Head Start.

TRIUMPH, INC.,
Taunton, Mass.

I represent 108 families of low-income status with pre-school age children enrolled in our local Head Start program in Taunton, Mass. We are a single purpose agency with no funded CAA. We operate under a governing body known as Triumph, Inc.

We have been in the unfortunate straits of repeatedly having to diminish the quality of our program last year for lack of funds. We have also had to cut the number of children we can serve each year for the same reason.

A policy statement issued on September 30, 1970 from the Regional Office of Child Development informs us that further reductions are anticipated for fiscal 1971. Reasons given for these cuts are based on a reduction of prior year unexpended funds and partly on anticipated reductions in new appropriations.

Our present funding level is \$109,000; the same as 1968-1969, 1969-1970 and 1970-1971. The reductions are expected to be between 9-11% for fiscal 1971. This means a further reduction in both quality and quantity of our efforts. We now serve approximately 65% of those children and families needing the program. Cuts to the extent of 10% would mean that of our 6 classes of 18 children each, we would have to drop back to 4 classes

of 18 children each and reduce the number served to less than 50%. This is wholly inconsistent with the needs of poor families in our county. We need more money not less.

We are unable to provide any auxiliary services such as medical, dental or psychological and believe me, a large number of our families desperately need just such attention.

Our funding level ought to be in the neighborhood of \$180,000 per year to allow us to adequately meet the needs of our low-income families. This is only adequate and by no means excessive. To maintain our present program an allocation of \$118,000 would be needed.

It is our sincere hope that due consideration will be given to the needs of early childhood programs before cuts are authorized.

WILLIAM C. EMSLEY,
Director, Operation Head Start.

COMMUNITY TEAMWORK, INC.,
Lowell, Mass.

We are facing impending cuts in three programs: Head Start, CEP, and NYC. Across the board cuts for this region have been announced for the Head Start program. We have been notified of specific cuts for the CEP program, and NYC cuts for the In-School program are already in effect. The effect of these cuts have been summarized on the attached sheet. May I point out that in all three areas we were not notified of the cuts by OEO, but rather by the administering agencies, HEW and DOL respectively.

We are, of course, concerned about these actions. In light of the President's earlier announcement of increased emphasis on the early childhood field, this proposed cut, in the only nationwide federally funded program of this kind, seems a contradiction.

Our concerns about impending cuts in manpower programs are especially acute since the employment picture in the area is quite grim. The unemployment rate is now 9.3%, the highest in Massachusetts and one of the highest in the nation. Lowell has just been reclassified into area E by the DOL, which means it is an area of substantial unemployment. We are the only SMSA in Massachusetts to have this rather unfortunate distinction. To cut ongoing manpower programs at this time seems a contradiction. Our NYC program has been a success from the start and consistently maintains a waiting list of around two hundred. Recent statistics from the DOL places CEP placement rate as second highest in the region, although our funding level is one of the lowest. Approximately \$225,000 for manpower purposes is coming into the area from the DOL. However, in light of these impending cuts, the effect of this additional money is neutralized.

LEO F. DESJARLAIS,
Executive Director.

ONBOARD INC.,
New Bedford, Mass.

Through the Office of Child Development, we have been informed that our Head Start budget will be cut 11% from its present level of \$67,800 to approximately \$60,342. The indicated reasons for this, from the Office of Child Development, are the expectations of Federal funding cuts to the Head Start Program. The proposed cut in our budget would mean the elimination of approximately 22 of our present pre-school children.

Our present funding level is as follows by component:

Basic Versatile	\$282,000
Youth Development	18,000
Health Services	14,000
Training and Technical Assistance	40,000
Legal Services	75,000
Head Start	67,800

In order to maintain our present programs at their current level, we estimate that it would be necessary to be funded at an in-

crease of 10% due to increases in personnel, facilities, and service costs.

At present, we are serving approximately 35% of the eligible population of our target areas.

In addition to the above, we are aggressively seeking new OEO funding for expanding and upgrading of Health Services and the expansion of the existing inadequate Surplus Food Commodity Distribution Program.

JOHN C. SHARP,
Executive Director.

ACTION FOR BOSTON
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, INC.,
Boston, Mass.

ABCD, which is the community action agency for Boston, currently receives funds from all three of the above-named Federal sources. Our prospects for funding in the coming year differ somewhat with regard to each of the three agencies, and I will treat them separately below.

I. OEO FUNDS:

We currently receive funds from OEO both for programs administered by OEO and for Head Start which is administered by HEW. The OEO-administered programs are of two types: programs running on a continuing basis and those funded for limited periods of time.

With regard to OEO-administered programs running on a continuing basis:

OEO has not notified us that our budget must be cut for 1971. Our present funding level for these kinds of programs is \$7,434,464.

Because of increased operating costs due to inflation, we estimate that to maintain our present programs at their current levels our budget would need to be increased by 7%, or by \$520,414 in 1971.

The various individual programs funded by this budget serve different proportions of the eligible populations. Overall, we estimate we are able to serve approximately one-tenth of the needy population in the City of Boston at our current funding level.

With regard to OEO-administered programs running on a limited basis:

We currently have three special grants (for family planning, for narcotics addiction, and for school hot lunches) each of which began in July, 1970, and will run out in the middle of 1971. The total amount of funds in these three grants is \$1,026,827. OEO has indicated to us that funding for two of these grants (family planning and narcotics) will be made available again. The hot lunch program, which accounts for \$96,000, will not be refunded. Funds in this program have been used to renovate school kitchens and the need for this will have been filled at the termination of the funding.

Again because of increasing costs due to inflation, we estimate that to maintain programs of this type a year from now we will need budget increases of 7%.

We estimate that with the family planning grant we will be able to serve approximately 50% of the eligible population in the City of Boston and with the narcotics program approximately 75% of the eligible population in a deliberately limited service area consisting of three housing projects.

With regard to Head Start:

We have been notified by the Regional Office of Child Development that our budget must be cut for the coming year. Our present funding level is \$2,655,340. The reduced funding level is to be \$2,363,252. The reasons given by OEO for the cut in funds are: reduced appropriations in OEO-funded programs and over-projections of 1969 and 1970 unexpended funds needed for funding in 1971 programs. If the budget cut is implemented, we will be forced to eliminate 197 children and their families from our Head Start program.

We feel that to maintain Head Start in

Boston at an effective level, it would be necessary to increase our present budget by 24.1%. This increase would offset the rise in operating costs due to inflation and would restore the program to its level prior to a cut which we sustained in 1968.

We currently have enrolled in the Head Start program 16% of those children in Boston who are eligible.

II. DOL funds:

We currently receive funds from the Department of Labor for a Concentrated Employment Program for the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

With regard to CEP:

DOL notified us several months ago that our CEP budget would be cut for the coming year. Our present level of funding is \$5,604,000. DOL planned to cut these funds to \$5,182,500. After protracted negotiations, DOL has recently agreed to fund us again at the current level. The reason given for the planned cut was an overall reduction in CEP funds nationally, although DOL stated that ours is one of the best of the many CEPs across the country. Had the cut been affected, we would have had to drop 300 slots in our Manpower training programs.

Due to increases in the number of persons unemployed in Boston over the course of the past year, we estimate funding for the CEP program would have to be increased by 50% for us to continue to have the same relative impact on the population which is unemployed and subemployed as we have in the past. A minimum 7% increase in funding would again be required merely to offset inflationary rises in operating costs.

We are currently providing employment services (training or direct job placement) to 10% of the eligible population in the city, including persons who are unemployed and subemployed.

With regard to the Neighborhood Youth Corps:

DOL has not notified us of any cut in these funds. Our present level of funding for NYC is \$1,427,000.

This is a first-time grant, funded at what we consider to be a realistic level.

We are currently serving 18% of the eligible population in Boston in the NYC program.

III. HEW funds:

We currently receive funds from HEW for the Foster Grandparents program and for a special Health Training Program.

With regard to Foster Grandparents:

HEW has not notified us of any forthcoming cuts in the Foster Grandparents program, which is currently budgeted for \$225,697. However, this program was cut by 5% last year and the grant, as it is now structured, does not provide any funds for overhead costs amounting to approximately 8.1% of the program funds. If this 8.1% were to be paid out of the current grant, program operations would be severely damaged.

As far as program operations go, the current grant level will be adequate to support Foster Grandparents at its present level next year.

Foster Grandparents currently serves about 4% of the elderly population eligible to participate.

With regard to the Health Training Program:

This program is a demonstration project which has been funded for two years and which, as planned, will terminate next year. The amount of funding for the program is \$53,897 per year.

If the program were to be continued, we would again need about 7% additional funds to maintain it at its present level.

The Health Training Program serves approximately 25% of the population which is eligible.

JOHN REPOLA,
Deputy Executive Director.

November 18, 1970

MICHIGAN
THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF
THE CITY OF MUSKEGON,
Muskegon, Mich.

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year?

It has been rumored and we have heard of the possibility that a 10% reduction in available funds will come about before the end of the present school fiscal year.

A. Present funding level, \$180,000.

B. OEO's reduced funding level, \$18,000 leaving an amount of \$162,000.

C. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds: Reason was failure of the President to release budgeted amounts and cutbacks in OEO preparations.

D. Impact on your program: for example, number of children who will be cut out of Head Start or trainees eliminated from Manpower Program.

If the above cutbacks are implemented it will result in 30 fewer children being serviced under Head Start. The reason for the large number is that fixed costs in tooling up for programs resulted in lower expansion costs for more children and higher costs for fewer children.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget.

Our present program as carried out in 1969-70 would necessitate a 7% across the board increase for all personnel. This would mean at least an \$11,000 increase over last year's program. Due to the fact that reductions in service had to be initiated under the 1970-71 program, we were able to maintain the same number of children in the program but reduce the number of teachers under contract.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving?

At the present time we are serving approximately 40% of needy children in our target district schools only. In other than target schools we are offering no service at all.

JAMES K. AUSTIN,
Director of Federal Programs.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE,
Eloise, Mich.

We have not been notified of any budget reduction. We have been told that there might be a reduction of 8-10%, however.

(a) Present funding level \$536,000.

(b) Unknown.

(c) Recommended reduction by House.

(d) A 10% reduction in our budget would take away \$53,600 and would be a major crisis. If the 10% budget cuts were made in the Summer programs about 178 children would be dropped from the program.

In order to maintain our present program, we would need a budget increase of 6-10%.

We are presently serving between 30 and 50% of the eligible population in our Wayne County. Of these being served, 60% are in summer programs and 40% are in full year programs.

In summary, any reductions in Head Start funding would be a tragedy. The Kirschner reports indicate that Head Start is a most successful Community Action Program for poor people.

JEROME C. FALWELL,
Child Development Coordinator.

TRI-COUNTY COMMUNITY
ACTION COMMISSION, INC.,
Benton Harbor, Mich.

Our Regional Office has notified us of the possibility of a 10% cut in our present funding level, and warned us to be prepared for it.

(a) Our present funding level is \$95,400.00.

(b) The reduced funding level would be \$85,860.00.

(c) Anticipated cut in O.E.O. appropriation level.

(d) It would eliminate 10% of the children we could serve at the present funding level.

A minimum 5% increase would be necessary to maintain our present program.

We are now serving only 10% of those eligible.

ORION H. FLOWERS,
Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM.

Yes, we were notified by O.E.O. of our funding cut.

No, we were not given a reason, other than Congress was cutting Head Start appropriations for fiscal 1971.

Our present funding level is \$248,000.

Our reduced funding level is \$239,000.

We have had to absorb this cut by reducing staff and cutting back on student transportation. It is in the area of transportation that we feel will greatly reduce the effectiveness of the program.

It is impossible to cut our program in other areas because of today's high costs without reducing the number of children served. We have not cut the number of children under this funding level, but we will be deeply concerned over the attendance in the coming months.

This reduction in our budget will hurt our mission in our community because we now are serving only 27% of the total eligible children.

RAYMOND K. TARDY,
Director, Community Action Program.

MAYOR'S COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN
RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT,

Detroit, Mich.

The 1,006 employees in the fifth largest city can testify that appropriations since Fiscal Year '69 have been far from adequate. FY '69 versatile funds were reduced from \$7,465,000 to \$6,965,000 because the Regional Office "welched" on an agreement to absorb the annual City of Detroit 6% wage increase. The result of the reduction was to trim a budget providing for the grantee and delegate agencies new hires, promotional opportunities, consultants and reimbursements to community representatives. We were barely able to avoid lay-offs.

On June 3, 1970 the MCHRD submitted its Program Year "F" budget. Again we were advised that the annual wage increase of 6% could not be absorbed. The submittal was at a level of \$6,965,000. Three weeks later we were advised that because of reduced appropriations, all CAA's would suffer further reductions. The large cities in Region IV were to receive an 8% cut. The versatile funding level for our Agency was arrived at in the following manner:

PY "E"	\$6,875,000
NSP Core Services	+200,000
PDP	+90,000
Total	7,165,000
8 percent	573,200
Total	6,591,800

See attached Sept. 2 letter to all Regional CAA's.

As a consequence of the 1970 reduction, the Executive Committee of the Policy-Advisory Committee decided that no employees would be terminated. The MCHRD has 91% para-professionals. However, the attached reductions were necessary in order to arrive at the assigned level (see attachment). The bracketed numbers indicate the number of affected staff.

In order to extend our four (4) target area boundaries as required by the Letter of Understanding of September 24 which in effect establishes the present program, it would be necessary for this Agency's versatile level to be increased by ten percent (10%) or an increase to \$7,250,900.

Since 1966 no demographic study to determine the real percentage of eligible has been made. Since that time we have annually reported 250,000. However, with the middle-class exodus from the City, the increase of inner-city residents, the displacement of inner-city residents by the introduction of two additional freeways and the addition of services to eligible residents from outside the boundaries of the four (4) target areas, it is planned to begin a demographic study as of November 2.

It is suspected that the study will reveal approximately 300,000 eligible residents. At the present level the cost per recipient (250,000) is \$26.37. For 300,000 recipients at a level of \$6,591,800 service delivery cost will be reduced to \$21.97 per beneficiary.

How does this CAP, nationally noted for having the quality program, continue to deliver needed service to approximately 16% of the City's population with continued budget reductions? Fortunately, for this Fiscal Year we will not experience a Head Start cut.

GEORGIA R. BROWN,
Director.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, INC., OF
MONROE COUNTY,

Monroe, Mich.

The Chicago office has warned this Agency of impending cuts in current funding level of eight percent, O.E.O. funds. We were also advised that we prepare for this cut for our new program year, December 1, 1970.

Present Federal funding levels are:

O.E.O.—Versatile Funds	\$62,000.00
O.E.O.—Earmarked Funds	58,000.00
Total O.E.O. Funds	120,000.00
Full Year Head Start (H.E.W.)	69,000.00
Operation Mainstream (D.O.L.)	95,000.00
Neighborhood Youth Corps (D.O.L.)	139,000.00

Reductions in the funding level will curtail operation of this Agency in the following categories:

1. Elimination of the limited Legal Aid that we are now able to provide. This is a top priority in this County in terms of need. Presently, there are 50 families awaiting legal assistance.

2. Cut in Neighborhood Service programs planned by the poor.

3. No expansion of Family Planning service into the rural areas.

4. No Neighborhood Service Centers, a priority, listed in the rural areas of Monroe County which has no agency services.

5. Elimination of job slots. No salary level is now more than \$10,000.00.

6. Cut in food service and nutrition program for 300 hungry children.

7. A cut in the number of youth served in the Youth employment program.

HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Under the present budget, Head Start must cut to four day a week classroom to allow for the Career Development program which is now required. Two non-professional slots are to be eliminated in order to serve the 60 children. The new cut would eliminate 15 children from our present enrollment.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Operation Mainstream must end its program of employment for 50 persons. Many of these persons were considered unemployed. It is now funded until December 30, 1970.

Neighborhood Youth Corps maintains a stand-by list of 100 disadvantaged teenagers, waiting for their first chance at a part-time job. The program now provides job slots to 55 In-School, 15 Out-of-School and 160 Summer.

This Agency's Plans and Priorities, as identified by the poverty population, calls for job-skill training, basic education and health

services, none of which can be ever considered under a reduced funding level.

This Agency would require at a minimum, an increase of six percent from each funding source, in order to maintain its present service. We are presently serving on a daily basis 885 low-income individuals. This does not include referrals and other Outreach services.

