EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HAZARDOUS DUTY PAY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the U.S. Navy completed the purchase of the town of Port Chicago in my district and displaced some 3,500 persons from their homes.

The Navy's reasoning, Mr. Speaker, was that these residents lived within the safety buffer zone that had been determined by the Department of Defense Armed Services Quantity Distance Table. At Port Chicago, this zone extended some 2 miles from three ammunition loading piers of the Concord, Calif., Naval Weapons Station.

At the time of the Navy acquisition, I called for reconstruction of the piers to conform to Navy safety regulations rather than for the largest military dislocation of American civilians in the Nation's history within the United States.

The Navy argued, and successfully, that the lives of Port Chicago residents would be in danger as long as they remained inside the safety zone.

The Navy also contended that acquisition and relocation of the civilian population would be less expensive than reconstruction of the piers.

Mr. Speaker, today the town of Port Chicago no longer exists. However, the deficient piers still remain and continue to pose a very real hazard to those Navy employees and personnel who work within the safety buffer zone.

It seems strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that personnel working within that zone do not receive hazardous duty pay even though the Navy predicated its decision to acquire the town on the basis of the threat that exists there.

It would be worth noting that the 322 persons killed at Port Chicago in the explosion that occurred during World War II all were on or near the piers. None of the fatalities occurred in the town itself.

Today many workers at desk jobs and other nonammunition loading occupations work within a few feet of the piers, yet do not receive compensation for working in this hazardous area.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill with Mr. HOWARD of New Jersey which would correct this situation that affects many employees of Naval ammunition facilities in the Nation.

The Federal Employee Hazardous Duty Minimum Pay Adjustment Act of 1971 will provide for additional compensation at the rate of 25 percent of an employee's basic pay if he works within a safety buffer zone determined to be unsafe for human habitation due to the presence of explosive, incendiary, or toxic material.

Mr. Speaker, if an area is unsafe for persons to live within it—then it is equally unsafe for persons to work within it.

I am hopeful that the Congress will pass this legislation and correct the present inequity that exists at Naval Weapons Station, Concord, Calif.; Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N.J.; Naval Ammunition Depot, Sunny Point, N.C.; Naval Ammunition Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; and Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.

REQUEST TO NAME SHIP "YOUNGSTOWN"

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. M. R. Kochert, president of the Western Reserve Council of the Navy League of the United States—the civilian arm of the Navy—recently sent a letter to Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee requesting that Secretary Chafee name a Navy ship the *Youngstown* in honor of the city of Youngstown, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support Mr. Kochert's efforts to have a U.S. Navy ship named the *Youngstown*. I am inserting a copy of his letter in the RECORD today for the information and consideration of Navy officials and my colleagues in the Congress:

NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Youngstown, Ohio.

Hon. JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Western Reserve Council of the Navy League of the United States requests that you consider the naming of a Navy Ship "Youngstown" in honor of our community Youngstown, Ohio.

Youngstown, Ohio is located in northeastern Ohio and is the county seat of Mahoning County with a population of approximately 166,689 within the city and a metropolitan area population of 509,006.

Located in Youngstown are the plants and mills of many of the industrial firms which provide steel and machinery for present U.S. Navy ships. These firms include Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, U.S. Steel Corporation, Republic Steel Corporation, Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation, Youngstown Welding, Commercial Shearing and Stamping Company, General Fireproofing Company, McKay Machine Company. The value added to our economy by these and other firms, too numerous to list is estimated at $1.17 billion annually.

The city of Youngstown, to our best knowledge, has never been honored by having a naval vessel named for the community. On February 8, 1941 the then Secretary of the Navy, Honorable Frank P. Knox, designated names for 22 new cruisers, one the "Youngstown." This light cruiser with the assigned hull number of CL–94 was cancelled on December 8, 1945 while under construction at Camp Shipbuilding Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This cancellation ended the efforts of numerous community and congregational leaders of the time to have a ship named for our community.

Letters from community leaders and organizations supporting this project of the Western Reserve Council of the Navy League are attached.

If additional justifying information is needed, please advise our Council.

Your fullest consideration of this proposal will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

M. R. KOCHERT.

PHYSICIANS SUPPORT MEDICAL EDUCATION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the American Medical News reports on the support given by our Nation's physicians to medical schools throughout the country. This aid takes the form of grants made to these schools by the American Medical Association Education and Research Foundation. The support of this foundation by our Nation's doctors has made a great contribution to medical education in these times when there is such a crying need fore more adequate delivery of health services. In recognition of this contribution, I include the American Medical News report in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

[From the American Medical News, Apr. 19, 1971]

SIGNS OF PROGRESS

The concern of organized medicine about medical education has been demonstrated in many ways, most recently by the announcement of this year's grants to medical schools by the American Medical Association Education and Research Foundation.

The grants of $955,725 bring the total for the past 11 years to more than $12 million. This money—donated by physicians and their wives, medical societies, and other sources—is used at the discretion of each school's administration.

The Foundation's work does not stop with aid to schools. Since 1962, it has guaranteed $48,571,275 worth of loans to 43,631 students, interns, and residents. And earlier this year, the Foundation broadened the program to provide interest-deferred loans to carefully-selected needy medical students (AMN, March 22, 1971).

The loan program and the grants to schools are only a part of the strong position organized medicine has taken toward medical education. For example, the AMA has testified before congressional committees in support of federal grants for construction, renovation, teaching, and research, along with increased financial assistance to all U.S. medical schools.