Monroe County, which is 75% rural, has had an unemployment rate of 10%. 50% of the labor force must find employment outside the County.

The poverty population numbers 14,000 persons who are located in pockets throughout the County.

IRENE FINCK,
CAP Director.

MISSOURI
JEFFERSON-FRANKLIN
COMMUNITY ACTION CORP.,
Hillsboro, Mo.

We have been notified of budget cuts as follows:

OEO-COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS
1. (a) Present funding level, \$112,602.
(b) Reduced funding level (2% reduction in funds), \$110,350.

(c) Reasons: Our Letter of Understanding did not give a specific reason for the reduction.

(d) Impact on our program: With a 2% reduction, a fewer number of families will be served by our General Services program.

2. In order to maintain our present program level, a 7% increase above our present funding level would be required. This would allow retention of present staff and cost of living adjustments for staff presently employed.

3. We are presently serving approximately 20% of those eligible to receive the benefits of our programs.

HEW—HEAD START PROGRAMS

1. (a) Present funding level, \$177,521.
(b) Reduced funding level: HEW, who administers the OEO Head Start monies by delegation agreement, has notified us of a 20% reduction if we do not convert our Summer Head Start program to a Full Year Head Start program, and if we convert from a Summer program to a Full Year program, we will only receive a 7% reduction in funds.

(c) Reasons: The reason given by HEW for this action is that OEO's appropriation bill has not been passed, however, HEW reports funds have been allocated to Region VII and this funding level is based upon the amount earmarked in the appropriation bill, taking into consideration projected carry-over funds from grantees who do not spend the amount of the grant monies allocated to them.

(d) Impact on our program: This will have a significant impact on our Head Start program. We have been serving 400 children in a Summer Head Start program, and 54 children in a Full Year program. Under the above mentioned guideline, we have no alternative other than to convert to a Full Year Head Start program because a 20% reduction in grant funds would seriously cut back the Summer program.

Projecting a 7% cut and full conversion of the Summer program to Full Year, we will serve approximately 140 Head Start children, versus serving 454 children the previous program year; thus, 314 children will not receive medical, dental, and psychological exams and follow-up, nor will they receive a hot lunch, or be exposed to the Head Start classroom activities.

2. In order to maintain our present programs, a 4% increase above our present level would enable us to continue our present programs; however, we are serving a very small percentage of those eligible to receive the services of the Head Start program.

3. Approximately 2 1/2% of those eligible to participate in Head Start are being served by the Full Year Head Start program, and approximately 15% of those eligible to participate in the Summer program are participating; thus, there is a lot of room for expansion in the Head Start area.

This Community Action Agency operates programs in Jefferson and Franklin Counties which are located just south and west of St. Louis and St. Louis County and are among the fastest growing counties in the State of Missouri.

RONALD J. RAVENSCRAFT,
Director.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY CORP. OF GREATER ST. JOSEPH,

St. Joseph, Mo.

HEW's office of Child Development has notified us that our budget must be cut for the coming year.

A. Our present funding level for Head Start is \$245,813.

B. HEW's reduced funding level for next year will be \$228,606.

C. Reason given for cut was reduction in appropriation of funds for Head Start.

D. Impact on our personal situation was not being able to open one (1) class this year consisting of twenty (20) children and not being able to expand to more classes next year where the need for such is definitely existent.

We would need approximately a 14% increase over present budget funding level to accomplish "D" above.

We are presently serving 34% of the eligible or needy population in this agency's area.

STEVE HALL,
Headstart Director.

DANIEL BOONE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,

Bowling Green, Mo.

OEO, via the Kansas City Region VII Office of Child Development, has notified the Daniel Boone Community Action Agency Head Start Program that we must suffer a 7% budget cut beginning Fiscal Year 2-1-71. Our present funding level is \$212,952 for 198 children and their families. In order to comply with the 7% reduced funding level, we will have to cut our budget to \$198,045. This, of course, will have a tremendous impact on our 9-County rural—semi-urban Agency for at the present time, we are only able to serve 21.1% of the eligible children in seven (7) counties and zero per cent of the eligible children in the additional two (2) counties served by your Agency. This cut must, of course, be absorbed by cutting no less than twenty-six (26) children and five (5) manpower trainees from our budget, or approximately 14% of those persons we are now able to serve. I am sure you will realize that this figure represents not only the 7% budget cut but an additional 6 1/2 to 7% cost of living cut that must be absorbed at this time.

In regard to the reason given by OEO for the cut in funds, it has not been clearly stated. However, it is the assumption of this office that the funds which are desperately needed by our target area residents are being siphoned off at the top level for the increased cost of administration and research. Of course, you recognize as do we, that the person suffering the most is the grass roots resident for whom the program was originally designated.

In order to maintain our inadequate but present program, we would have to anticipate a budget of no less than \$225,730 for Fiscal Year 1971-72.

I would like to point out to the Subcommittee that we have more than the requested local support or non-federal share within

our 9-County Agency. We are realizing 24% or \$70,801 non-federal share at this time, or 4% over the amount requested for Program Year E.

If we may be of any further assistance to the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, please contact us immediately, and we will make every effort to provide you with the information and the support so requested.

DOROTHY M. BISHOP,
Headstart Director.

WEST CENTRAL MISSOURI RURAL DEVELOPMENT CORP.,

Appleton City, Mo.

West Central Missouri Rural Development Cooperation is a Community Action Agency serving nine very rural counties in West Central Missouri. This community action agency receives \$566,882 directly from OEO and \$223,342 from HEW for Project Head Start. Due to the time of funding, September 1, this CAA budget was cut only \$3,750 this year. Considering cost increases, this amounts to a 1.6% funding cut at a time when 4.6% more was needed just to "break even".

Due to the time of funding, guidance has not been received as to OEO funding for next program year. Unofficially, the CAA has been warned to anticipate budget cuts. Cuts of 7%, or \$16,750, are anticipated in Head Start monies for next year. The reason given for these probable cuts is an anticipated reduction in OEO and HEW funding levels.

Funding cuts experienced, thus far, by this CAA have resulted in:

(1) A reduction of the number of participants in a hot meals program for senior citizens.

(2) Inability to undertake research and evaluation projects.

(3) Elimination of partial support for locally funded and operated youth programs originally stimulated by the CAA, but being "spun off" to local communities.

Several alternatives are faced by Project Head Start due to anticipated funding cuts. These include:

(1) The elimination of one class (twenty children).

(2) Reduction in the quantity and quality of health services provided (Head Start children average 1.8 health problems per child that can be remedied).

(3) Situation of all classes in major towns with no transportation provided from farm areas or smaller towns.

CAA funding levels of \$612,232 from OEO and \$231,209 from HEW would be required to maintain present levels.

Statistics indicate an excess of 45,000 poor people reside in this area. Many of the poor are never counted. During the last program year the CAA dealt with 6,038 low income people. Many others benefited indirectly from programs the CAA stimulated others to undertake.

An important consideration in determining funding levels of programs dealing with the poor is that many of the poor do not want to remain so. While many of this CAA's efforts are intended to help the poor, the major aim is to provide avenues for escape from poverty. For every dollar this CAA spends, 97c worth of increased earning capacities result (measure by one years earnings or increased earnings as compared to earning capacities prior to participating in CAA activities). Those whom the CAA has assisted carry their improved capabilities into future life while the CAA continues to help still others obtain the skills and attitudes necessary to become self sustaining, dignified human beings.

CHARLES BRAITHWAITE,
Executive Director.

November 18, 1970

DELTA AREA ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY CORPORATION,
Portsmouth, Mo.

We have just received our Letter of Understanding from the Regional Office and find that our flexible or versatile funds have been reduced by 2% or \$13,780 from the previous year. In regard to Head Start, we have been notified that our funding level has been reduced by 7% or \$82,000. The reason given for these cuts actually and simply stated was that appropriations would not be such as to maintain the level of funding. Another reason was that more sophisticated fiscal management has cut the normal carry over funds which have existed in past years. As to the impact on our program, the cut will bring a tightening of belts and curtailment of services in some instances. In Head Start at least 200 eligible children will be excluded from the program.

The funding level necessary to maintain our present program is exactly the decrease in percentage and dollars as indicated by the cut.

We are naturally happy to present this information and hope that this trend does not continue in the future because each item of our service demands an increase since all services have increased in unit expenditures.

C. B. HUBER,
Executive Director.

NEW JERSEY JERSEY CITY CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS,
Jersey City, N.J.

Present funding level is \$682,000 (a reduction from \$718,000), and a further cut is proposed of 8.5% with no reasons given. Number of children has already been reduced in the Head Start program from 479 to 412 and will have to be cut even more. Center now serves 10% of the needy population, and needed to maintain the present size will be a reinstatement of the 13.5% cut.

"Length of Program will have to be shortened by more than a month. Important staff personnel will not be hired. Morale will be completely destroyed. Experienced staff will look for new positions."

GERTRUDE C. ZEITLIN,
Executive Director.

HOBOKEN ORGANIZATION AGAINST POVERTY AND ECONOMIC STRESS,
Hoboken, N.J.

Present funding level is \$239,000 for CAA and \$61,000 for Head Start, and proposed 5% cut will reduce CAA to \$227,000 and Head Start to \$58,000. Organization expects no reduction in the 264 Head Start children now served since it is a summer program. But the Concentrated Employment Program anticipates a cut of nearly \$300,000 which will result in closing of two program accounts, New Careers and Mainstream, which will involve about 250 enrollees. HOPES serves a population of 45,000, and at least a 10% increase in funds is needed to maintain present level. OEO gave no specific reason for cut at local level only that "the national appropriation will necessitate such a reduction."

E. NORMAN WILSON, Jr.,
Executive Director.

PASSAIC HEAD START PROJECT,
Passaic, N.J.

Present funding level is \$53,101, a cut of 3%, reducing the federal share to \$50,343, with "national cut" as reason given for their reduction. Program presently has a class of 20, only .02% of the eligible population of 650 to 700 children. Program estimates its needs at \$80,000 or a 55% increase for federal share.

"The impact of this reduction is vital . . . this delimiting amount cripples the quality

of our services and of the effectiveness of our program."

MISS MEGAN THOMAS,
Director.

BERGEN COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,
Hackensack, N.J.

CAA present funding level is \$265,000 and will be cut to \$260,000, with no reason given. Program personnel and effectiveness will be adversely affected. Program now serves 45% of eligible population and would need a 5% increase or \$278,250 to maintain present level.

JOHN P. LYLE,
Executive Director.
JOANNE BUZZETTA,
Program Analyst.

BERGEN COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.

Present funding level for full-year Head Start is \$173,458 and will be reduced by 7% to \$161,316, with reason given for reduction as "funds requested by Head Start not given." Program will be cut back by 1 month and reductions will occur in field trips, consultant services and staff Travel. Program serves .04 of needy population. To maintain current level a 5% increase or \$182,130 is needed.

Present funding of summer Head Start program is \$24,398 and will be reduced by 20% to \$19,519. This program serves .06 of the needy population.

BETTY B. SPRINGER,
Educational Coordinator.

BAYONNE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOUNDATION,
Bayonne, N.J.

Present funding is \$8,000. Program serves 68 children, now over half of eligible population in community. A 15% increase is needed to maintain present level of program, and to expand facilities and accommodate other eligible children a 100% increase would be necessary.

RABBI R. H. BENDELSTEIN,
Headstart Director.

OCEAN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC ACTION NOW, INC.,
Toms River, N.J.

CAA has not been notified of OEO cut in funds. It presently serves 59.4% of needy population. Budget level of \$310,103 is necessary to maintain present level. The HEW community representative advised that they can expect a cut in full year Head Start program of 5% to 7%, that all programs over \$40,000 can expect to receive a cut from 3% to 11% depending on size of program, and that their summer Head Start program may receive a 20% cut in funds. Reason given was "reduction in National funding level." Present funding level for 2 full year Head Start programs is \$164,000 and this could be reduced to \$155,800 or \$152,520 depending upon percentage of cut. Summer Head Start would be cut from \$90,000 to \$72,085.

Head Start programs currently serve 2% of eligible population. Cuts would shorten full year Head Start programs and eliminate 68 children from summer program. A 20% increase in funding would be necessary to maintain current program level.

State Dept. of Employment Security informed them that their budget for On-the-Job Training program would be reduced to 13% of total budget, representing a cut of \$16,000. This amounts to a reduction only in administrative area, but the program only can serve 5% of the eligible population.

ROBERT L. TARVER,
Executive Director.

PATERSON TASK FORCE FOR COMMUNITY ACTION, INC.,
Paterson, N.J.

Present funding level is \$569,000 for agency and \$258,000 for Head Start and will be reduced to \$558,000 and \$237,000 respectively, with reasons given as "regional and national cut-backs." One Head Start center will be closed and general services will be severely reduced. CAA presently serves 25% of needy population and Head Start, 5%. A 15% increase, to \$654,000, would be necessary to maintain present program level.

ODIS B. WALKER,
Comptroller.

ATLANTIC HUMAN RESOURCES, INC.,
Atlantic City, N.J.

Funding level of \$613,826 was reduced by 5% to \$583,000 in Sept., 1970. Reason given by OEO: "... to absorb reduction of Fiscal 1971 estimated national Head Start funds available for refunding existing grantees. Should appropriations for Head Start be greater than expected, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Child Development will restore the 5% to the Grantee on the basis of established need." Program currently serves 21%, or 440, of the 2,079 eligible children. A 10% increase in funding level would be necessary to maintain present program level.

MRS. JANE M. FLIPPING,
Project Director.

PATERSON, N.J.

Present funding level of \$258,000 will be reduced to \$237,000 in Head Start program. Reason given was "national cut-backs." One center will be eliminated. Needy population now served is 5%, and an increase of 12% would be necessary to maintain present program.

POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

NORTH HUDSON COMMUNITY ACTION CORP.,
Union City, N.J.

CAP present funding level is \$97,000, and agency has not yet been informed of a cut-back yet. Agency can serve only 15% of eligible population. Summer Head Start program, funded at \$67,000, was able to reach 284 children officially and about an additional 120 through volunteers, etc. They were offered a full year Head Start program a few months ago, with promises of at least double the funding level, and told that if they did not go for year round Head Start they would have none. "Now we are told that we must have year round Head Start and that our funding level will not be increased over last year. At best this means we can handle 45 children. Only three classes in an area where over 1,000 children enter public school kindergartens with critical language problems" (area has high percentage of Cuban refugees).

NICHOLAS MASTORELLI,
Executive Director.

OHIO KNOX CO COMMUNITY ACTION COMMISSION,
Warsaw, Ohio.

Current funding level of HEW funds is \$91,755. They have not been told of a cut but CAA's in area have been warned of possible cuts from 7 to 8%. Funding level for Neighborhood Youth Corps program is \$40,920. "Effective February 1, 1971, the Federal Minimum Wage Law will increase the hourly wages paid to Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees from 1.45 to 1.60. Without a corresponding increase in funding for this program you can readily see that the number of youth being served will have to be reduced." Without a budget increase in cur-

rent level, 15 children will have to be eliminated from Head Start, 20 enrollees will have to be eliminated. 10% of needy population is reached, and an 8-10% increase in funds will be necessary to maintain present level.

JOHN F. GRAHAM,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM CORP.,
Marietta, Ohio.

Present OEO funding level is \$201,000 and HEW funding level is \$102,500. OEO funds will be reduced by 7.7% and Head Start will be reduced by 10%. Reasons given: "reduction of carry-over balances, increasing costs; tentative Congressional appropriations will not sustain current level of funding for programs such as Headstart." 30 part-time, low-income persons will lose employment; and 15-25 Head Start children will be eliminated. A 6% increase in funding level will be necessary to maintain current level.

"The real American tragedy would be the demise or ineffectiveness of O.E.O. which represents local initiative; human importance; and a chance for people to participate in the building of a society which provides a better life for everyone, be it in terms of needed dollars, education, self-worth, hope or dignity . . ."

ANTHONY MELE,
Executive Director.

BUTLER COUNTY COMMUNITY
ACTION COMMISSION,
Hamilton, Ohio.

Present OEO funding level is \$472,175 and will be reduced by 7.74%. Funds that were earmarked (Head Start, Legal Assistance, Family Planning and Neighborhood Youth Corps) were not cut. Program currently serves 50% of eligible population and a 10% increase in funds would enable them to maintain present level.

J. C. HORNBERGER,
Executive Director.

FAYETTE COUNTY COMMUNITY
ACTION COMMISSION,
Washington C. H., Ohio.

Present funding levels are \$71,000 for OEO, \$30,000 for summer Head Start and \$17,500 for N.Y.C. No reduction in levels. 24% of current eligibles are being served, 120 children in Head Start. Present funding is adequate, but if the \$30,000 figure were reduced, the number of children will decrease.

JACK M. HAGERTY,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION ORGANIZATION,
Marysville, Ohio.

Present funding level is \$212,628 for overall program, and it will be reduced to \$190,000. Reason given: "funds not available." Program personnel and services will be affected. Program is serving 20% of eligible population, and a 13% increase in funding level would be necessary to maintain present level.

J. W. HENRY, Jr.,
Executive Director.

GALLIA-MEIGS CORP. FOR
COMMUNITY ACTION,
Pomeroy, Ohio.

Present funding level for total program is \$477,641, including levels for HEW, OEO and Labor. OEO's share will be reduced by 2 1/2% down to \$55,000. Reason given: "forced to reduce the overall regional budget." 420 children are presently being served by Head Start. To maintain present program Head Start should be increased by 15%, Program Administration by 10%, Medical Programs by 20%, and Labor programs by 20%.

"The cut-back in age hurt our drop-out N.Y.C. program more than anything. We

used to have a 16 to 21 age range, now we have a 16 to 17 age range only . . . in the rural area, young people don't drop out of school until they get ashamed of their age and also, here in Ohio, they are required to go to school until they are 18 years old."

RICHARD G. SAYRE,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION,
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

OEO present funding level is \$480,000 and will be reduced to \$450,000. Current Head Start funding level of \$550,000 will be reduced by 11% necessitating the dropping of 80 children from program. 415 Head Start children now served, and 16% of needy.

ALBERT G. ROSENBERG,
Executive Director.

JACKSON-VINTON
COMMUNITY ACTION, INC.,
Wellston, Ohio.

Present funding level is \$149,000 and OEO's reduced funding level will be \$136,000. 85 children will be eliminated from summer Head Start; a 50% reduction to support to 250 community people; reduction of 30 indigent patients per week from general medical clinic; elimination of family planning project; discontinuance of 2 jobs held by low-income people, 25% of eligible population is now being served, and a 42% increase will be necessary to maintain present program.

"In the past six months, we have become somewhat alarmed, as we see efforts that we have made for four years having to be demoralized because of sudden unexplained changes being passed down from the federal authorities. The general environment thus created on this level, tends to keep our personnel in a chaotic state. If such uncertainty as we have experienced continues to exist, it can only evolve into total collapse of the effectiveness of the local anti-poverty effort."

MARVIN J. HUSTON,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION COMMISSION,
Findlay, Ohio.

Present OEO funding level of \$376,238 will be reduced by 4.4%-7.74%. With a minimum cut, 35 participants in Head Start will be dropped (10%) and 98 participants will be dropped from other programs. 11.8% of the needy population is now being served, and a 41% increase in all OEO programs would be necessary to maintain present level.

FRANK KELLEY,
Executive Director.

WARREN-TRUMBULL COUNCIL
FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Warren, Ohio.

Present funding level is \$186,000, and they have been informed that it will be cut, but not by how much. Reason given: "five million dollar deficit due to reclaiming of PTO funds." 65 senior citizens terminated from program, loss of enrollment in NYC program, and curtailment of services are impact of reductions. 24% of eligible population is served, and a 10.8% increase in funding would be necessary to maintain present level.

JAMES R. SHELTON,
Executive Director.

GREATER AKRON COMMUNITY AC-
TION COUNCIL,
Akron, Ohio.

Present funding level is \$2,100,984 and will be reduced to 1,915,537, with reason given as "program and administrative deficiencies." Approximately 800 poor people per quarter (3-month period) will not be involved in program. 34.8% of needy population is now being served, and to maintain present level

of program a 4.35% increase would be needed.

DONALD J. ELLIS,
Executive Director.

AUGLAIZE-MERCER BI-COUNTY
COMMUNITY ACTION COMMISSION,
Celina, Ohio.

No OEO cuts have been made, and agency has been promised a 4% increase beginning next April. They may receive a cut in Head Start funds, but this is not certain.

FRANK HUNBERGER,
Executive Director.

THE MARION-CRAWFORD
COMMUNITY ACTION COMMISSION,
Marion, Ohio.

Present versatile funding level is \$114,000 and will be reduced by OEO to \$110,000. Less than 25% of eligible population is now being served, and an increase of at least 11 1/2% would be necessary to maintain present program.

DONALD P. SHANAHAN,
Executive Director.

MANSFIELD, OHIO.

Present funding level is \$293,751 and has not been reduced. 35% of eligible population in area is being served.

JOHN WARREN HOUSTON,
Executive Director, CAP.

CAC OF THE CINCINNATI AREA,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Total federal funding level of Head Start program is \$1,070,564 and serves 1,331 children. It will be cut by 10%, and one of the reasons given was "that the Senate Finance Committee had earmarked another \$17.7 million nationally, making the Chicago Regional deficit projection \$4.902 million which cannot be absorbed without program cut backs." Program currently serves less than 3% of needy population.

MARION JELIN,
Education Coordinator.

ASHLAND-WAYNE COMMUNITY
ACTION COMMISSION,
Ashland, Ohio.

Present funding level for CAC is \$53,247 and will be reduced to \$47,500. Reason given: "the cut in local initiative funds, available to Region V, a result of Congressional action." Impact will be felt mainly in rural area where poverty is at high level. Less than 10% of needy population is being served, and an increase of 8 1/2% would be needed to maintain present program.

AUSTIN PEASE,
Chairman of the Board.

NORTHWESTERN OHIO COMMUNITY
ACTION COMMISSION,
Defiance, Ohio.

Present funding level is \$229,362; for Head Start it is \$107,000 (cut from previous level of \$165,000). A reduction will take place in the next funding level. Reasons given for cut: "better organized and wiser spending of the CAP agencies with less P.T.O. monies remaining and less monies not spent for programs; not complying to certain required reports; letters written to the public; and monies misappropriated." Reasons given over phone. Cuts will affect personnel and number of program participants (no figures given). Total increase needed would be \$61,000 to maintain present level.

FRANK W. JEFFERY,
Executive Director.

MUSKINGUM ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY ACTION GROUP, INC.,
Zanesville, Ohio.

Present funding level is \$169,000 and will be reduced by 7.74% to \$144,000. Health

services to poor eliminated for 1,000 people; reduce Foster Grandparent care to children from 800 to 0; reduce to 0 the number receiving Emergency Food and Medical Services; 2,000 adults and 150 children eliminated from Neighborhood Service Centers. 65% of eligible population now being served, and 11% increase needed to maintain present program.

ROBERT P. WINDISCH,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE
OF PIKE COUNTY, INC.,

Waverly, Ohio.

Present funding level is \$82,435 and OEO's reduced funding level will be \$75,000. Reasons given: "extending program year for some agencies; funds allocated for program accounts all being used by end of program year." They also expect a drastic cut in summer Head Start funds. About 85% of the eligible population is being served, and a 5% increase would be necessary to maintain present program.

TRUMAN KNEISLEY,
Executive Director.

OREGON

CLATSOP COUNTY INTERMEDIATE
EDUCATION DISTRICT,

Astoria, Oreg.

DEAR SIRS: The following information is provided as per your request of October 20, 1970. Our Head Start program is a summer program and has been funded at \$42,300.00. We have been notified that this amount will be reduced to \$25,400.00 if we continue our summer program or \$33,800.00 if we convert to a full year program.

It is impossible for us to convert to a full year program due to lack of funds and lack of space when schools are in operation. For some reason the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare notified congressman Wendell Wyatt that we would probably convert to a full year program. I do not know where they received their information, but it did not come from us as a conversion of this type is impractical.

Neither HEW or OEO has actually notified us of the reason for the cut other than to suggest that it was a pro rata share of the total National Head Start cut. HEW did inform congressman Wyatt that the reduction is not based on the President's requested budget but on OEO's intention to reallocate these funds to other programs.

Our current program is designed to service 135 underprivileged children. With the proposed reduction of funds my estimate is that we would have to cut the number of children participating in the program to 80. In order to maintain the program at the current level, we feel we would need a minimum increase of 6% in our allocation.

GEORGE E. LONG,
Head Start Director.

JACKSON COUNTY COMMUNITY
ACTION COUNCIL, INC.,

Medford, Oreg.

I have responded to your request for information in an as brief and to the point manner as possible. Such a serious matter tempts me to go on in detail describing what a cut in poverty funds can do to an organization such as ours. However, I realize you will receive input from hundreds of CAP's and must have brief data.

The following represents the funding cuts for the Jackson County Community Action program serving Jackson County Oregon:

I. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year? If so, supply:

A. Our program year began on November 1, 1970. Our present funding total is \$474,900. \$213,000 of this is for our Head Start pro-

gram which is a delegate agency of the CAA. \$261,900 if for other CAA programs.

B. Last program year our CAA programs received \$211,000 and our Head Start program \$213,000. We have also been notified to expect a cut in Head Start funds of approximately \$16,000. If this cut takes place we will then be operating with \$49,100 less than last program year.

C. The cut in CAA funding was explained by OEO Regional as not being, in effect, a cut. They point out that we began the last program year with a lower funding but were given additional money to enlarge our Manpower program.

The pending cut in Head Start funds was explained as likely future Senate action following cuts passed by the House of Representatives.

D. The reduction of funds available to our program has had a major impact in several areas. First, it should be noted that the reduction in funds was in local initiative programming rather than earmarked funds, which has resulted in at least the following impact:

1. Attempts by the local community action program to use local initiative funds to develop innovative programs and activities designed to respond to the self-felt needs of target area residents has been severely curtailed.

2. Local support in the form of a 10% cash contribution by the county government has been jeopardized by a reduction in federal funds which threatens to shake their confidence in the community action program.

3. There has been a 25% reduction of personnel and services from the previous year in local initiative programs. Among the activities hardest hit were outreach services designed to identify and involve the poor in self-help and community services activities and employment services.

4. The reduction in funds has created additional resentment because we were the first community action program in the newly created region to be evaluated, and despite a very good evaluation our funding levels were reduced.

5. The target areas served by the local community action program has suffered what amounts to a severe economic recession with their annual unemployment rate soaring over 7%. High interest rates and a slow down in construction designed to slow down inflation has dealt a staggering blow to our lumbering economy. Since federal spending here is half the national average many local residents feel federal spending cuts are ill timed and not consistent with national objectives spelled out by Congress and the Administration.

6. The effect of the \$16,000 cut on the Head Start program has not been fully determined as of yet. However, it is obvious that either less services will be provided or less children will be served.

II. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget:

Our program could operate well on the last year level of \$524,000 if approximately 5% were added for wage advancement and cost of living increase.

III. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving?

In the previous program year we contacted an estimated 20% of the needy or eligible population in the target areas served by the local community action agency.

We do not suggest that we should have the resources available to contact 100% of the target population since we share this responsibility with other social service agencies.

Our major concern has been our inability to tackle local poverty-related problems because of lack of resources. Among the more

pressing problems we have not begun to effectively resolve are—

1. *Services to the elderly*—this despite the fact that one-third of the eligible population falls into this category.

2. *Transportation services*—this despite the fact that most rural areas have no access to public transportation.

3. *Health services*—this despite the fact that medical care for the indigent adult is virtually non-existent in the county.

There are major areas of concern, but not an exhaustive list which might include vocational education, crime and delinquency prevention, and economic development, etc.

JON DEASON.

MID-COLUMBIA COMMUNITY
ACTION COUNCIL, INC.,

The Dalles, Oreg.

Thank you for your inquiry concerning the OEO and HEW funding of the Mid-Columbia Community Action Council, Inc. Our present funding level is as follows:

Versatile funding	\$95,400.00
Special Summer Impact (Youth)	7,000.00
Senior Opportunities	23,900.00
Head Start	28,500.00

Total funding 155,200.00

In addition to the above, this CAC share an Operation Mainstream Program with two other Eastern Oregon CAC's representing 8 counties. Our share of this project is approximately \$55,000.00 per year. We have also had some funding from Programs for Aging Americans through the State which will terminate June 30, 1971. These funds were used to provide transportation for senior citizens in isolated rural areas and governed by the senior citizens it serves.

With our \$28,500.00 Head Start funding, we have two early childhood development child care centers; one written to serve 80 migrant and local poor children and the other serving 40 resident poor children. Through the use of volunteers, we have served 170 children with these programs. Our goal is to have year round child care centers which provide early childhood development and free the parent to work or train for a job. A cut in funding would be disastrous. We need additional funds, and have had recognition at local, State, Regional and even national level for excellence in program quality.

Please note enclosure for notice to this CAC of cut-backs. This has been a year round program funded under program account 23 for over one year, which is not recognized in this notice. Evidence has been mailed to Regional Office along with the second enclosure which is our Board's reaction to the cut-back.

It is estimated that the CAC programs are reaching and serving between 10 and 15% of the eligible poor.

We are particularly concerned with the tendency to *destroy* rural programs with large cut-backs. In addition to our Head Start cut-back, we are informed through our Regional Field Representative that our Youth money will not be funded as written. We receive \$7,400.00 per year and the criticism is that we do not have a year round program. With this money, we support a Work and Recreational Live-In Camp for 30 boys (80% are disadvantaged) in Hood River County and the County provides \$12,650.00. Secretary of State Clay Myers has visited the Camp and suggested that it might be used as a model for the State. We also support a "Hot-line" which is run by youth and provides a number for troubled youth to call for help. All information is confidential. An advisory council of 15 professional adults is available for consultation and all cases are referred to the professionals. The program is a year round service to troubled youth and is a

success in many respects. It is too new to really evaluate at the present time.

We do not know why small rural programs are being cut, and plead with our Washington representatives to see that it does not happen. Now that the people of our community are aware of poverty problems, they are coordinating their efforts to solve them. We do have the advantage of knowing everyone and sharing information, which the cities do not have. I do not mean to imply that we do not have our opposition in the community, but it is becoming increasingly less vocal.

To continue our operation at its present level, we will need approximately a 6% increase. It would be our hope that such an increase would be specifically identified to increase all OEO allocations as I fear it could be earmarked for other purposes.

Please hear our plea for continuation of rural programs. Even though they are not adequate in funding, they have caused some very effective programs, community awareness and involvement in the Mid-Columbia area in Oregon.

Mrs. RITA SWYERS,
Executive Director.

LANE HUMAN RESOURCES, INC.,
Eugene, Oreg.

In response to your notice of October 29, 1970 concerning the need for information on OEO programs we respectfully submit the following concerning our organization.

Lane Human Resources, Inc., is the Community Action Agency for Lane County, Oregon. Lane County is located in the West Central portion of Oregon and includes Eugene which is the second largest city in Oregon. The population of the county is estimated at 212,000 persons. The county covers an area of 4610 square miles. Our community action agency is preparing to enter into its sixth year of operation and is an outgrowth of a former juvenile delinquency study project, started in 1962, known as the Lane County Youth Project.

Our present budget consists of \$344,000 versatile funds which is a reduction from the fiscal 1969-1970 allocation of \$367,000.

These funds are used to establish a housing program, a system of outreach centers, a community organization program and a job development program.

We also operate a small elderly program of \$26,000 which is totally inadequate to the magnitude of the need. In addition \$56,000 is used for a legal services program which has been delegated to the local Bar Association.

In answer to your questions, OEO has not notified us of any proposed budget cuts but it has stated that these may occur.

HEW/OCD did notify us that our Head Start program would be cut \$14,000 from last years appropriation of \$153,456. This places a level of \$141,456 for the coming years programs.

The reason given was that Congress has not appropriated enough money to cover the costs of maintaining the present program levels and that there have been less surpluses available to re-cycle to make up the deficits and that it was a national decision.

The effect on the program will mean the cutting out of one full year site. This represents 20 full year slots and will affect a minimum of 30 children.

In answer to your second question at least a 10% increase is needed to offset the cost of living and other higher program costs involved to accomplish the same goals.

We are having to cut some programs to offset these increased program costs this next program year.

In answer to your question three, we are serving approximately 10% of the total poverty population of Lane County in some way or other.

ELWIN E. GROUT,
Associate Director, Planning, Research
and Evaluation.

LANE HUMAN RESOURCES, INC.,
Eugene, Oreg.