Each year the AMA appropriates more than $1.7 million in support of its Division and Council on Medical Education. The Association's accreditation, undergraduates, graduate, continuing, and allied education programs have been a major factor in establishing and maintaining the preeminence of medical education in the United States.

Today, the medical education picture is a complex combination of problems and progress. Faced with demands by the public and Congress to produce more physicians, medical schools have found expansion plans hampered by rising costs. And inflation has had an even more dramatic effect on schools now under construction or still on the drawing board.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

But there are encouraging signs as well. This year the number of medical schools rose to 103, and 12 more schools are scheduled to open this fall. For the 1970–71 school year, total enrollment passed the 40,000 mark for the first time. Some 11,100 first-year students entered U.S. medical schools last fall; the previous high was 10,400. And more schools are experimenting with programs to accelerate the progress of medical students, making it possible to receive the MD degree after three years.

While examples of the old "town-gown" controversy remain, in many instances academicians and private practitioners are discovering that they have much in common, most particularly the desire to see that the American public receives optimum medical care.

Appropriately, organized medicine is serving as the sounding board for much of the dialogue that is taking place. The most encouraging development is the continued and growing interest by all segments of medicine in finding effective solutions to the problems of medical education today.

[From the American Medical News, Apr. 19, 1971]

AMA-ERF GIVES $1 MILLION TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Grants totaling $955,725 are being distributed to United States and Canadian medical schools as a result of contributions during 1970 to the American Medical Association's Education and Research Foundation.

John M. Chenault, MD, president of the AMA–ERF's Board of Directors, said contributions represented unrestricted gifts from physicians and the Woman's Auxiliary. Dr. Chenault said all checks to medical schools have been sent to their respective state medical associations to arrange for appropriate presentations to the schools.

The 1970 gifts, about the same as for 1969 when a total of $956,909 was contributed, went to:

Alabama: Medical College of Alabama—$20,140.

Arizona: U. of Arizona College of Medicine—$14,352.

Arkansas: U. of Arkansas School of Medicine—$8,454.

California: U. of California School of Medicine at San Francisco—$5,453; U. of Southern California School of Medicine—$23,723; Stanford U. School of Medicine—$6,604; Loma Linda U. School of Medicine—$12,703; U. of California Los Angeles School of Medicine at Los Angeles—$3,548; U. of California, Irvine, California College of Medicine at Los Angeles—$6,958; U. of California, San Diego School of Medicine at La Jolla—$4,623; U. of California, Davis School of Medicine at Davis—$9,719.

Colorado: U. of Colorado School of Medicine—$12,641.

Connecticut: Yale U. School of Medicine—$4,589; U. of Connecticut School of Medicine—$3,461.

District of Columbia: George Washington U. School of Medicine—$7,385; Georgetown U. School of Medicine—$11,314; Howard U. College of Medicine—$4,647.

Florida: U. of Miami School of Medicine—$4,814; U. of Florida College of Medicine—$4,477; U. of South Florida School of Medicine—$463.

Georgia: Medical College of Georgia—$5,980; Emory U. School of Medicine—$5,582.

Hawaii: U. of Hawaii School of Medicine—$5,103.

Illinois: Rush Medical College of Chicago—$6,241; Pritzker School of Medicine of the U. of Chicago—$15,173; Northwestern U. Medical School—$28,482; U. of Illinois College of Medicine—$26,292; Chicago Medical School—$16,839; Stritch Medical School, Loyola U.—$20,736; Southern Illinois U. School of Medicine—$172.

Indiana: Indiana U. School of Medicine—$29,587.

Iowa: U. of Iowa College of Medicine—$10,369.

Kansas: U. of Kansas School of Medicine—$17,490.

Kentucky: U. of Louisville School of Medicine—$7,538; U. of Kentucky College of Medicine—$3,754.

Louisiana: Tulane U. School of Medicine—$14,244; Louisiana State U. School of Medicine—$6,854; Louisiana State U. Medical Center-Shreveport School of Medicine—$3,322.

Maryland: U. of Maryland School of Medicine—$12,766; Johns Hopkins U. School of Medicine—$8,956.

Massachusetts: Harvard Medical School—$11,949; Boston U. School of Medicine—$7,967; Tuts U. School of Medicine—$10,232; U. of Massachusetts School of Medicine—$2,744.

Michigan: U. of Michigan Medical School—$14,153; Wayne State U. School of Medicine—$8,422; Michigan State U. College of Human Medicine—$62,214.

Minnesota: U. of Minnesota Medical School—$12,039.

Mississippi: U. of Mississippi School of Medicine—$10,820.

Missouri: Washington U. School of Medicine—$10,715; U. of Missouri School of Medicine, Columbia—$4,482; St. Louis U. School of Medicine—$13,164; U. of Missouri-Kansas City School of Medicine, Kansas City—$2,969.

Nebraska: U. of Nebraska College of Medicine—$10,075; Creighton U. School of Medicine—$12,626.

Nevada: U. of Nevada School of Medicine—$3,328.

New Hampshire: Dartmouth Medical School—$3,860.

New Jersey: New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry—$8,407; Rutgers-The State U., Rutgers Medical School—$1,539.

New Mexico: U. of New Mexico School of Medicine—$4,063.

New York: Columbia U. College of Physicians and Surgeons—$6,124; Albany Medical College of Union U.—$4,544; State U. of New York at Buffalo School of Medicine—$5,187; State U. of New York Downstate Medical Center—$4,153; New York Medical College—$4,604; State U. of New York Upstate Medical Center—$3,709; New York U. School of Medicine—$5,159; Cornell U. Medical College—$6,579; U. of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry—$4,568; Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva U.—$2,945; Mount Sinai School of Medicine of the City U. of New York—$2,864.

North Carolina: U. of North Carolina School of Medicine—$6,027; Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College—$6,115; Duke U. School of Medicine—$7,854.

North Dakota: U. of North Dakota School of Medicine—$4,814.

Ohio: Case Western Reserve U. School of Medicine—$13,798; Ohio State U. College of Medicine—$13,698; U. of Cincinnati College of Medicine—$16,393; Medical College of Ohio at Toledo—$6,112.

Oklahoma: U. of Oklahoma School of Medicine—$11,477.

Oregon: U. of Oregon Medical School—$10,775.

Pennsylvania: U. of Pennsylvania School of Medicine—$13,714; Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia—$8,204; Medical College of Pennsylvania—$5,178; Hahnemann Medical College—$8,338; U. of Pittsburgh School of Medicine—$7,914; Temple U. School of Medicine—$11,263; Pennsylvania State U. College of Medicine, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center—$2,983.

Puerto Rico: U. of Puerto Rico School of Medicine—$3,424.

Rhode Island: Brown U. Division of Biological and Medical Sciences—$1,695.

South Carolina: Medical U. of South Carolina School of Medicine—$10,491.

South Dakota: State U. of South Dakota School of Medicine—$7,050.

Tennessee: Vanderbilt U. School of Medicine—$13,897; U. of Tennessee College of Medicine—$23,486; Meharry Medical College School of Medicine—$5,434.

Texas: U. of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston—$7,247; Baylor College of Medicine—$6,103; U. of Texas Southwestern Medical School at Dallas—$4,729; U. of Texas Medical School at San Antonio—$5,739; U. of Texas Medical School at Houston—$35; Texas Tech U. School of Medicine—$30.

Utah: U. of Utah College of Medicine—$14,769.

Vermont: U. of Vermont College of Medicine—$7,734.

Virginia: U. of Virginia Medical School—$9,383; Medical College of Virginia—$9,121.

Washington: U. of Washington School of Medicine—$6,612.

West Virginia: West Virginia U. School of Medicine—$13,305.

Wisconsin: U. of Wisconsin Medical School—$8,621; Medical College of Wisconsin—$14,658.

Canada: U. of Alberta Medical School—$90; U. of Manitoba Medical School—$164; Dalhousie Medical School—$90; U. of Toronto Medical School—$120; Queens U. Medical School—$40; U. of Western Ontario Medical School—$335; U. of Ottawa Medical School—$295; McGill U. Medical School—$520.

SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND PRESENTS ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Association of New England today made its annual presentation of its legislative program to members of the House Small Business Committee at a luncheon in the Rayburn Building.

The presentation was excellent and the proposals well-reasoned, well-considered, and worthy of careful consideration by all Members of Congress.

Highlights of SBANE's four point legislative program are as follows:

First. SBA should be provided with additional manpower because of its expanding responsibilities. The expansion of SBA commitments without corresponding increases in staff in various areas is damaging the effectiveness of the agency, spreading SBA's present manpower too thin.

Second. The 7-percent investment tax credit should be reinstated to stimulate economic growth. A surtax exemption should be enacted, providing for a $50,000 surtax exemption to small business for those corporations which have earnings of $50,000 or less.

Third. Small business size standards

should be lowered to assist small businessmen in securing Federal contracts and subcontracts in procurement. The Government should continue to rely on the private sector of the economy for its service needs and Congress should mandate this into law. In addition, mandatory set-asides should be required in package procurement programs and subcontractors should have the right to appeal to the Government.

Fourth. Congress should take steps to assist small business in its conversion from a military-space oriented economy, including passage of legislation to provide special loans, extension of legislation which provides technical assistance, and a limited plow-back tax credit for civilian research and development.

TRADE AND TARIFF POLICIES MUST BE CHANGED

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have read three newspaper articles focusing attention on the critical effect this Nation's trade and tariff policies are having on American industries and American workers. The articles reflect fears I have expressed on the floor of this House several times over the past few years.

I do not believe there is any doubt left in the minds of anyone that our trade and tariff policies must be changed if America is to survive as a strong productive nation. We cannot continue to play the new game of world economy by old rules. This has led us to a record deficit in our balance of payments of $5.5 billion for the first quarter of 1971, more than half the total deficit compiled in all of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these articles to the RECORD and call them to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the AFL–CIO News]

U.S. PRESSED TO CURB BORDER INDUSTRY ABUSES

ATLANTA.—The Mexican Border Industrialization Program "has assumed utterly unacceptable economic and social proportions for the U.S.", the AFL–CIO declared as it called for strong government action to cope with the problem.

The Executive Council noted that the border program has grown from 30 U.S. companies in 1967 to 250 at present, with the growth due to policies of both the U.S. and Mexican governments.

U.S.-owned plants on the Mexican side of the border receive special tax and tariff assistance; they pay substandard wages to assemble components from the U.S. into final products for the U.S. market. The goods come into the U.S. under special low tariff duties and are sold at American prices.

The Mexican government, the council said, recently announced the extension "of these border industrialization lures" into the interior of the country.

This presents, the council said, a new threat of a rising flood of imports produced at substandard wages and aided by various Mexican government benefits.