This is in response to the questionnaire regarding our funding situation. The following information is related to Lane Human Resources, Inc., Child Development Program, Oregon CAP 7020.

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year? Yes.

(a) Present funding level: \$153,400.

(b) OEO's reduced funding level: \$141,900.

(c) Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds: Cut at national level.

(d) Impact on your program: 30 children cut 1 professional and 7 non-professional staff cut.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget: \$159,000.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving? 10%.

Mrs. MARILYN HOLSTROM,
Director.

WESTMORELAND COUNTY CONFERENCE FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, INC.,
Greensburg, Pa.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As per your request for information from the Westmoreland County Conference for Economic Opportunity, Inc., regarding our funding situation to assist the Senate in determining the proper level of funding for OEO, please consider the following:

1. The Office of Economic Opportunity has informed us, through our Regional Representative, that programs funded with OEO Funds will receive the same allocations as they did for last year's program. This in essence represents a "cut" in that normal cost of living increases are reflected in our projected budget. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, on the other hand, notified this agency on October 9, 1970, that funds available for our Full-Year, Full-Day and Full-Year, Part-Day Head Start Programs will suffer the cut back.

a. Present Funding Level:

OEO Funds	139,584
HEW Funds	460,710
DOL Funds	162,000

Total 762,294

b. According to the memo dated October 9, 1970, we can expect a 7% cut back on our HEW appropriations for last year on:

Present \$460,710.

Next Program Year, \$428,460.

Cut, \$32,250.

Percentage, 7 percent.

c. Reasons given for cut:

(1) Reduction in Head Start Fiscal Year 1970 national appropriation.

(2) High estimate of carryover balances had been incorporated in the budgets of all regional offices for the new fiscal year.

d. We will attempt to maintain individuals center enrollment on an equal par with present capacity but will be forced to cut back on: equipment necessary to provide a comprehensive educational program; field trips which provide the additional experiential base to assure competitive equivalency with children in the middle and upper income sectors; the overall nutritional program and parent related services. This would represent a cutback in the comprehensive services offered the total family by our Head Start Program.

2. To maintain our present program for the next fiscal year, we would need an approximately 10% increase across the board or:

Present	
OEO	\$139,584
HEW	460,710
DOL	162,000

Total 762,294

Next fiscal year

OEO	\$153,542
HEW	506,781
DOL	178,200

Total 838,523

Increase

Percent

OEO	10
HEW	10
DOL	10

Total

10

3. We are serving approximately 25% of the 13,417 families in poverty in Westmoreland County or 3,354 families. If we propose to reach more individuals, additional funds are essential.

THOMAS G. NIGEL,
Administrative Assistant, Westmoreland County Conference for Economic Opportunity, Inc.

PENNSYLVANIA
GREATER ERIE COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE,
Erie, Pa.

Senate Sub-Committee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is in answer to your letter of October 20, 1970:

1. We received a notice of a reduction in funding from the HEW Region III Office dated October 9, 1970:

a. Our present funding level is \$420,000.

b. We were told to expect a 7% cut. This would mean almost \$30,000 less for us.

c. We were told the cut was necessary because less money was appropriated in 1970, less carry-over funds were available than anticipated, and an additional cut in appropriations is anticipated for 1971.

d. The impact could be felt in one or more ways: eliminate summer program for 100 children if we are allowed to apply converted monies to ongoing full year Head Start; or cut back full year classes (our cutback represents the cost for approximately 30 children); cut services and salaries across the board.

Our Head Start Council is already setting up educational meetings for our parents so they will be fully informed of the cutback and have input as to where these cuts should occur.

2. We had to cut our program from 230 days to 220 days this program year so a minimum of a 5% increase would be needed to maintain the program we had before. Increased costs, such as transportation, would make an 8-10% increase more realistic.

3. We estimate we are serving approximately 25% of those needing services.

Our Head Start program is funded through the Greater Erie Community Action Committee, H2020, H2604, PA 22 and PA 24.

It cannot be gainsaid that any reduction in funding will seriously diminish the positive impact of our Head Start Program. We would greatly appreciate any assistance you can give us in securing adequate financial support.

Thanking you for your interest and support, I am

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT B. WILEY,
Executive Director.

CENTENNIAL SCHOOLS,
Warminster, Pa.

*Senate Subcommittee on Employment,
Manpower and Poverty,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIRS: The O.E.O. has notified us of an across the board seven percent cut of funding in our region for Head Start for our forthcoming fiscal year, March 1, 1971 to February 28, 1972. Our present funding level for fiscal year, March 1, 1970 to February 28, 1971 for our Full Year Head Start program (school year=10 months) is \$51,647.00 federal share and \$23,532.00 non-federal share. The stated reason for the O.E.O. cut is the decrease in federal appropriations. The impact of a financial cut of this size on our program will be devastating with the "drying" up of federal resources and the steadily rising costs and salary increases, there can be no alternative other than the decrease of the number of children and families served.

Considering cost of living increments and the lack of responsiveness of O.E.O. to the recent annual increases in the cost of living, it would be necessary for us to have a fourteen percent increase in our present federal share of budgeting costs to simply maintain at present level our program for poverty families.

Due to O.E.O. maintenance of on level funding for the past few years, it has been necessary to cut staff regularly. We no longer have staff available to keep track of the extent of poverty needs in our community in an accurate fashion. All that we know is that we, by far, are not serving all of the poverty families in the ghetto of Lacey Park.

How can we help you provide more specific information regarding our needs? Our parents and other citizens will gladly come to Washington to testify regarding our needs.

BETTY K. MELLOR,
Director of Social Services.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM OF
LANCASTER COUNTY,
Lancaster, Pa.

STAFF DIRECTOR,
Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower,
and Poverty, Old Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: The following are answers to the questions in your letter of October 20, 1970:

1. Only for our Head Start components:
a. Grant No. H-2054, \$143,000; Grant No. H-2540, \$87,000.

b. 7 percent cut: Grant No. H-2054, \$133,000, Grant No. H-2540, \$80,000.

C. Orders from headquarters.

d. Grant No. H-2054 serves 90 children in Lancaster City on a Full Year Full Day Care basis—all poverty level—all from parents who are employed, seeking employment, or in O.J.T. programs. We would probably cut 15 children in order to implement the necessary career development steps and training needs for our non-professional staff, as well as to meet the rising costs of operation.

Grant No. H-2540 serves 60 children (30 in each of two rural target areas, Columbia, Pa. and Ephrata, Pa.) on the same Full Year Full Day care basis. These are new centers, the result of conversion of a Summer Head Start program. They will have operated 8 months on the \$87,000. Reduced to \$80,000 would mean cutting 15 children from the program while trying to stretch it to 12 months. We feel the latter is necessary since we are getting some rural parents to go to work or to seek employment—which are direct by-products of providing day care for them.

2. Grant No. H-2054, \$150,000=5% increase, Grant No. H-2540, \$104,000=20% increase (includes going from 8 to 12 months operation).

3. With over 6,000 poor pre-school children in the county, serving a total of 150 chil-

dren is 1/40 of the eligible population or .025%.

If there is any other way in which we can help you prepare for the Senate vote, please get in touch with us. I will be attending the White House Conference on Children, but I'm afraid any recommendations from that meeting will be too late to have impact on the Senate appropriations.

I am taking your suggestion and sending the above information to Senators Scott and Schweiker.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY STEVENSON,
Director of Planning.

LITTLE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

*Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower
and Poverty, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIRS: Yes, we are one of the programs asked to cut our budget.

(a) We are at present funded at \$100,000 (round figures).

(b) We have been told to reduce our budget 7%. No matter how it is done, by shortening the program (already shortened from 12 to 10 months) or dropping staff, or dropping children, it will reduce services that are already minimal.

(c) The reason for the proposed cut is a reduction in federal appropriations.

(2) We need an increase of at least 10%, in order to keep up with inflation, and to grant small raises to our non-professional staff.

We are a grass-roots community action program and have been in operation since 1965.

We serve 75 families at or below OEO defined poverty levels. We also serve almost 1,000 neighbors through supplementary activities.

Please let us know whether we can do anything else to support the efforts of you and your committee.

IDA M. BRODSKY,
Founder-Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE
FOR BEAVER COUNTY, OFFICE OF
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,

Monaca, Pa.

*Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower
and Poverty, U.S. Senate, Labor
and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIRS: In reply to your letter of October 20, 1970 I submit the following information:

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year? If so, supply:

OEO has notified us that a Head Start budget cut for the coming year will include 7% cut for full year and deletion of the summer program. (See attached.)

	Amount	Amount reduced
(a) Present funding level:		
Full year Headstart	\$98,000	
Summer Headstart	16,000	
Conduct and administration	92,000	
Neighborhood services	28,000	
Emergency food and medical	50,000	
Total	281,000	
(b) OEO's reduced funding level:		
Full year Headstart	91,140	\$6,860
Summer Headstart		16,000
Conduct and administration	92,000	
Neighborhood services		28,000
Emergency food and medical		53,860
Total	269,140	

c. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds:
(See attached.)

d. Impact on your program; for example, number of children who will be cut out of Head Start or trainees eliminated from Manpower program.

In the Summer Head Start Program, 75 children will be cut out of the program. In the Conduct and Administration, unless a supplemental grant of \$28,000 is allocated, it is anticipated that one Neighborhood Center would be closed down resulting in dismissal of 7 employees, and a 25% reduction in delivery of services to the poor.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget.

Funding level to maintain present program is \$323,000 or 20% increase in present budget.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving?

25%.

We hope that the above information proves helpful in your attempts to assist us to maintain services to the poor.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCENA R. COLAMARINO,
Senior Coordinator.

WILKES-BARRE CITY SCHOOLS,

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

*Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower
and Poverty, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIRS: We are writing to you on behalf of the Wilkes-Barre City School District Head Start Program which is delegated by the Luzerne County Commission on Economic Opportunity to the Wilkes-Barre City School System.

1. The Commission on Economic Opportunity has notified us that there would be a seven per cent cut for the coming year. Our fiscal year runs from January 1, 1971 to December 31, 1971.

Presently, we are funded for \$131,321. A seven per cent cut brings us to \$122,126. The Commission on Economic Opportunity has written to explain that there would be a seven per cent cut in the region for all full-year Head Start Programs due to cuts in appropriations and little excess funds remaining from the current operating year. With this in mind, it is possible that we may have to request permission to fund the program with five classes of 18 children each and a teacher and aide rather than the current six classes with 15 children, a teacher and an aide. In terms of a cut-back, other staff personnel will have to be deleted from the program. The length of time—which has currently been a ten-month program—will probably go back to nine months or less if we are to maintain a program of 90 children as we do today.

2. The staff includes nine professional people who are to be given increases under the Wilkes-Barre City School's guidelines to a minimum of \$300. The P.S.E.A. is currently negotiating with the School Board for increases up to \$1,000 for all professional staff. This would seriously affect the budget within the school system. Non-professional people who also receive regular increases will either have the length of their time each day cut back or be eliminated and replaced with volunteers. This would seriously hamper both the progress of the non-professional staff in their growth and career development and damage the program to a very real extent.

3. Presently, we are serving 50 per cent of the eligible and needy pre-school children enrolled in the school district. Also, each year the evaluators recommend that the program be increased to meet the needs of those youngsters who are unable to participate, since our budget limits us to 90 children.

We urge your consideration and express on

behalf of the parents our very real concern for what has been a successful program for six years by virtue of the participation of children and their parents in gaining needed strengths.

Sincerely,

EVELYN S. GURBST,
Director, Head Start Program,
Wilkes-Barre City School District.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, Reading, Pa.

Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing to urgently appeal to your committee to reconsider the reduction of OEO funds for the fiscal year 1971, for Head Start programs.

In a memo of October 9, 1970 from our Region III Assistant Director, Fred Digby, we were informed that we should plan the application for refunding at an anticipated 7% reduction of our 1970 funding. To be specific our program is a full day-full year Head Start program in the city of Reading, Pa., funded with OEO-HEW funds allocated through the Economic Opportunity Council of Reading and Berks County. Our 1970 budget of \$127,125 provides child care services to 75 children in 5 centers full day-full year thus enabling mothers to secure employment and upgrade their family income. Our program employs 10 teacher aides from the low income area, thus upgrading their family income. In the reduction memo we were told this 7% reduction reflected our share of the total cut in the national appropriation for the fiscal year.

In order to maintain our present program providing the complete educational, social service, nutritional and health services for our participants, we would have to increase our 1971 budget to \$137,525. To increase salaries to the present salary scale of employees in other federally funded child care programs in our area, our budget would have to be approximately \$154,000. This gives us only three alternatives: retain present low salary scale, close one child care center thus cutting out services to 15 children and their families or cut down on the total amount or quality of services now given to our participants. Naturally we are reluctant to resort to any of these alternatives because we feel our program is meeting the needs of at least 75 children of the many needy families in our community. One has only to walk into any one of our child care centers to see the eager faces of these children and realize that we are giving them that necessary head start toward a better life in today's society.

On behalf of the children, their families and our staff I urgently appeal to you and your committee to review and reconsider this reduction. Please restore the funding level to meet the needs necessary for us to carry on a quality program and not make it necessary for us to resort to one of the above alternatives. We need your immediate action in this important matter.

Mrs. DAVID L. PHILLIPS,
Program Coordinator.

LOWER BUCKS CHILD DAY CARE CENTER, Bristol, Pa.

Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, Old Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: The Lower Bucks Child Day Care Center, operated as a delegate agency of the Bucks County Opportunity Council, has received word that our budget would be cut by seven per-cent this year. This is supposed to be due to the fact that anticipated surplus funds are now not available.

This will mean a cut of \$5,000.00 in our operating budget at a time when we can no longer hold the line on expenses; with the cost of every item being used in the program increasing. It will also mean no salary increments for the staff, who have not had one in the past two years. No allowances can be made for additional training for the staff or for any type of upgrading in the program.

We also will not be able to replace equipment that is in the classroom or to purchase new items for same.

In order to update our program and keep abreast of the rising costs we would need at least a ten per-cent increase in our federal funding.

For the past two years there have been no allowances for the above mentioned items and this year several of our previously federal funded items were transferred to the non-federal funded category.

Members of the Board of Directors have given valuable voluntary time towards fund raising, in recent years, to help us meet our ever increasing local share. This time could well be spent on helping the staff with curriculum and in getting facilities for additional care.

If anything can be done to reduce these cuts and increase our funding, you would have the thanks and appreciation of the Board, the Staff and most of all the children.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. LORETTA WHETSTONE,
Director.

RHODE ISLAND PROJECT HEADSTART, Woonsocket, R.I.

Reference is to your letter of October 20, 1970, requesting information about the funding situation of the Woonsocket Head Start Program.

The pertinent information is as follows:

1. Our present funding level is \$39,000.
2. OEO's reduced funding level is 11% (\$4,290)—net \$34,710.

3. The reason given by OEO is that the Congress has decreased its appropriation for OEO programs.

4. In Woonsocket's program such a cut-back would result in four children and one trainee being eliminated.

5. Actually, it would require a 3% increase in our present budget to maintain our program.

6. We now serve 10% of the needy population.

I join with the thousands of Americans who implore you and respectfully seek your strong support in the fight to prevent the cut-back from becoming law.

Mrs. JEAN SADWIN,
Woonsocket Headstart Director.

SELF-HELP, INC.,
East Providence, R.I.

In response to your letter of October 20, the following information is submitted:

SELF-HELP, INC.,
Riverside, R.I.

Present funding level for our Community Action Program is \$139,000 for program year "E", effective November 1, 1970. This is the same funding level as last year and has remained static for several years. As a result, program services have been gradually reduced in the face of rising costs. To have maintained our program at last year's level would require a seven per-cent budget increase.

The funding level for the Summer Head Start program was \$37,000. The funding statement on Head Start programs, dated 9/30/70, outlined the anticipated cutbacks in summer programs. The Parent Advisory Groups voted to retain the summer program and automatically incurred a 20% reduction in funds. The number of children previously served in the summer programs was 165; it

is not clear at present how this number will be affected by the cutback.

One year ago an effort was made to start a Day Care program for 85 children, budgeted at \$140,000; for various reasons it never became operational.

Under the present guidelines we will be trying to serve four communities with approximately \$30,000. To operate only a summer program at last year's level would require a 30% increase. Percentage increases for a year-round Head Start or Day Care facility, based on the above figure, would be astronomical.

Approximately 40% of the eligible population will participate in our program.