The council called for repeal of the loopholes in the U.S. tariff laws; requirements for reporting of investment, production, employment and trade by U.S. firms in Mexico; regulation of border crossing of Mexican labor and, in general, discouraging U.S. firms from participating in the programs and directing government agencies to stop encouraging the operations.

[From the AFL–CIO News, May 15, 1971]

LABOR'S 9-POINT PLAN—GLOBAL FIRMS TARGET OF TRADE PROPOSALS

ATLANTA.—Sweeping new trade and investment legislation to meet the problems and realities of the 1970s has been called for by the AFL–CIO, with major attention focused on control of the growing power of the multinational corporation.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council proposed new legislation covering nine basic points, many of them dealing with methods of curbing the export of American jobs and capital.

"Rapid changes in international relationships have deteriorated America's position in world trade and affected the world standing of the American dollar." While other nations have adjusted their policies "the U.S. has failed to adjust."

The council pointed out that multinational firms and banks, usually U.S. based, "now have global operations which benefit from the policies of every country but which are beyond the reach of present U.S. law or the laws of any single nation. The policies of these U.S. based firms and banks are designed solely to profit the corporations and are made with disregard for the needs of the United States, its economy and its people."

In the past decade investments of U.S. firms in their foreign subsidiaries have risen from $3.8 to $13.2 billion and this year outlays are expected to be more than $15 billion. "In addition, joint ventures, foreign licensing and patent agreements and other relationships of U.S. firms abroad have changed the patterns of the U.S. economy in its relation to world trade and investment," the council said.

New legislation should include the following concepts, the council said:

New tax measures to halt the export of U.S. jobs, remove the incentive to establish production and assembly facilities abroad and curb expanded production abroad.

Regulation, supervision and curbing of the outflows of U.S. capital. Present controls on foreign investments are loose, inadequate and not related to trade and production.

Presidential authority to regulate, supervise and curb the export of technology via licensing and patent agreements.

International fair labor standards in trade agreements.

Quantitative restraints, with a base year of 1965–69, should be applied to products and parts imported into the U.S.

Truth in labelling to establish the country of origin of components and parts as well as the final product.

Consumer protection so that all imports conform strictly to all laws designed to protect the safety and health of American consumers.

Federal standards for international accounting by U.S. firms with foreign operations.

Modernization of existing antidumping and escape clause in trade legislation.

[From the Washington Star]

RECORD DEFICIT IN BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The U.S. balance of payments hit a record deficit of $5.5 billion in the first quarter of this year, the Commerce Department said today.

On Capitol Hill, Treasury Secretary John B. Connally said the situation is transitory, and that the best way to defend the dollar's strength abroad is to strengthen the domestic economy and demand fair treatment by foreign competitors.

The Commerce Department said the first-quarter deficit—the difference between what the nation spends abroad and what it takes in—was $2.2 billion higher than for the last quarter of 1970 and more than half the $9.8 billion deficit for all of 1970.

The department said the deficit on the "official reserve transactions basis" reached a seasonally adjusted $5.5 billion in the first three months of 1971.

The official reserve transaction basis represents all transactions with foreign governments and foreign central banks.

The department said the payments deficit on the "liquidity basis" was $3 billion in the first quarter, up $2.5 billion from the previous quarter. The liquidity basis measures all transactions with foreign countries.

The department said much of the first-quarter deficit was caused by speculators seeking higher interest rates in Europe than were available in the United States—the situation which brought international monetary crisis over the dollar, in which Germany decided to float its currency, untying it from the dollar, and other countries decided to revalue their currencies.

"To keep pace in this world economy, our first task is to attend to our own economy," Connally told the Senate Finance Committee's subcommittee on international trade.

"We must restore the stable, noninflationary growth that was disrupted by the domestic financial policies of the late 1960s," he said.

"LEGITIMATE COMPLAINTS"

Beyond domestic policy, he said, "We have legitimate complaints about some of the practices of other nations . . . that have the effect of blunting our competitive effort."

He mentioned the $5.5 billion deficit and said:

"Clearly, that level of deficit is not sustainable."

But he maintained that "the major cause of these extraordinary dollar outflows is transitory—interest rates here which are lower than those in Western Europe."

"That imbalance will be largely corrected as (the U.S. and European) economies move back into phase," he said.

A previous record deficit on the official basis occurred in the last three months of 1970, when the deficit was $3.3 billion. On the liquidity basis, the new deficit was the second highest on record. The highest was in the second quarter of 1969, when the deficit $3.8 billion.

THREE "CHALLENGES"

More disturbing than the temporary flows of dollars, Connally said, is the weakening trend in the U.S. trade surplus.

American business and labor must cooperate to hold down costs, prices and interest rates to enable the United States to compete effectively in world markets, he said.

Foreign nations also bear a responsibility for stabilizing the international economy, he said, citing three "challenges" for policy:

1. U.S. allies must accept "a fair sharing of the burden" for mutual security.

2. All nations must broaden cooperation in finance and foreign aid.

3. "The efforts to foster increased competitiveness in our economy must be actively pursued in the context of fair and liberal trading arrangements."

Calling for "a return to the principles of hard work and responsibility," Connally warned that the United States must adjust to a new world economy, in which Europe and Japan have acquired great power.

"A generation of ease and affluence enjoyed by (American) labor and business alike—a period when our strength was so apparent that erosion in our competitive position was almost unnoticed—is over."

"The simple fact is that in many areas others are out-producing us, out-thinking us, out-working us and out-trading us," he said.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE CRISIS

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think all of us are aware of the financial crisis in higher education. One of the cruelest aspects of this crisis is the rapidly rising cost of attending colleges and universities in this Nation.

Estimates indicate that anywhere between 600,000 and 1 million talented high school graduates each year are unable to continue their education simply because they lack the financial resources to pay for it. In addition, literally hundreds of thousands of students who are in college now are there only because of great personal and financial sacrifice by themselves and their parents.

Rapid inflation in recent years has hurt millions of American citizens in different ways and the cost of attending college has risen twice as fast as general inflation elsewhere in the economy.

As a result, many middle-income as well as needy families are finding it exceedingly difficult if not impossible to pay tuition and related costs of higher education for their children.

One promising but limited response to this pressing need has been student financial assistance as provided under the educational opportunities grant programs and the college work-study program. Unfortunately, these useful programs have never been adequately funded.

Just this month, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted reports to the Congress describing the magnitude and distribution of grants under these programs.

It is disappointing to note that recipients of educational opportunity grants awards have declined from 295,169 last year to 285,616 this coming year—even though the funds available for this program have remained approximately the same. Similarly, the work-study program has declined in funding from a level of approximately $107.4 million last year to approximately $80.5 million this coming semester. While it is true that the actual number of recipients of work-study will increase in the coming year, this simply reflects the fact that the funds available are being spread more thinly. For example, the average amount of assistance under the work-study program will be reduced from approximately $320 per recipient last year to only $190 per recipient this year.

I think the information contained in these reports—and the statistics I have cited above—indicate quite clearly that our efforts to fund these programs adequately have not kept pace with the rapidly rising cost of education and the increasing number of students who need assistance.

In order that the information contained in these reports might be available to all of us who seek to increase appropriations for these vital programs, I ask unanimous consent that the HEW reports I referred to earlier be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

APPROVAL OF GRANTS FOR INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

(Report of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, May 7, 1971, Notification to Members of Congress Regarding P.L. 89–329, the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended)

Grants to institutions listed on the attached sheets have been approved for the operation of the College Work-Study Program, authorized under Title IV, Part C, of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, as a "first installment" for the period July 1, 1971 through June 30, 1972. Additional funds are expected to be obligated for program operations during fiscal year 1972, as soon as funds become available from the fiscal year 1972 appropriation. The format used in this notification schedule identifies the: (1) State and Congressional District in which the institution is located; (2) name and location of the institution; (3) name of the institution's president; (4) approved level of operation (allocation); and (5) estimated number of students to be employed under the College Work-Study Program during this period. The determination of the estimated number of students is based on the total of Federal funds ultimately expected to be available for use during fiscal year 1972.

Federal funds will provide 80 percent of student payrolls, and a matching college, university, or off-campus agency contribution will provide the remaining 20 percent. This schedule contains approval of a total of 2,459 institutional programs which are estimated to benefit 424,704 students. The total of Federal funds being obligated at this time in this "first installment" for program operations during fiscal year 1972 (July 1, 1971 through June 30, 1972) is $80,506,704.

Further information about the program may be obtained from Mr. Warren T. Troutman, Chief, College Work-Study Program Branch, Division of Student Financial Aid, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Telephone: Area Code 202–962–3871. (Government Code 13–23871.)