I hope this information will be of some assistance in your effort to increase the appropriations in the Senate.

James J. O'MALLEY,
Executive Director.

CRANSTON COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM COMMITTEE, INC., Cranston, R.I.

DEAR SIRS: I am grateful to have this opportunity to voice the grave concern the Cranston Community Action Program Committee Inc. has over the impact a budgetary cut will have on our Head Start Program.

We have been notified that we face a nine to eleven percent cut in our present allocation. This would undoubtedly mean the end of Head Start in the City of Cranston.

Our present funding level is totally inadequate. Efforts to keep a quality program operating is a constant challenge to all those involved. The uncertainty and low level of funding undermines the effectiveness of the program as we must constantly divert our energies to fund-raising activities in order to survive.

Cranston is the fourth largest city in Rhode Island with a population of 75,000. Between ten percent and fifteen percent of the population falls into the low-income classification. Presently we operate a token program for thirty children. Due to the funding restrictions imposed upon us, we receive \$21,150 in Federal money.

To sustain our present project and to offer a quality program which can be expected to have some significant impact upon those youngsters who participate and their families, it is imperative that our funding level be doubled.

To begin to meet the needs of the eligible population in this community would require approximately a ten-fold increase in our allocation.

Since we were officially notified of the impending cut in Head Start, this is our most immediate concern. However, we would like to bring attention to the fact that the Community Action Program agency in this community is also operating on a shoestring budget. Our total funding is \$90,000, which includes a \$15,000 Family Planning project. Those pressures facing Head Start are felt perhaps more intensely by the sponsoring agency as we struggle to maintain a quality program. Our funding level has remained at \$75,000 since the inception of the program in this community in 1966.

In spite of this, our impact has been significant. We also realize that there is much more that must and can be done.

I sincerely hope that the members of Congress recognize how essential it is to keep a force operating in the interest of the low-income residents of our community alive and vital.

Mrs. ADELAIDE LUBER,
Executive Director.

WARWICK COMMUNITY ACTION, INC., Warwick, R.I.

Our Community Action Program is operated in and for the City of Warwick in Rhode Island. It is Grant Number 1019.

Our agency has been funded at the same level for the past two program years, and we have been notified that we will be funded at the same level or less for 1971. Our funding level is \$112,000 Federal share. Because of increased cost of operation and personnel, we have had to continually cut-back. This next program year's funding will necessitate the termination of three employees because of lack of funds.

Warwick has approximately 11 percent of its total population (83,000) eligible for our program under Federal Poverty Guidelines. Our agency services an estimated 30 percent of the needy in the city. Our funding level should be at least \$150,000 (Federal) to maintain our present program. Our agency also received funds from the Labor Department to operate a Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program. Our budget for this program is inadequate to meet the needs. We have a waiting list of seventy (70) eligible applicants. We have been funded at the same level on an extended contract since March 1968. Our funding level for this program is \$90,000, and we need double that amount to meet the needs of our city's disadvantaged youth.

Our Head Start Program was informed of an 11 percent cutback from our present funding level of \$82,000. Again, this will cause a cut-back in service. A funding level of \$125,000 is needed to maintain our present program.

The Foster Grandparent Program operated by our agency is the only one in the state of Rhode Island. At present, we are funded for \$92,000 to employ forty-two "Grammies". Again, we have a waiting list. A 5 percent cut-back is experienced here to a budget that is inadequate. A budget of \$115,000 should be funded to maintain the present programming.

It is demoralizing and discouraging to face continual cut-backs and restrictions in our funding. Staff is hard to retain and attract. Community participation is also difficult to maintain and recruit because of the question of survival. The adverse publicity and reaction from Congress does not help.

I firmly believe that a decision should be made to fully attack the problems of poverty through the OEO programs or to terminate OEO, rather than run it with inadequate funding clouded by insecurity.

The subcommittees efforts on behalf of the OEO Program is greatly appreciated and much needed.

LEO G. PERRONE,
Executive Director.

BLACKSTONE VALLEY COMMUNITY,
ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,
Pawtucket, R.I.

In response to your request for information on the funding situation of the Blackstone Valley Community Action Program, Inc., I hereby submit the following information:

1. OEO has not yet notified this agency of its funding level for next year. However, even if the budget is not reduced, and we receive only the same amount we received in previous years, this budget will be tantamount to a budget cut.

AGENCY ORIGINALLY UNDERFUNDED FOR
POPULATION AREA

Pawtucket Community Action Program was originally funded in 1966 at \$143,041, annual versatile funds for population of 77,538. Pawtucket agreed to add Central Falls, Cumberland and Lincoln to its area with the assurance of sufficient additional funds to serve the additional population, and the Blackstone Valley Community Action Program was formed in December, 1966, to serve an area of 134,654 people.

In actual fact, annual funding was only increased to \$219,484 (1967) so that the agency received a 53% increase in funds to serve a 73% increase in population.

FUNDS CUT IN 1968

The next year (1968) the total allocation was cut to \$208,000, so that a 45% increase in the original Pawtucket funding now had to serve the 73% increase in people served.

While Pawtucket's original allocation figured out on the basis of \$1.82 per resident, funds now equal \$1.54 per person for the area served by the BVCAP. It should also be noted that the agency serves a geographic area of 54 square miles, necessitating large transportation and communication expenses. See the attached "Comparison of Population & Funds Providence & Blackstone Valley Community Action Program Area" for one example of the discrepancy in funding for the BVCAP.

NO INCREASE IN VERSATILE FUNDS

In spite of the original underfunding of BVCAP for the size and population of the area it serves, there has been no increase in versatile funds from OEO. The agency has been forced to operate in 1970 with the same funds as in the two previous years and with less than in 1967. At the same time operating costs have steadily risen.

HEW has notified this agency of a 20% cut in funds for Summer Head Start.

(a) Present funding level—\$75,675.

(b) Reduced funding level—\$60,540.

(c) Reasons given—"reduction of prior year unexpended funds" and "anticipated reduction (\$17.7 million) in new appropriations based on the earmarking language in the Economic Opportunity Act.

(d) Impact on program—elimination of 34 to 60 children from summer Head Start.

2. Present versatile CAP funds—\$208,000.

Projected funds needed for 1971—\$290,000 to continue programs on same level.

3. Percentage of eligible or needy population BVCAP serves—20,383 total poor in area.

Number of program participants for last quarter reported (June 1-August 31, 1970)—3,884.

Percentage served—19%.

Center attendance in quarter—11,794.

I trust this information will be helpful.

VINCENT S. CEGLIE,
Executive Director.

SOUTH CAROLINA
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
DILLON-MARION COMMUNITY ACTION, INC.,
Marion, S.C., October 27, 1970.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER,
AND POVERTY,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In response to your October 20, 1970, request for information regarding our funding level, I am submitting the following:

Present funding level: OEO total budget, \$343,037; HEW Federal Funds, \$120,534; Dept. of Labor, \$396,880 (NYC & Mainstream).

OEO's reduced funding level: OEO total budget, \$324,108; HEW—notified of considerable cut, but figures not yet available. Manpower—has not notified us of a cut.

Reasons given for cut—reduction in carry-over funds available in OEO. HEW—reduction in funds to be approved by Congress.

Impact on program—two outreach workers to be cut out of Neighborhood services program, reduction in amount of funds available to fight malnutrition (about \$17,000); will cut a number of Head Start children, but number not available until exact amount of funds cut is known.

Funding level necessary: OEO total budget, \$349,454; HEW Federal Funds, \$123,543.

What percentage of eligible population serving? 56%—60%.

If more definite figures are available prior to November 6, 1970, we will forward them immediately. Please do not hesitate to call on me if there is something that needs clar-

fication or if I can be of any further help to you.

Very truly yours,

NANCY G. FINKLEA,
Director of Information.

WILLIAMSBURG-LEE COUNTIES ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL, INC.,

Kingstree, S.C., November 4, 1970.
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of October 20, 1970 in reference to our funding level, please be advised of the following:

1. This CAP Agency has been notified that its funding level will be \$154,280 for Program Year "E", which is \$45,000 less than Program Year "D".

(a) The reason which was given for cutting this agency's fund was a limited appropriation.

(b) The Head Start Program funding level is \$144,376 this year and was \$148,841 Program Year "D".

To begin with, the funds for Head Start which we are using came from a Summer Head Start Program, which means that about 18% of the low-income children are being served in a Year Round Head Start Program.

2. It is the Boards' thinking that the \$45,000 which was cut, plus \$10,000 to give a 3% raise in salaries and \$600,000 to be used to give the other 650 low-income children an opportunity, is needed. This would amount to about 100% increase in our present budget.

3. It is estimated that we are serving about 30% of the needed population in some cases, and less in other cases.

We hope that this information can be used to show an overall picture of how much OEO is needed. If this agency can be of any further service at any time, please do not fail to call.

Sincerely,

P. G. GOURDIN,
Executive Director.

E. I. LAWRENCE,
Assistant Director, Program Coordinator.

LEXINGTON-RICHLAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AGENCY,

Columbia, S.C., November 6, 1970.
Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECHTEL: This is in reply to your letter dated October 20, 1970, requesting information regarding the funding level of OEO. The answers to your specific questions are as follows:

1. We have heard rumors that we must cut our budget for the current fiscal year but we have received no such official notification. Our staff is experiencing a great deal of anxiety while waiting for a final decision. We did receive small decreases in our approved budget for our Head Start and Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs which forced us to reduce the number of children and trainees which we had planned to serve.

2. Our present funding level is \$2,211,118 and it will require a total of \$2,476,452 or an increase of twelve percent (12%) during the next fiscal year in order for us to maintain our programs at the same level of operations.

3. We estimate that we are only serving 18 percent of our population found in families with incomes below the poverty level according to the latest OEO criteria.

We hope the above information proves useful to your Committee and that you will exert every effort to obtain an adequate appropriation. Our programs are well accepted in our area of operations and we would like to think that one day more of our needy people can be brought back into the mainstream of our Society.

If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

DEWEY M. DUCKETT, JR.,
Executive Director.

BERKELEY, COLLETON, AND DORCHESTER COUNTIES, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
Walterboro, S.C., November 5, 1970.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER, AND POVERTY,

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In regard to your letter of October 20 concerning the funding level of our program we submit the following information:

1. a. \$538,224.00; b. \$44,602.00; c. Reason not stated; d. Number of children in Head Start remain the same the budget cut effected personnel, travel, consumable supplies and other costs.

2. \$602,826.00.

3. We estimate that we are now serving approximately 50% of the eligible or needy population.

If our office can be of further assistance to you, please advise.

With kind regards, I remain

Yours truly,

THOMAS MYERS,
Director of Program Planning and Operation.

ORANGEBURG AREA COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC PROGRESS, INC.,
Orangeburg, S.C., November 5, 1970.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER, AND POVERTY,

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: This letter is in answer of your inquiry of October 20, 1970.

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year? Yes.

a. Present funding level: \$439,866.00, OEO: \$67,374.00, HEW.

b. OEO's reduced funding level: \$391,-

866.00.

c. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds: Deficit in regional office.

d. Impact on your program: for example, number of children who will be cut out of Head Start or trainees eliminated from Manpower program. This will mean less emergency food for the poor and less work with youth development in Orangeburg and Calhoun Counties. This cut will also prevent us from increasing our staff and make it impossible for us to serve the poor as we see the need.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget. \$439,866.00 No increase over present budget.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving? Calhoun County: ½ of population; Orangeburg County: ½ of population.

Very truly yours,

LULA L. WILKINSON,
Executive Director, CAA.

CHARLESTON COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,
Charleston, S.C., November 4, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: We are enclosing the information that you requested for your Committee, regarding our funding situation, in order to assist the Senate in determining the proper level of funding for OEO.

We hope that this information will be helpful in your presentation. If there is any

further information or assistance you may need, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. CAMPBELL,
Executive Director.

CHARLESTON COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,
Charleston, S.C.

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year? If so, supply:

Yes, OEO has notified us that our budget will be cut for the coming year. The cut involves at least four of our programs: namely, the Charleston Industrial Education Center (CIEC) cut \$75,550, Emergency Food and Medical cut \$15,000; Youth Development program cut \$5,100 and Head Start cut \$36,391. However, we received small increases in some of our programs, the largest being in the form of an added program to the Comprehensive Medical Program, a program for Alcoholics in the amount of \$112,663 and \$60,000 for a Public Service Careers program.

a. Our present funding level is \$2,947,468.

b. OEO reduced funding level is \$2,898,296.

The overall net reduction is \$51,172. However, this is somewhat unrealistic due to the net gain in the Comprehensive Medical program.

c. Reasons given for cut in funds:

The reason given for the reduction for the Emergency Food and Medical program is the Regional claim that there was a reduction in the total amount of funds available for all Food and Medical programs.

Charleston Industrial Education Center (CIEC) reduction was a Regional decision.

Head Start reduction was considered to be part of an over-all reduction in Head Start funds in the Southeast region. The reason given for the reduction in the Youth Development program is that a similar request was approved in the previous grant for center renovations, minor repairs and building and maintenance tools.

d. Impact on your programs:

The cut in funds has made a tremendous impact on our programs. CIEC had to reduce their intake of trainees from 240 to 180. The cut will possibly have an effect on the quality of our Head Start program, the number served by Emergency Food and Medical and the number of areas served by the Youth Development program.

2. The estimated funding level necessary to maintain our present programs, in terms of a percentage increase to present budget is +15%.

3. We are now serving 25% of the eligible or needy population.

CAROLINA COMMUNITY ACTIONS, INC.,
Rock Hill, S.C., November 5, 1970.
Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am sorry for the delay in responding to your letter of October 20, 1970. I had however some pressing matters including recent notification of OEO funding.

Here is the information you requested:

1. O.E.O. did notify us that the budget would be cut. In fact that has already occurred.

a. The funding level for 1969-70 operational year (grant CG3141/D) which ended September 30, 1970 was \$482,858 in federal funds. (Does not include U.S. Department of Labor fundings).

b. The funding level for 1970-71 operational year which began October 1, 1970 and which ends September 30, 1971 (Grant CG 3141/E) is \$447,708 in federal funds. (Does not include U.S. Department of Labor fundings.)

c. The reasons given for this were:

1. A reduction in and reassessment of carry-over funds from prior years.

2. A reduction in the allocation from Congress for O.E.O. for 1971 fiscal year.

d. The main reductions will cause:
1. Less gardens for low-income people estimated from 400 last year to 200 this year. (50% reduction).

2. Less money available for individual determination programs in training and technical assistance for poor people in Model Cities area. (50% reduction).

3. Less staff travel funds.

4. Fewer school lunches for children in Emergency Food funding. (40% reduction).

5. Less funds for direct food purchases, food stamp purchases and medical examinations in Emergency Food funding. (15% reduction).

6. No funds for training of poor in planning concepts particularly in rural areas. (100% reduction).

7. Reduction in dentists' time which will result in less children treated in the Dental Health program. (8% reduction).

8. Reduction in camp maintenance fees for one program for underprivileged boys which will probably allow one week of camp as opposed to two. (Reduction about 33%).

These statements refer only to federal share of program costs and they are the effect upon only a portion of the programs. Only OEO direct funding is included.

2. The funding level necessary to maintain the present program would be that contained in 1a above.

3. The percentage of the population now being served is estimated at 25%. This is service in one form or another by the agency.

The grant number for this agency is CG3141 for OEO fundings, M-1153-45 for Mainstream, R3-8096-43 (In-School) and R-1055-45 (Out-of-School) for Neighborhood Youth Corps and E/HO 3141 for Head Start.

I hope this is the information you wanted.
Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. RUMFORD,
Executive Director.

FLORENCE COUNTY OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,

Florence, S.C., October 30, 1970.
Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: This is the information requested in determining the proper level of funding for OEO.

1. (a) Present funding level: \$494,169.
(b) OEO's reduced funding level: \$19,767.
(c) Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds: Nationwide cut for all Head Start Budgets.
(d) Impact on your program; for example, number of children who will be cut out of Head Start of trainees eliminated from Manpower program. Reduced length of program—from 12 to 11 mos. Decreased centers' staff salaries.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget. 20%.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving? Approximately 15,000.

Sincerely yours,
(Miss) THELMA BROWN,
Director, Full Year Headstart.

TEXAS

JEFFERSON COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, INC.,
Beaumont, Tex.