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	ALABAMA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 57)		
	Total	$1,420,923	9,220
8	Alabama A & M College, Normal, Ala. 35762, R. D. Morrison, president	30,108	186
2	Alabama Christian College, Montgomery, Ala. 36109, Rex A. Turner, president	7,849	54
7	Alabama School of Trade, East Gadsden, Ala. 35903, E. L. Darden, president	4,273	25
2	Alabama State Univ. Montgomery, Ala. 36101, Levi Watkins, president	77,239	469
7	Albert P. Brewer State Junior College, Fayette Ala. 35555, Dr. Charles W. Davis, president	6,825	51
3	Alexander City State Jr. Col., Alexander City, Ala. 35010, W. Bryon Causely, president	12,710	103
99	Alvarson Draughon Business College, Birmingham, Ala. 35201, W. H. Foster, president	15,394	108
8	Alverson-Draughon Col. Hunstsville, Ala. 35805, Kenneth H. Brown, president	2,907	17
8	Athens College, Athens, Ala. 35611, Sidney E. Sandridge, president	5,104	22
2	Auburn Univ. at Montgomery, Montgomery, Ala. 36104, H. H. Funderburk, Jr., president	2,991	19
3	Auburn University, Auburn, Ala. 36830, Harry M. Philpott, president	47,627	364
6	Birmingham Southern Col. Birmingham, Ala, 35204, Charles D. Hounshell, president	13,099	80
6	Booker T. Washington Bus. col. Birmingham, Ala, 35202, M. L. Gaston, Director	37,750	167
7	Cullman College, Cullman Ala., 35055, Sr. Mary Lourdes Michell, president	2,827	27
6	Daniel Payne College, Birmingham, Ala., 35212, Daniel T. Grant, president	15,914	115
3	Enterprise State J C Enterprise, Ala., 36330, B. A. Forrester, president	25,133	125
8	Florence State Univ., Florence, Ala., 35630, E. B. Norton, president	36,777	246
2	Gadsden State Jr. College, Gadsden, Ala., 35903, Allan Naylor, president	13,837	87
7	George C. Wallace, State Teacher School-Cullman Co., Hanceville, Ala., 35077, Benjamin F. Johnson, director	$8,595	43
3	George C. Wallace, State Tech Jr., Col., Dothan, Ala., 36301 Phillip J. Hamn, president	7,310	52
2	Huntingdon College, Montgomery, Ala., 36106, Allen K. Jackson, president	10,004	70
4	Jacksonville State Univ., Jacksonville, Ala., 36265, Houston Cole, president	47,607	332
2	James H. Faulker State Jr., College, Bay Minette, Ala., 36507, Lathem N. Sibert, president	15,592	99
2	Jefferson Davis State J. C., Brewton, Ala., 36426, Woodfin Patterson, president	9,435	63
6	Jefferson State Jr., College, Birmingham, Ala., 35215, Leroy Brown, president	28,898	187
8	John C. Calhoun State Tech., Jr., Col., Decatur, Ala., 35601 Carlton Kelley, president	10,501	74
5	Judson College, Marion, Ala., 36756, N. H. McCrummen, acting president	2,238	18
5	Livingston State Univ., Livingston, Ala., 35470, John E. Deloney, president	24,657	198
2	Lurleen B. Wallace State Jr. College, Andalusia, Ala., 36420, Dr. William H. McWhorter, president	9,766	64
2	Massey Draughon Bus. Col., Montgomery, Ala., 36102, J. E. Leonard, president	3,690	22
6	Miles College, Birmingham, Ala., 35208, L. H. Pitts, president	125,604	785
1	Mobile College, Mobile, Ala., 36613, William K. Weaver, Jr., president	10,127	58
1	Mobile State Jr. Col., Mobile, Ala. 36603, Sandford Bishop, president	19,680	158
8	North Ala. College of Commerce, Huntsville, Ala. 35801, T. B. Chesnutt, president	1,845	12
8	Northeast St. Jr. Col., Rainsville, Ala. 35986, E. R. Knox, president	21,037	135
7	Northwest Alabama St. Jr. Col., Phil Campbell, Ala. 35581, James A. Glasgow, president	12,409	91
8	Oakwood College, Huntsville, Ala. 35806, Frank W. Hale, Jr., President	10,665	77
1	Patrick Henry State Jr. College, Monroeville, Alabama 36460, B. E. Lee, president	5,713	43

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	ALABAMA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 57)—Continued		
6	Samford University, Birmingham, Ala. 35209, Leslie S. Wright, president	$10,332	74
4	Selma Univ., Selma, Ala. 36701, M. C. Cleveland, Jr., president	25,785	130
7	Snead State Jr. College, Boaz, Ala. 35957, Virgil M. McCain, president	7,086	50
4	Southern Bus. Col., Birmingham, Ala. 35203, Kenneth C. Horne, president	1,160	9
4	Southern Union State Jr. College, Wadley, Ala. 36276, Harold N. Stinson, president	15,682	97
1	Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala. 36608, Very Rev. William J. Rimes, president	8,200	49
7	St. Bernard College, St. Bernard, Ala. 35138, Rt. Rev. Gregory Roetter, president	8,200	50
5	Stillman College, Tuscaloosa, Ala, 35401, Harold N. Stinson, president	57,732	391
6	T. A. Lawson State Jr. College, Birmingham, Ala. 35211, T. A. Lawson, president	27,274	155
4	Talladega College, Talladega, Ala. 35160, Herman H. Long, president	18,595	143
5	She Marion Inst., Marion, Ala. 36756, Dr. Paul B. Robinson, president	1,239	9
2	Troy State Univ., Troy, Ala. 36081, Ralph W. Adams, president	44,936	336
3	Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Ala. 36088, L. H. Foster, president	142,651	900
6	Univ. of Alabama in Birmingham, Birmingham, Ala. 35233, Joseph Volker, president	36,493	339
8	Univ. of Alabama in Huntsville, Huntsville, Ala. 35807, Benjamin B. Graves, president	7,298	41
5	Univ. of Montevallo, Montevallo, Ala. 35115, Kermit Johnson, president	14,514	113
1	Univ. of South Alabama, Mobile, Ala. 36608, Frederick Palmer Whiddon III, president	59,040	332
5	University of Alabama, University, Ala. 35486, F. David Mathews, president	188,051	1,123
7	Walker College, Jasper, Ala. 35501, David J. Rowland, president	2,868	29
	ALASKA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 3)		
	Total	39,129	322
[1] 1	Alaska Methodist University, Anchorage, Alas. 99504, Frederick P. McGinnis, president	22,416	178
[1] 1	Sheldon Jackson Jr. Col., Sitka, Alas. 99835, Orin R. Stratton, president	7,209	51
[1] 1	University of Alaska, College, Alas. 99701, William R. Wood, president	9,504	93
	ARIZONA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 19)		
	Total	745,949	3,910
1	Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz. 85281, John W. Schwada, president	189,932	870
2	Arizona Western College, Yuma, Ariz. 85364, George L. Hall, president	22,990	118
2	Central Arizona Col., Coolidge, Ariz. 85228, Don P. Pence, president	32,374	160
2	Cochise College, Douglas, Ariz. 85607, John R. Edwards, Jr., president	4,865	39
3	Eastern Arizona Col., Thatcher, Ariz. 85552, Dean A. Curtis, president	19,261	94
3	Glendale Cmty. Col., Glendale, Ariz. 85301, Matt O. Hanila, executive dean	3,569	41
3	Grand Canyon College, Phoenix, Ariz. 85017, Arthur K. Tyson, president	4,410	24
2	Granite Computer-Tucson, Tucson, Ariz. 85716, Frank J. Okane, president	6,496	31
1	Granite Computer-Phoenix, Phoenix, Ariz. 85013, Paul R. Ash, president	13,632	68
3	Maricopa Tech. Col., Phoenix, Ariz. 85004, Norbert I. Bruemmer, executive dean	9,554	68
1	Mesa Community College, Mesa, Ariz. 85201, John D. Riggs, executive dean	21,250	164
3	Navaho Cmty. Col., Many Farms, Ariz. 86503, Ned Hatathli, president	33,571	191
3	Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff Ariz. 86001, J. Lawrence Walkup, president	108,854	569
1	Phoenix College, Phoenix, Ariz. 85013, J. Lee Thompson, executive dean	133,683	2
2	Pima College, Tucson, Ariz. 85711, Dr. Kenneth Harper, president	19,247	99
3	Prescott College, Prescott, Ariz. 86301, Ronald C. Nairn, president	7,965	35
3	Thunderbird Grad. School of Int. Mgt., Phoenix, Ariz. 85001, Robert F. Delaney, president	1,407	6
2	University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz. 85721, Richard A. Hapvill, president	109,370	438
3	Yavapai College, Prescott, Ariz. 86301, John W. Barnes, president	3,519	23
	ARKANSAS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 31)		
	Total	1,100,247	5,913
4	Agric. Mech. & Normal Col., Pine Bluff, Ark. 71601, Lawrence A. Davis, president	173,280	869
4	Arkansas A. & M. College, College Hghts., Ark. 71633, Claude Hunter Babin, president	58,154	301
2	Arkansas Bapt. College, Little Rock, Ark. 72202, J. C. Oliver, president	$10,864	47
2	Arkansas College, Batesville, Ark. 72501, R. William Wygle, president	18,078	94
3	Arkansas Polytechnic Col., Russellville, Ark. 72801, George L. B. Pratt, president	97,145	495
1	Arkansas State Univ., State University 72467, Carl R. Reng, president	96,914	446
3	Arkansas Valley Voc. Tech. Sch., Ozark, Ark. 72949, Alvin E. Vest, director	11,015	48
4	Capital City Bus College, Pine Bluff, Ar. 71601, Perry L. Turnbull, chief ex officer and sect	1,920	11
2	Capitol City Bus Col., Little Rock, Ar. 72204, Perry L. Turnbull, chief executive	7,713	53
3	College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark. 72830, Don E. Davis, president	23,040	111
99	Cotton Boll. Voc. Techschool, Burdette, Ar. 72321, Johnny W. Rapert, director	2,632	13
1	Crowleys Ridge College, Paragould, Ark. 72450, Emmett Smith, president	19,391	124
2	Delta Vocational Technical School, Marked Tree, Ar. 72365, William L. Stanley, director	2,737	15
2	Harding College, Searcy, Ark. 72143, Clifton L. Ganus, Jr., president	22,548	141
4	Henderson St. College, Arkadelphia, Ark. 71923, Dr. Martin B. Garrison, president	48,487	361
2	Hendrix College, Conway, Ark. 72032, Rox B. Shilling, Jr., president	8,969	57
3	John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark. 72761, John E. Brown, Jr., president	16,544	94
4	Ouachita Baptist Univ., Arkadelphia, Ark. 71923, Daniel R. Grant, president	44,796	258
2	Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Ark. 72203, Walter Hazzard, president	34,193	183
1	Phillips Co. Cmty. Col., Helena, Ark. 72342, John W. Easley, president	6,300	32
4	Pines Voc. Tech. School, Pine Bluff, Ark. 71601, Leon Coker, director	5,671	38
3	Red River Voc. Tech. Sch., Hope, Ark. 71801, J. W. Rowe, director	8,641	32
1	Southern Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, Ark. 72476, H. E. Williams, president	33,068	206
4	Southern State College, Magnolia, Ark. 71753, Imon E. Bruce, president	96,449	621
4	Southwest Technical Inst., East Camden, Ark. 71710, Charles O. Ross, director	15,812	83
2	State Col. of Arkansas, Conway, Ark. 72032, Silas D. Snow, president	50,876	272
3	Twin Lakes Voc.-Tech. School, Harrison, Ark. 72601, Weldon Stevenson, director	2,993	14
2	Univ. of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, Ark. 72204, Carey V. Stabler, president	21,505	128
3	University of Arkansas, Fayatteville, Ark. 72701, David W. Mullins, president	101,444	526
2	University of Arkansas Md. Ctr., Little Rock, Ark. 72201, James L. Dennis, vice president	49,947	190
3	Westark Junior Col., Fort Smith, Ark. 72901, Ben Whitfield, acting president	9,121	50
	CALIFORNIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 203)		
	Total	5,415,726	32,750
13	Allan Hancock College, Santa Maria, Calif. 93454, Walter E. Conrad, president	10,240	51
3	American River College, Sacramento, Calif. 95841, Douglas Burris, acting president	41,630	207
27	Antelope Valley College, Lancaster, Calif. 93534, William N. Kepley, Jr., superintendent, president	6,911	36
7	Armstrong College, Berkeley, Calif., 94704 John E. Armstrong, president	9,973	52
99	Automation Institute of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. 90013 Edward Tokeshi, president	22,824	154
32	Automation Institution, Long Beach, Calif. 90807, James E. McCormick, president	2,620	18
24	Azusa Pacific College, Azusa, Calif. 91702, Cornelius P. Haggard, president	14,826	104
18	Bakersfield College, Bakersfield, Calif. 93305, Burns Finlinson, president	29,882	179
33	Barstow College, Barstow, Calif. 92311, Donald L. White, president	5,230	38
12	Bethany Bible College, Santa Cruz, Calif. 95060 C. C. Burnett, president	5,829	41
19	Biola College, La Mirada, Calif. 90638 J. Richard Chase, president	5,325	41
10	Bryant & Stratton Col. of Commerce, San Jose, Calif. 95126, Richard J. Oneil, president	2,506	16
2	Butte College, Durham, Calif. 95938, Albert A. Schlueter, president	4,593	46
18	Cal. State College, Bakersfield, Bakersfield, Calif. 93309, Dr. Paul F. Romberg, president	7,446	64
12	Cabrillo College, Aptos, Calif. 95003, Robert E. Swenson, president	16,979	120
24	Cal. St. Poly Col., Kellog Voorhis, Pomona, Calif. 91766, Robert C. Kramer, president	41,750	279
17	Cal. State Col., Dominguez Hills, Dominguez Hills, Calif. 90247, Leo F. Cain, president	74,886	478
33	Cal. State Col., San Bernardino, San Bernardino, Calif. 92407, John M. Pfau, president	17,213	114
12	California State Poly College, San Luis Obispo, Calif. 93401, Robert E. Kennedy, president	10,771	89
7	California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland, Calif. 94618, Harry X. Ford, president	4,719	35