We are supplying the following information in response to your request of October 20, 1970:

1. HEW has notified us that our budget must be cut for the coming year.

a. Present funding level: OEO, \$262,200; HEW, \$458,696; Total, \$720,896.

b. Reduced funding level: OEO, \$262,200; HEW, \$428,512; Total, \$690,712.

c. Reason given by HEW for cut in funds: Decrease in appropriations at the Regional level.

d. Impact on our program: Approximately 80 children cut out of our Head Start program. This is based on a \$30,000 cut in the OCD programs that would eliminate three teachers and three teacher aides.

2. Approximately a 5% increase up to \$450,000 would be necessary to maintain our present program.

3. Percentage of eligible population now being served:

COMPONENT, ELIGIBLE, AND NOW SERVED

Day Care, 480, 25 percent.

SPISD Head Start, 175, 85 percent.

BISD Head Start, 300, 66% percent.

Summer Head Start, 237, 84 percent.

Thank you very much for your concern. We wish you every possible success in your efforts to increase appropriations for fiscal 1971.

JAMES G. HENDRICKS,
Executive Director.

DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE, INC.,

Dallas, Tex.

This is in response to your letter of October 20, 1970 regarding funding levels of this Community Action Agency.

1. OEO has verbally indicated that our Agency will be cut in its funding level for our next Program Year.

2. Our present funding level is as follows:

a. OEO, \$2,100,000.00; USDL, \$2,500,000.00; HEW, \$880,000.00.

3. OEO will cut approximately 10%.

4. The reasons given by OEO are simply that funds are not available for versatile programs. There may be some special purpose program monies available that we may apply for. Outside of fifty children to be eliminated from a proposed Head Start Program, there will be no reduction in services by this Agency. We feel economies effected in better management will maintain the present level of service and action. However, this Agency had planned to expand its service area utilizing the same funding level as last year.

5. This Agency feels that at least the same funding level as currently being received is absolutely necessary for Dallas County. Increased funding levels are, of course, desired, but this Agency still must face its maximum potential with the current monies available.

6. We are dealing on an annual basis with approximately 33% of those who are eligible for our services.

Please advise us if there are any further answers required.

BENNETT I. MILLER,
Acting Executive Director.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES
ADVANCEMENT CORP.,

Waco, Tex.

Thank you for your letter from the Subcommittee seeking information from us regarding our funding situation. We appreciate the efforts of the Subcommittee to increase the Economic Opportunity Act Amendment appropriations.

We have been informed by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that our funding level may be decreased approximately 5% from OEO and anywhere from 7% to 12% from HEW. Such action would have the following results:

a. Present funding level is \$1,364,331.

b. OEO and HEW reduced funding level would be \$1,282,709.

c. The reasons given by OEO and HEW for cuts in funding are: reduction in national

appropriations; smaller carry-over fund balances by grantees, and greater demands on the part of grantees to maintain their present level of operations.

d. The impact on the reduction of funds would result in:

1. Elimination of most of the rural work being done by EOAC.

2. Serving only 430 pre-school children in Head Start instead of 460.

3. If ear-marked programs are decreased by 5%, a reduction in the Planned Parenthood program would curtail services to approximately 3,000 women.

4. The Emergency Food and Medical Services funds would be exhausted six months before the end of the program year.

5. A serious decrease in the number of personnel in Administration, Planning, Neighborhood Centers, and Community Organization. These programs already are operating with limited staffs and any additional decreases would cause a complete curtailment of many of the program efforts. We are presently operating the total EOAC program at a 4.3% administrative cost.

We have calculated that the present budget would need an increase of 6% in order for EOAC to maintain its present level of operation.

EOAC is presently serving approximately 35% of the eligible needy population in McLennan County.

To identify the program operations of Economic Opportunities Advancement Corporation we are listing the following grant numbers: CG 5059/E, H 5059/E, CG 5814/A, and CG 6789/A.

CHARLES W. DOREMUS,
Executive Director.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES
DEVELOPMENT CORP.,

San Antonio, Tex.

This is in response to your letter of October 20, 1970, requesting information on our funding situation.

The Economic Opportunities Development Corporation of San Antonio and Bexar County, Texas, is the CAA for the area indicated in its title.

To date, OEO has not notified us of a contemplated budget cut, however, we are in receipt of a letter from the Dallas Regional Office of the Department of HEW advising us of an anticipated reduction in funding for our Full Year Head Start Program. They estimate the cut to be between 7% and 10% across the board.

Our response to your numbered questions, therefore, reflect only the Head Start Program.

1. a. \$1,034,373 (Present funding level). b. \$930,936 (Estimated reduced funding level).

c. Likelihood of reduction in the appropriation for Fiscal Year 1971 is reason given for anticipated reduction. d. Reduction from 800 to 750 children plus reduction of teachers and teacher aides and other supportive staff would result.

2. An estimated increase of 6% would help us maintain the level of living salary increases, etc., dictate increases in all quality single purpose programs to maintain effectiveness.

3. Four percent (4%) of the eligible children are presently being served.

GENE RODRIGUEZ, Jr.,
Executive Director.

BOWIE COUNTY ECONOMIC
ADVANCEMENT CORP.,

Texarkana, Tex.

In answer to your letter of October 20, 1970 concerning the level of funding for OEO, I submit the following financial information affecting the local Community Action Agency, Bowie County Economic Advancement Corporation, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

1. This agency's overall budget has not been reduced, however, one of the program accounts, Summer Head Start, has been reduced 20%, or from \$82,398 to \$65,918 or a total of \$16,479 reduction. May I further point out that this agency has had to operate at the same funding level for the past three years.

a. Present funding level \$389,446.

b. OEO's (HEW) reduced funding level \$372,922.

c. The agency received a 20% cut in the budget for Head Start. A reduction in the funding level in fiscal year 1970 and the likelihood of a further reduction in appropriation for fiscal year 1971 was given as the reason for a reduction of 20% in the funding level of the Head Start Program operated by this agency.

d. This agency is presently frozen at 284 children requiring 19 classes located in five different school districts scattered throughout Bowie County. The reduction will make it necessary to eliminate 6 classes, thereby depriving 180 children of Head Start training or closing down one of the centers involving 60 children. The closing of any one center operated by this agency would create problems for the agency in the field of public and human relations.

The 284 children allocated to the agency for 1970 did not meet the needs of the communities. We received applications for 181 eligible children that we could not serve. The demand for slots in the Head Start program, I am sure, will increase because of the number of families that will become eligible as a result of increased unemployment in this area. As of September 1970 Bowie County has a 7.4% unemployment as compared to 3.3% September 1969. Texarkana's percentage of unemployment is above the State average of 3.8% and National average of 5.1%. If this trend continues we will undoubtedly have more and more families becoming eligible and requesting Head Start training for their 3 to 5½ year olds.

2. Based on present operation of this agency, the funding level should be increased to a minimum of 7.9% annually. This then would make it possible for management to provide increase in salaries of employees; repair, replacement and purchase of equipment when needed. Anything less than that means that the agency cannot compete with salaries paid by other agencies such as Model Cities Program, Concentrated Employment Program, Mental Health and so forth.

3. At present we are serving 30% of the eligible or needy population.

Hope that this information will serve your purpose and be of benefit to all Community Action Agencies now being funded under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

E. E. COLLINS,
Executive Director.

VERMONT

CHAMPLAIN VALLEY OFFICE OF
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, INC.,

Burlington, Vt.

I am pleased to give you the information requested in your letter of October 20, 1970.

1. Yes, cuts were announced for the Head Start Programs in the following amounts:

	Question A	Cut	Question B
Elimination of summer Head Start.....	\$9,600	\$9,600	0
Approximately 10 percent cut of full-year Head Start.....	237,438	23,743	\$213,695
Total Head Start.....	247,038	33,343	213,695

A cut of more than 13%.

C. First, we were made to believe that the cut was necessary because of an overstated

estimate of the FY carry-over balance. On September 10, Mr. Zeigler didn't even seem to be aware that the cut was nation-wide (see attached letter of Mr. Zeigler to House Representative Robert Stafford). Later, we were told, always insufficiently, that the reduction would be permanent.

D. In the school year ending June 1969, we had 270 children in twelve centers. Because we had no hopes that the gradual devaluation of the dollar would be compensated by an equivalent increase in funding, we already closed one center (twenty children). If the ten percent cut becomes effective, we will have three alternatives:

1. Close another center.
2. Run the centers for 15 children, instead of 20, 30, and 40.
3. Run for eight months instead of nine.

In addition, elimination of the Summer Head Start would effect 80 additional children in Burlington.

2. An increase of at least six per cent or \$14,822 would be necessary only to compensate for the current inflation.

But, our last year's program is grossly underfunded. For example, Champlain Valley OEO could not enforce in Head Start its prior decision to pay no wages lower than \$2.00 per hour.

3. We estimate that in 1970 there are between 1,500 and 2,000 low-income families with preschool children. Last school year, we served 270 children, which is about 90% of those eligible.

In addition to the Head Start cut, all Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in Vermont were reduced last year by approximately one-third of their enrollees.

If you have any further questions, please contact me.

JOSEPH H. VANHOENACKER,
Executive Director.

OCCSA DAY CARE PROGRAM,
Newport, Vt.

The following statistics apply to Head Start Grant #H-1018-E-H-O, for Caledonia, Essex and Orleans counties in Vermont.

1. We have been notified by the Office of Child Development that we are to expect a cut for the coming year. OEO's role in this cut has not been explained officially.

(a) Our present funding level is \$151,322.

(b) The reduced funding level is expected to be \$134,677 with the maximum cut.

(c) The reasons listed were the same on all official notifications.

(d) We expect to have to cut one full program from our project. At a maximum this could remove Day Care Services from a population of 7,000 people. Some of the money will filter into other centers but at least five low income people will lose jobs.

We also extensively use Neighborhood Youth Corps and Operation Mainstream aides in our centers, as well as providing employment for them at the end of their training. At a maximum three Mainstream-Neighborhood Youth Corps training slots would be lost and two former Mainstream-Neighborhood Youth Corps employees would lose their jobs.

2. In order to maintain our present program, including paying for some free services which will be terminated next year, to keep up to the cost of living, to add salary increments, we will need to increase our budget by 11%, or \$16,800.

3. It is very roughly estimated that we are serving 20% of the eligible population.

PETER GARON,
Director, Day Care Centers.

STATE OF VERMONT,
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Montpelier, Vt.

The following is the response of the Vermont State Office of Economic Opportunity

to your inquiry of October 20, 1970 relative to the Head Start funding problem and how it affects programs in Vermont.

1. Has OEO notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year? Yes.

State-Wide

A. Present funding level-----	\$829,882
11% cut-----	91,287

B. OEO's reduced funding----- 738,595

C. Reasons given by OEO for cuts—See attached memorandum.

D. Impact on programs—1. Number of children eliminated from services i.e., medical, psychological, educational, and dental. (approx. 150); 2. Number of staff and trainees terminated (Approx. 21); 3. Social & economic losses to children, parents, and communities immeasurable but certainly severe; and 4. Number of centers closed (7).

In rural areas the impact of these reductions is multiplied by the fact that in some cases one center may serve 8 or 10 towns and even with our existing program, we are only serving, on an average, approximately 30% of those eligible and in some areas of the state as little as 2% or 3% of those eligible.

2. To maintain our present program activity it is estimated that at least a 10% increase would be necessary.

3. At the present time on a statewide basis the Child Development Program is serving approximately 30% of those eligible. (I believe this estimate is high).

If we can be of further assistance in restoring these funds, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

FRANCIS MCFAUN,
Chief, Technical & Technical Assistance.

BENNINGTON-RUTLAND
OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL, INC.,
Bennington, Vt.

This is in response to your inquiry of October 20th in regard to the OEO funding situation.

The only information we have on a budget cut for the coming year is in reference to Head Start. Our latest memo is dated October 29, 1970, and comes from Mrs. Rheable Edwards, Assistant Regional Director of HEW, Region I.

The following information applies to our Head Start program.

1. Yes.

a. Present funding level: \$69,000.
b. Reduced funding level: \$61,410.
c. Mistake at National level in projection of Carry Over. Balance and due to shifts and priorities within OEO caused by ear-marking language of the Bill.

d. Impact on our program:

1. One very rural area, consisting of several small villages, would be cut out of program.

2. 15 children who represent only 2% of eligible families in area would be lost.

3. Three staff, one of former welfare status would be cut.

4. Two mainstream (Manpower) trainees would be terminated.

5. The children and their families would cease receiving medical, psychological, educational and dental services.

6. The general community would lose an opportunity to be involved in Head Start Program.

2. Our present full-year program (one month old) is funded at summer 1969 Level and is unrealistic. However, to maintain it we estimate a 10% funding level increase.

3. As mentioned in d-2 at present our two counties of about 1,600 sq. miles are serving 2% of the eligible population. Based on 1960 census there are 3,892 low-income families with approximately 1,900 eligible pre-school children. We serve 95.

We appreciate anything you can do to restore the Head Start cut and to get the Mondale-Cranston Proposal Appropriations Amendment passed.

ROBERT L. GREEN, Jr.,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL, INC.,
Montpelier, Vt.

Following is in response to your letter of October 20, 1970 regarding the inadequacy of the OEO budget.

1. a. Present funding level—\$420,377.
b. OEO's reduced funding level—Head Start reduction of 11%.

c. Reasons given by OEO for cutting funds—Reasons have been vague and contradictory. Latest explanation is the action of the House in passing a \$321,000,000 budget for Head Start.

d. Impact on program—Alternatively lessening of over-all quality or closing of two centers and denial of Head Start experience to approximately 36 children.

2. Funding level necessary to maintain present program is a figure of \$463,414. . . . This figure represents an increase in estimated cost of living since the last Head Start increase of three years ago. This figure does not, repeat, does not, represent any change in staff salaries which are at present, well below non OEO personnel of comparative or lesser experience or responsibility.

3. Percentage of needy being served—44%.

I raise the question as to the advisability of maintaining a program at the plainly insufficient levels applied to OEO. It would seem the effort for productive development is nullified and the possibilities of negative reaction are amplified.

PETER R. LEWIS,
Executive Director.

VIRGINIA

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY, INC.,
Williamsburg, Va.

Present funding level for Head Start is \$35,228 and will be reduced by 7% to \$32,763. Program now serves 160 children, and 30 will be lost due to reduction. About 20% of eligible population is now being served, and an increase of 20% would be necessary to maintain present level.

W. L. TRUMBO,
Executive Director.

SOUTHWEST COMMUNITY ACTION
COUNCIL, INC.,
Huntington, W. Va.

Full year Head Start is present funded at \$129,702 and will receive a 7% cut. Number of Children affected has not yet been determined. 40% of the needy population is now being served, and a minimum increase of 5% is necessary to maintain current level.

Mrs. JOAN E. ROSS,
Executive Director.

ARLINGTON COMMUNITY ACTION
PROGRAM, INC.,
Arlington, Va.

Present level of funding (figures not given) for CAP will be reduced by about \$74,000. Staff is main area where impact will be felt. About 18-20% of needy population is now being served, and an increase of about 79% would be necessary to operate effective program.

WILLIAM N. THOMAS.

NEWPORT NEWS OFFICE OF ECO-
NOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Newport News, Va.

Present funding level for Head Start is \$178,488 and will be reduced by 11%, to \$158,448. "Insufficient appropriations" was reason given. Staff and services to community will be main areas of impact. About 10% of present population is being served

and an increase of 25% would be necessary to maintain present level.

GEORGE E. WALLACE, JR.,
Deputy Director.

SCOTT COUNTY RURAL AREAS
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Gate City, Va.

Present Head Start funding level is \$48,000 and will be cut by 7% to a total of \$44,640. 45 Children are currently being served, and they will try to keep all of them in program. Funding should be doubled to maintain present level. One-third of eligible 5-year olds are now being served.

DAVID H. TAYLOR,
Executive Director.

SOUTHEASTERN TIDEWATER
OPPORTUNITY PROJECT,
Norfolk, Va.

Present funding level for Head Start of \$834,000 will be cut by 7% to \$776,000, resulting in the elimination of 45 children from program. An 18% increase in funds would be necessary for this program to operate at present level. CAP funding will remain the same, or \$614,124.

GEORGE C. CRAWLEY,
Executive Director.

YORK COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Yorktown, Va.

Present funding level for Head Start will be cut from \$23,179 to \$21,620. At least 13 children will be eliminated. 34% of eligible children are now being served, and a 7% increase in funding would be necessary to continue operations at present level.

G. H. POPE,
Division Superintendent.

NEW RIVER COMMUNITY ACTION, INC.,
Christiansburg, Va.

Present versatile funding level is \$122,000 and for Head Start \$220,852. Summer Head Start will receive 7% cut. 40 Children will probably have to be dropped from program. 30% of eligible children are now being served by Head Start full year and summer programs; 10% of needy are reached through other CAP programs; and 15% of those in need of jobs are reached through manpower program. A minimum increase of 5% would be needed to maintain present level.

GEORGE W. DALLEY,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT COUN-
CIL, INC., HEAD START-CHILD
DEVELOPMENT,
Danville, Va.

Present funding level for Head Start is \$95,000 and will be cut by 7%, or by \$6,650. 105 Children are now being served, and it is not determined yet what number of children will be affected. Present funding level would enable them to continue current program.

Mrs. MARY WOODING,
Director.

CHARLOTTESVILLE-ALBEMARLE COM-
MUNITY ACTION ORGANIZATION,
INC.,
Charlottesville, Va.

They have not been informed of a cut yet. They now serve 35% of eligible population, and a 20% increase in funding would be necessary for them to maintain present program.

WILLIE FRENCH,
Executive Director.

LYNCHBURG COMMUNITY
ACTION GROUP, INC.,
Lynchburg, Va.

Operating budget will remain the same except for a 4% cut in Head Start. Budget cut

from \$172,000 to \$165,889. 100 Children are now in Head Start, and it is felt they can remain. 30% of eligibles are now being served.

HAYWOOD ROBINSON, JR.,
Executive Director.

WASHINGTON

CAP DIRECTORS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Port Townsend, Wash.

Your letter of October 20, 1970, regarding Office of Economic Opportunity funding, has been discussed fully by the Washington State CAP Directors' Association on October 29-30, 1970. It was agreed at this meeting that while each Executive Director would respond individually, they would also respond collectively regarding a general matter.

All community action agencies in the state of Washington with Head Start programs have been notified of funding cuts in varying degrees of severity. We submit, collectively, that we are meeting only some 15 per cent of the known need in our communities, and these budgetary cuts only aggravate the problems. Inflation alone is constantly injuring the programs without the added burden of actual dollar decreases.

We hear rumors of cuts in other OEO programs from the national news media. As of this date, however, none of us have been officially advised of any cuts. If appropriations are cut, however, together with inflationary pressures, program reductions will, of necessity, occur in other poverty programs, which, even now, are under-financed. We believe the War on Poverty should be strengthened, rather than weakened and strongly support your sub-committee's endeavors.

BEN S. ILWANGER.

EDWIN T. PRATT CENTER FOR
COMMUNITY ACTION,
Seattle, Wash.

As the State of Washington's largest Community Action Program (C.A.P.), funded under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, we are grateful for your request for information.

Irrespective of the following data requested by your office and the attached budgets, the Seattle-King County Community Action Program (SKCEO) has two very basic concerns with Congressional funding patterns in general. These are:

1. The increasing prevalent trend to "earmark" funds into such categorical cells as health, legal services, manpower services, and the like. At the local level, categorical earmarking of funds create service agencies that are functionally specialized so that most will treat only one kind of problem. Services handling health problems, education, employment, fields or responsibility and application. In addition, there are divisions of responsibility among federal, regional, state and local agencies. Services to the poor thus becomes locked in a never-ending cycle between various interest groups. But more important, the resulting situations produce fragmented and uncoordinated services. As advocates of the poor in Seattle-King County, the local Community Action Program (C.A.P.) must have the fiscal/programmatic flexibility to respond to local needs in a comprehensive manner and no degree of justification or "earmarking" will explain to our Skid Row Community why poor people died of exposure (there were 7 reported deaths) last winter because versatile funds were unavailable.

2. A corollary tendency is internal to National O.E.O., but is nonetheless of some concern to local Community Action Programs. This is the policy of National O.E.O. to make direct grants to institutions/organizations outside of existing (C.A.P.) agencies. The application of such grants requires separate administrative, fiscal, reporting and evalua-

tion structures. In many cases, neither the regional office nor the local C.A.P. agency are informed. Not only does such procedures create excessive overhead costs, but also poor coordination and duplication of services at the local level. Furthermore, as established by Title II of the E.O.A., the Community Action Program is the one organization mandated by law whose primary mission is to provide the overall anti-poverty thrust in a given political division. As such, the poor are involved in every aspect of program designed affecting their health and welfare. However, we are unable to answer their request for information about O.E.O. grants passing to organizations external to the local C.A.P., particularly to those who do not even request C.A.P. input, let alone that of the poor whom they propose to serve.

This C.A.P. agency has good reason to be concerned about these areas. Having survived an era of euphoric rhetoric about poverty and the resulting poor fiscal and administrative management thereof, we are disturbed by imprudent national policies which mitigate against strategies formulated at the local level to alleviate the causes and conditions of poverty in the Seattle-King County Area. In specific response to items 1 through 3 of your letter, please see attachments A, B, and C. The Regional Office of Economic Opportunity has not notified this C.A.P. officially that there would be overall budget reductions. However, as we are officially the prime sponsors of the Headstart Programs, as well as DOL-Manpower Programs, the reductions sustained in these programs seem to be coming about as a matter of Congressional attrition policies. Of course, from our vantage point the reductions seem arbitrary, unreasonable now wholly inconsistent with National mandates.

Again, SKCEO appreciates the interest shown by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty. If I or staff can be of further assistance, please forward same at your convenience.

JEFFERSON W. WOODS,
Executive Director.

ATTACHMENT A — CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

	CEP III, 10 months	CEP III, level annualized	CEP IV, October 24, 1970 to October 23, 1971	Percent of CEP III
EOA	954,802	1,145,762	880,000	76.6
MDTA	307,000	368,400	360,000	97.7
Total	1,261,802	1,514,162	1,240,000	81.9
100.0				
Net reduction			-18.1	

Note: The drastic effect of this reduction, as can be seen, lies in the EOA funds. While MDTA remains at substantially the same amount as CEP III, these funds are 100 percent obligated to the Washington State Department of Employment Security, and are thus of no use, as presently programmed in the relief of other subcontracts. The reason given by DOL for the reduction of EOA-CEP funds was national reduction of appropriation to the Economic Opportunity Act as it affects the concentrated employment program in region X. The effect of this reduction has been to reduce the administrative staff 15 percent; to cut supportive services (transportation, reimbursements, dental and medical services) and to substantially lower the overall quality of services provided.

HEAD START PROGRAM

1,642,000 to August 31, 1970.
1,422,000 "cut in funds" to August 31, 1971.

(NOTE.—HEW has informed the local CAP that such reductions are made as part of overall National appropriations. HEW has further informed the local CAP that it may anticipate further reductions. The total HEW reduction amounts to 10% over this year's allocation.

(Although no decision has been made at

the local level, several options are available. Final determination will probably combine two or more of the following:

- reduce administrative staff
- reduce supportive staff
- reduce classroom days
- cut-back on full-day programs
- reduce participants by 150 children or 16.7%

ATTACHMENT C—OEO FUNDING PATTERN

CG0681	Fiscal year—9 months ending Mar. 31, 1971	Annualized funding level
CAP versatile	989,389	1,319,185
Family planning	59,447	79,263
Legal services	197,795	263,727
Youth program	111,453	148,580
Total CG0681	1,358,066	1,810,755
CG 0002: Seattle Opportunities Industrial Center		332,000
CG 0011 (10 months): Emergency food	80,000	80,000
CG 0806-2A (to July 31, 1971): Comprehensive health	298,784	298,784
CG 0027 (5 months): Mobilization of resources	35,000	0
Total OEO funding, actual and projected at present program levels	2,103,850	2,521,539

Note: No notification of planned reduction from OEO funding.

HEAD START CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS,

Olympia, Wash.

In accordance with O.E.O. policy the Head Start budget for Mason-Thurston Counties was submitted May 5, 1970. A telegram was received in September authorizing continuation of the program for 1 month; again in October another telegram was received. Not until October 20, 1970 was the revised budget received by this office. This process is entirely too long. Because of the delay there will be an additional \$300.00 in accounting costs.

1. The budget was cut 7.5% or \$10,417. Past Federal funding level \$138,898.00. O.E.O. reduced it to \$128,476.00.

Reasons given for cuts—reduction in all programs and need for research and evaluation monies.

Impact: There will be 1 month less operation—this of course means cuts in salaries.

There are 8 trainees who may again need Public Assistance.

There will be 10 less children.

There will be fewer field trips.

There will be reduction in amount of equipment (replacements i.e. records, books, crayons etc.)

2. The former Federal funding level of \$138,898.00 of previous years barely covered basic costs. Therefore a restoration of 7.5% in present Federal funding level of \$128,476.00 is essential.

3. Percent of population below O.E.O. poverty guidelines: Thurston County, 19.8%, and Mason County, 21.6%.

Number of 4 yr. olds of Public Assistance families: 300.

There are many more children whose families are not on Public Assistance but whose incomes are marginal.

This year, again, we are focusing on families as well as children. Of our 91 families 75 need and desire further education; G.E.D. etc. Because of lack of transportation in rural areas it is necessary to take classes to them. There are limited funds for this as well as for books and supplies, and yet if the families are to upgrade themselves this is essential. Funds are also needed to help pay for necessary babysitting to attend the classes. As you know when the parents are

involved in classes, the school attendance and work of all the children improve.

The enclosed brochure gives pertinent facts regarding the Head Start program. The figures are all up to September, 1969.

If there is further information which would be helpful, please let me know.

Mrs. VIRGINIA SAIBEL,
Director.

expand the Head Start Program. Its beneficial effects to the children, their families and the "low-income" community are immeasurable.

JAMES H. ROBERTSON,
Director Head Start.

KITSAP COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM,
Bremerton, Wash.

This is in reply to your letter of October 20, 1970, wherein you requested information about our funding level for next program year.

We have been informed that we shall be receiving the same amount of OEO versatile funds as we have in the past which is \$156,000. However, the Regional Office of Child Development has indicated to us that our Head Start Programs will be reduced by 4 per cent. Since our current funding level is \$94,000, this will mean a cut of \$3,760. We are also faced with the fact that we have received \$7,000 for the past three years from the OEO/OCD Indian and Migrant Desk. However, we have doubts that this money will be granted again, since we cannot run a Head Start class for a full year for that amount; and we do not have sufficient low-income Indian children to fill the class. Also, we have \$7,300 of State OEO money written into our current budget. This funding is also in jeopardy since the biennium ends June 30, 1971, and there is question as to whether the program will be refunded particularly in light of the state tax reform measures which failed in yesterday's election. These potential cuts equal \$18,060 which is equal to the budget for one of our full year, part day Head Start Centers which serves fifteen children. Our total Head Start Program currently serves sixty children—thirty at a Day Care Center and fifteen each in two centers in the North and South ends of the county. Therefore, we are facing a 25 per cent reduction in the number of children we serve.

We are a small, largely rural county of 100,000 people. Our primary industry is Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and its related facilities. The shipyard has and is experiencing some cut backs in the labor force as has our neighboring community—Seattle—with its Boeing plants. There has been closure of a Naval Ammunition Depot. Our present unemployment rate is about 8 per cent and from all indications will get worse. Our Aid to Dependent Children case load has nearly doubled in the last two years. We are faced with a high rate of school dropouts, many of whom find their way to the welfare rolls. With all these inter-playing factors, it is obvious that we should be serving more, not fewer, children in the coming program year. Doctor Edward Zigler, Director of the Office of Child Development, has stated that nationally we are probably serving 15-20 per cent of the children eligible for Head Start; and we have no reason to doubt that this is true of our community.

We believe that to continue our program at its present level, we would need all our present funds plus another five to seven per cent to allow for inflationary rises.

Mrs. BONNIE L. LOOP,
Child Development Coordinator.

WEST VIRGINIA
NORTH-CENTRAL
WEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY
ACTION ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Fairmont, W. Va.

The North-Central West Virginia Community Action Association, Inc. is a six-county CAP covering an area of 2,280 square miles and having a population of 184,801.

Our Project Year is November 1 to October 31; therefore, we are just entering a new Project Year.

I implore you to not only continue, but

1. (a & b)

Herein I am listing the various Programs: the 1969-70 allocation and 1970-71 allocation.

	Project year 1969-70	Project year 1970-71
OEO	\$338,071	\$320,000
Year-round Headstart	367,329	315,235
Summer Headstart	66,000	(1)
Legal service	65,000	(2)
Mainstream	86,050	86,050

¹ Allocation reduced 7 percent.

² Allocation not made at this date.

(c) The only reason that we have been given is lack of funds.

(d) The cutbacks will do extensive harm to the Head Start Program in that we will have 150 to 200 youngsters who cannot be enrolled in the Project. In the Manpower Program we have been allocated 27 slots in the Mainstream Project. We have requested 125 slots. The Out-of-School NYC Program is sponsored by another agency but serves only three of the six counties. We would need an additional 115 slots in order to include three additional counties.

2. In order to maintain a satisfactory program we should have a minimum of a 35% increase over our 1970-71 allocation.

3. The percentage of eligible needy population which we are serving will vary with respect to each of the programs; however, an estimated 62% of the needy population is being served.

J. J. STRAIGHT,
Executive Director.

PRIDE IN LOGAN COUNTY, INC.,
Logan, W. Va.

DEAR SIRS:

We are in receipt of your communication of October 20, 1970. Our agency, PRIDE in Logan County, Inc., is the administering agency of the Head Start program under Grant H-2773 and the Community Action Program under Grant CG-2021. As per your inquiry, we submit the following information.

1. We have been notified that our Head Start program budget must be cut, but as of this date, we have not received an official notice of any cuts in any CAP program funding.

(a) Present funding level:
Head Start program—\$138,411.

CAP programs:

Program Acct. 01—19,938.
Program Acct. 08—91,262.
Program Acct. 55—50,000.

(b) OEO's reduced funding level: Head Start program, \$132,240., a cut of 4%. CAP programs, unknown at this time.

(c) Reasons given for cut in funds: The reason given for the 4% Head Start program cut is that there has been an overall cut, and 4% is our share in the cut.

(d) The 4% cut in our Head Start program will not make a reduction in the number of children enrolled in our Head Start program. We are going to make every effort to absorb this cut in a reduction of supplies, equipment and repairs.

In re: CAP programs—Our major problem is that we are finding it most difficult to initiate new programs due to a lack of funds.

2. A 10% increase in funding before the reduction will enable us to maintain our present programs. This will permit us to grant a 5% annual raise per employee according to our personnel policy, and if possible, additional benefits as an incentive for each employee to upgrade themselves through a continuous educational program.

3. With our present funding level, we are able to reach 20% of our needy population.

Thank you for your interest, and we hope

this information will be of some help to the Subcommittee.

ROSCOE THORNBURY,
Executive Director.

MERCER COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION,

Bluewell, W. Va.

In reply to your letter regarding our funding situation we submit the following information.

1. Has O.E.O. notified you that your budget must be cut for the coming year. Ans. YES

(a) Present funding level \$110,200.00
(b) O.E.O.'s reduced funding level; \$102,-486.00

(c) Decrease in funding due to pressure from Congressman

(d) Impact on program; approximately 15 children along with 4 Head Start staff members or cutting program short of allotted time.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program; in terms of a per-centge increase in present budget. 10%

3. What per-centge of the eligible on needy population are you now serving? 20%
Hopefully this information can be of assistance to you in your presentation to the Senate.

THELMA PAYNE,
Headstart Director.

THE COUNCIL OF THE SOUTHERN MOUNTAINS, WEST VIRGINIA BRANCH, McDOWELL COUNTY CHAPTER, INC.,

Welch, W. Va., October 26, 1970.

DEAR SIRS: Many thanks for your letter dated October 20, 1970.

We are submitting the following information as per your request:

I. We have been notified that our Head Start budget must be cut for the coming year. We have received no notification of a cut in CAP funds.

(a) Present funding level:

CAP ----- \$383,054
Headstart ----- 418,256

Total ----- 801,310

(b) OEO reduced funding level:

CAP ----- \$383,054
Headstart ----- 388,996

Total ----- 772,050

(c) Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds: See attachment (1.C).

(d) Impact on program:
7½% cut in salary for Headstart staff (this was done in lieu of cutting the number of children).

Deletion of three (3) full-time and one half-time staff positions.

Reduced the amount budgeted for children and parents as follows:

Food: From forty (40¢) cents per day to twenty-five (25¢) cents per day.

Equipment: From \$100 per room per year to \$50 per room per year.

Consumable supplies: From \$100 per room per year to \$50 per room per year.

Parent Activities: From \$100 per room per year to \$50 per room per year.

Transportation: Decrease of 33½% resulting in crowded schedules and increased the number of children per vehicle to be transported.

II. Estimated Funding Level Necessary to Maintain Present Program:

Fourteen (14%) percent in terms of percentage increase will be necessary to maintain our present program.

III. We are now serving approximately forty-five (45%) percent of eligible or needy population.

We do hope the data contained herein will be of value to you. If additional information is needed, please contact me.

HAROLD P. COOPER,
Executive Director.

TRI-COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION

AGAINST POVERTY, INC.,

Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR SIRS: In response to your letter of October 20, 1970, Multi-CAP is anxious to respond and participate in any other way it can in presenting an accurate statement to the Senate and House on the results of OEO funding of the past year.

Multi-CAP serves low-income people in four West Virginia counties: Boone, Clay, Kanawha, and Putnam. It is the largest CAP in the State and is headquartered in Charleston, the capital city. A total of 19,699 families with annual incomes of \$3,000 or less reside in the four-county area.

OEO has notified us of a reduced budget level for the current program year, 9-1-70 through 8-31-71. Our Program Year C funding level was \$709,440. It is being reduced to \$647,000 due principally to the following reasons given by OEO:

(a) An anticipated Congressional cut in funds causing all CAP agencies to take a predetermined cut by the Regional Budget Division.

(b) Two special projects which were funded last year will not be refunded this year despite the importance and success of the programs. They include Management Improvement which was funded for \$10,000 and Agriculture Development which was funded for \$29,320.

(c) Another unfortunate situation is the ruling by OEO to disallow extension of any program beyond the dates stated in the grant action. A three-month Emergency Food funding request was recently received half way through the planned timetable. The funds were not allowed to be expended beyond the project end date. Consequently, most of the \$14,532 had to be returned. An Agriculture Program funding request was submitted in December 1969 but not funded until June 1970, despite the fact it was submitted for an operation period from 3-1-70 to 8-31-70. Nearly 50% of the funds were unexpended and are having to be returned with no new funds available for this program and a refusal by OEO to extend the time period. This factor could result in the elimination of a very vital economic development program which has combined many area resources to enable low-income people to become commercial vegetable producers.

We have today received a memorandum from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Regional Office which says that our Summer Head Start funding request must be at a level which is 7% less than our funded Head Start program for 1970. Due to an expected reduced appropriation by the Congress, the Head Start budget reduction will reduce enrollees by about 7%.

Because of increased personnel and operational costs, the total community action program is facing a continuous cutback in staff and funds for the third consecutive year. Unfortunately, we are faced each year with cutting back a little bit more. To maintain our present program would require an approximate 4% increase in funding beyond the current funding level of \$709,440. This approximates \$35,500 which is an increase of 13% over the funding level given us by OEO in their recent Letter of Understanding.

An unduplicated count of program participants indicates that Multi-CAP has served 21,556 people during the program year which is 28% of the total four-county poverty population. In addition, there are several activities of the CAP which indirectly benefit

all low-income people or major classifications of low-income people such as through legal class actions, urban renewal target area relocation commitments and advancement of regional issues.

Mrs. SYLVIA D. PARKER,
Acting Executive Director.

WISCONSIN

DANE COUNTY HEADSTART PARENT
ADVISORY COUNCIL, INC., PROJECT
HEADSTART,

Madison, Wis., November 3, 1970.

Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Man-
power, and Poverty, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In March and April of 1971, 240 Head Start children will be at home. This is the result of a previous funding reduction and cost of living increase. We reduced, therefore, from 12 to 10 months and cut 15 children or one center.

We have been informed verbally by our Regional Office that we should expect a 10-14% reduction when we submit our budget for 1971-72. At our present funding level of \$270,000, this means a reduction of \$27,000 to \$37,800.

Should such a reduction occur again, we would have to: 1. Reduce from 10 months to 8 months; 2. Reduce from 13 to 10 centers; 3. Reduce quality by reducing staff time to the project; 4. Reducing Centers would take away 54 more children, plus 10 staff positions, 8 of which are low-income positions filled by our parents and other poor; 5. Further reduce our office, and classroom supplies which is already below par.

Head Start in Dane County has been of assistance to entire families, not just children.

We urge you to support a substantial increase to the Head Start budget as suggested by Senators Mondale and Cranston.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BARBARA J. SHADE,
Director, Dane County Head Start.

SOUTHWESTERN WISCONSIN COM-
MUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,

Dodgeville, Wis., November 5, 1970.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT,
MANPOWER AND POVERTY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: We hope that the following information on our Agency and its programs will be of some assistance to you in your efforts regarding OEO funding.

In answer to your questions:

1. OEO has notified us that our budget will be cut.

a. Present funding level:

\$94,000 OEO grant to Agency for Program Administration, Housing Services, Senior Opportunities & Services, Community Organization.

\$10,000 OEO grant to Agency for Emergency Food and Medical Services Program.

\$95,000 DOL contract for 50 Operation Mainstream enrollees under Economic Opportunity Act Title I-B.

\$118,810 DOL contract (Since June, 1968) for Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees (20 in-school, 90 summer) under Economic Opportunity Act Title I-B.

\$40,000 HEW grant for Summer Head Start for approximately 135 children under Economic Opportunity Act.

b and c. The reduced funding level and the reasons for the cut in funds are best explained by referring you to the enclosed letter.

d. Impact of reduced funding on our programs: We have not received any notification regarding our Head Start or NYC Programs. The Operation Mainstream contract expires on December 31, 1970. The list above indicates the number of enrollees that would be affected by non-renewal of the programs.

2. We estimate that a 5% increase in our funding level is needed to maintain our present program.

3. We estimate that the Agency is serving about one-third of the eligible or needy population in this area. We have waiting lists for slots in the NYC and OM programs. The Parent Advisory Committees of the Head Start Program are already preparing for an anticipated program renewal. Each week the Agency becomes a little better known, and more people come seeking some forms of assistance.

Please contact us if any additional data are needed.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PEG RASCH,
Executive Director.

KENOSHA UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1,

Kenosha, Wis., November 3, 1970.

Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Man-
power, and Poverty, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: This letter is in response to your communication of October 20, 1970 concerning the funding situation in the local Head Start program.

Those of us who are involved in the Kenosha Unified School District Head Start program (Grant Number H-4125) are alarmed and concerned over the reports of threatened cuts for the program. Having to remain at the same funding level for each of the past two years has been, in effect, working with cutbacks since our expenses have risen each of those years.

In answer to the questions, O.E.O. has not notified us officially that our budget must be cut for the coming year. However, state and regional staff members have indicated such a possibility by questioning us concerning the implications a reduction would have for us.

A condition accompanying the current grant also indicates that we must be alert to the possibility of "legislative or other fiscal limitations affecting H.E.W. programs and funding".

The Kenosha Unified School District Head Start funding level is presently \$182,000.

The implied cuts discussed with us have been from 4% to 10%. The reason given is simply that Congress is unlikely to appropriate the funds.

A cut of 10% would make it necessary to decrease drastically the number of children and families served and/or would undoubtedly have a negative effect on the quality of staffing and career development opportunities as well as an unfavorable effect on health and parent involvement components of the program.

To meet the increasing costs an increase of 8% to 10% in funding is realistic and imperative.

The local program is reaching an estimated 75% of the eligible children in Kenosha.

Thank you for your interest in and concern for the funding of the Head Start Program.

Sincerely,

EDITH S. WATTS,
Director, Headstart.

DANE COUNTY HEADSTART PARENT

ADVISORY COUNCIL, INC.,

Madison, Wis., November 3, 1970.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MAN-
POWER, AND POVERTY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In March and April of 1971, 240 Head Start children will be at home. This is the result of a previous funding reduction and cost of living increase. We reduced, therefore, from 12 to 10 months and cut 15 children or one center.

We have been informed verbally by our Regional Office that we should expect a 10-

14% reduction when we submit our budget for 1971-72. At our present funding level of \$270,000, this means a reduction of \$27,000 to \$37,800.

Should such a reduction occur again, we would have to 1. Reduce from 10 months to 8 months. 2. Reduce from 13 to 10 centers. 3. Reduce quality by reducing staff time to the project. 4. Reducing Centers would take away 54 more children, plus 10 staff positions, 8 of which are low-income positions filled by our parents and other poor. 5. Further reduce our office, and classroom supplies which is already below par.

Head Start in Dane County has been of assistance to entire families, not just children.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) BARBARA J. SHADE,
Director, Dane County Headstart.

MENOMINEE COMMUNITY

ACTION PROGRAM,

Keshena, Wis., October 28, 1970.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MAN-
POWER, AND POVERTY,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: In response to your inquiry of October 20, October, we supply you the following information:

1. OEO has notified us that our budget for November 1970-October 1971 must be cut and that our budget for November 1971-October 1972, may be additionally affected.

(a) Present CAP funding level \$147,850.00.
(b) OEO's reduced funding level \$115,000.00.

(c) Reasons given by OEO for present cut, vary as follows:

(1) Underspending by agency on Regional P.I.P. basis.

(2) Deletion of "one-shot" funds from program.

(3) Non-availability of local initiative money.

(4) By previous agreement with past CAP Director.

(5) Over-all 7.74% Regional reduction anticipated.

(d) Impact on program.

(1) Discontinuation of Evaluation Program. (One professional position).

(2) Discontinuation of Newsletter Publication (One local paraprofessional position).

Newsletter circulation of approximately 2,000, bi-weekly.

(3) Cut back in Outreach Program by deletion of two local paraprofessional positions (two remain on program) with subsequent curtailment of Outreach target contacts and activities.

2. Funding level necessary to maintain present programs, \$135,000.00, a decrease from present budget at \$147,850.00—an increase of approximately 15% over the reduced budget of \$115,000.00.

3. CAP Program now serves approximately one-half of the needy population.

SARAH L. SKUBITZ,
Executive Director.

RACINE COUNTY

COMMUNITY ACTION

PROGRAM COMMITTEE, INC.,

Racine, Wis., November 11, 1970.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT,
MANPOWER, AND POVERTY,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public
Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: First, may I apologize for my lateness in responding to your letter of October 20, 1970. Pressing agency problems prevented me from responding as soon as I would have liked.

Regarding budget cuts, OEO has not officially notified the agency of any cuts to be made. Unofficially, we expect a possible cut of approximately \$13,000 to \$19,000.

1. In responding to your questionnaire, I am taking the liberty to differentiate between OEO funds, HEW funds and Labor Department funds. Response is as follows:

A. Present funding level:

OEO	\$336,687
HEW	261,804
Labor Department	93,000

Grand total 691,491

B. OEO's reduced funding level; reduced funding will be in Local Initiative Funds at approximately \$13,000 to \$19,000.

C. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds; failure of Congress to make appropriations.

D. Impact on program; decrease in Local Initiative funds would mean loss of personnel and services provided to the low-income. It would mean complete shut-down of certain Program Accounts.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget.

We would estimate conservatively that a 10 percent increase would be necessary to maintain the present program operations.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving?

We would estimate that we are serving approximately 65 percent of our needy population.

I should mention here that the agency will not experience any cut in its Head Start budget as we have been funded for this Program Year. However, we are opposed to any cuts that may be planned for the future and support all efforts to defeat plans to cut the Head Start budget.

Sincerely,

ERNEST D. DENNY,
Executive Director.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as we consider appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity, I would like to share some of my experience with OEO use of funds available to alleviate hunger. It is a subject I feel particularly close to.

As Federal feeding programs go, the budget for the emergency food and medical services program is one of the smallest. But the impact of that program is enormous. The emergency food program was established out of the desperate need presented to this body in the first of the hunger hearings, in 1967. There were Federal feeding efforts then, as now; and then, as now, there were eligible and needy individuals for whom the available programs were not working. The emergency food program was instituted to help those programs better meet existing needs, and to support efforts to improve national nutrition.

Unlike the food stamp and commodity distribution programs, emergency food has concentrated on using small amounts of money to experiment and to demonstrate methods for improving overall program operation. Its projects will make it possible for the food dollars in our larger programs to do a better job. Last year the program supported some 400 projects. Food services were provided to individuals at a rough cost of \$10 per person. Badly needed information in areas like food enrichment, school lunch research, nutrition education, how poor

November 18, 1970

people spend their food dollars was developed. These projects will help us improve the operation of all of our family feeding efforts, and upgrade the nutritional status of the general public.

The return we will realize in national nutrition, in more rational planning, and in improved nutrition for all American schoolchildren, is incalculable. It is for such ends that we vote today to strengthen the OEO appropriations.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GOODELL TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, immediately following the disposition of the reading of the Journal and any unobjectionable items on the legislative calendar, the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn in accordance with the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 19, 1970, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MILITARY MEN IN SPACE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently an article entitled "Military Produces Space Heroes" written by my good friend, Col. William C. Moore, vice-commander of Headquarters Command, U.S. Air Force, Bolling Field, Washington, D.C., appeared in the Air Force Times. Because so very few people realize the great contribution the military has made to our space program, I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

MILITARY PRODUCES SPACE HEROES

(By Col. William C. Moore)

Two national heroes retired from the USAF recently, Col. Frank Bowman, commander of Apollo VIII, which orbited the moon and blazed the trail for Neil Armstrong's moon landing, ended 20 years of AF service July 18. Eight of those years were with the space program.

Col. Leroy Gordon Cooper, one of the original seven astronauts and commander of "Faith 7," the last of the Mercury flights, retired at Ellington AFB, Tex., July 31 following 21 years' service, 11 with the space program.

Each received the Legion of Merit. The citations emphasized their military service along with their service to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The U.S. space effort is essentially a non-military program oriented to peaceful purposes, and from its beginning the military contribution has received limited public recognition. Military men assigned to NASA seldom wear their uniforms.

However, at a recent ceremony at the Manned Space Center in Houston, at which 70 military men with NASA received military medals for their service to the space program, all wore their uniforms.

For some who had been in the space program for as long as 11 years it was a rare occasion. They had never seen so many uniforms. Some didn't realize so many military men were working with the space program.

Little public attention has been given to the fact that, of the 73 astronauts who have been selected for the space program, 49 are military—25 Air Force, 19 Navy and 5 Marine.

Twenty-four are civilians. Of these, only Neil Armstrong, John Swigert, Russell Schweickart, Walter Cunningham and Fred Haise have flown. All are ex-military pilots—Armstrong and Haise, Navy; Swigert and Schweickart, Air Force; Cunningham, Marines.

Less public attention has been given to 165 other military men, including 150 USAF, who work for NASA. These men range in rank from sergeant to lieutenant general (Sam Phillips, who returned to a military assignment after the moon landing is the lieutenant general). Many have seen service in Vietnam.

Their military expertise is far ranging: radio biologist, aerospace trajectory analyst, lunar surface operations officer, space radiation technician, Apollo flight planning engineer, lunar module vehicle engineer, physical training supervisor.

The lack of recognition for their part in the space program understandably annoys people in the military services who would like to identify themselves and their service with the heroes of the space age. Marines still grimace when recalling John Glenn's ticker-tape parade down Broadway in a business suit. To them he was a Marine. He was the product of a system that gave him the stuff of which heroes are made. To all Marines, the uniform which is symbolic of the system, deserved the accolades as much as John Glenn.

Marines didn't know the character of Colonel Glenn before he was a Marine. But they know what the system gave his character: Self-discipline, resourcefulness, elan, cool courage, competence, pride, self-reliance, technical expertise—all the things so essential to being a hero.

A Navy system not unlike the Marine's produced Wally Schirra, Charles Conrad and Alan Shepard. The nerves of Wally Schirra, who performed the first rendezvous in space with such precision and self-reliance, were conditioned long before by the exacting standards demanded by the Navy in routine formation flying.

An Air Force system not unlike those of the Navy's and Marine's produced Frank Borman, Gordon Cooper, Buzz Aldrin and Gus Grissom. Long before he made his lonely, record-breaking orbit in "Faith 7," Gordon Cooper had been conditioned to the loneliness and apprehension he would experience in orbit by flying as an Air Force "fighter jock" in single-place fighters having only one engine. Frank Borman was conditioned in "Beast Barracks" and "Plebe Year" at West Point where he adopted the motto "Duty,