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	CALIFORNIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 203)—Con.		
30	California Institute of the Arts, Valencia, 91335, Robert Corrigan, director	$6,120	47
25	California State College, Fullerton, Fullerton, Calif. 92631 L. Donald Shields, acting president	73,656	320
32	California State College, Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif. 90801, Stephen Horn, president	107,357	767
29	Calif. State Col., Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. 90032, John A. Greenlee, president	215,125	1,393
99	California Col. of Podiatric Med., San Francisco, Calif. 94115, H. D. Bailey, president	2,439	8
13	California Lutheran Col., Thousand Oaks, Calif. 91360, Raymond M. Olson, president	7,445	50
9	California St. Col., Hayward, Hayward, Calif. 94542, Ellis E. McCune, president	32,539	257
11	Canada College, Redwood, Calif. 94061, William M. Goss, president	17,677	125
99	Central City Occupational Center, Los Angeles, Calif. 90015, T. D. Kimbrough, principal	3,959	25
19	Cerritos College, Norwalk, Calif. 90650, Siegfried Ringwald, president	13,485	91
8	Chabot College, Hayward, Calif. 94545, Reed L. Buffington, president	14,597	95
33	Chaffey College, Alta Loma, Calif. 91701, T. Stanley Warburton, president	12,893	76
5	Chapman College, Orange, Calif. 92666, John L. Davis, president	5,157	35
2	Chico State College, Chico, Calif. 95926, Lew D. Oliver, president	48,787	398
24	Citrus College, Azuza, Calif., 91702, Robert D. Haugh, president	6,114	41
6	City Col. San Fran. SF Un. Sch. Dist., San Francisco, Calif. 94112, Louis Batmale, president	28,317	216
24	Claremont Grad. Sch. and U Ctn., Claremont, Calif. 91711 Howard R. Bowen, president	10,093	59
38	Col. of the Desert, Coachella Val. JCD, Palm Desert, Calif. 92260, Roy C. McCall, president	10,802	70
7	Col. of the Holy Names, Oakland, Calif. 94619, Sister Mary Ambrose Devereux, president	1,909	10
99	Coleman College, San Diego, Calif. 92101, Coleman Furr, director	5,863	39
8	College of Alameda, Alameda, Calif. 94501, Dr. Ernest H. Berg, president	43,780	271
99	College of Data Processing, Los Angeles, Calif. 90044, Booker T. Thomas, president	26,198	176
1	College of Marin, Kentfield, Calif. 94904, John A. Grasham, president	28,716	184
11	College of San Mateo, San Mateo, Calif. 94402, Robert Ewigleben, president	30,517	305
27	College of the Canyons, Valencia, Calif. 91355, Dr. Robert C. Rockwell, Superintendent-president	4,212	27
1	College of the Redwoods, Eureka, Calif. 95501, Eugene J. Portugal, president	14,640	92
18	College of the Sequoias, Visalia, Calif. 93277, Ivan C. Crookshanks, president	7,920	55
6	College of the Siskiyous, Weed, Calif. 96094, E. Schumacher, president	5,121	24
2	Columbia Jr. Col., Columbia, Calif. 95310, Harvey Rhodes, dean	9,583	62
23	Compton College, Compton, Calif. 90221, Abel Sykes, Jr., president	6,315	50
20	Computer Lrng. Ctr. Iti. Division, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004, Eugene Axelrod, president	15,722	106
14	Contra Costa College, San Pablo, Calif. 94806, Dr. Robert L. Wynne, president	28,646	200
9	Control Data Inst., San Jose, Calif. 95112, Marion A. Condie, president	1,523	13
28	Control Data Inst., Los Angeles, Calif. 90045, Donald Kettler, director	7,603	50
3	Cosumnes River College, Sacramento, Calif. 95825, Oliver J. Durand, president	5,132	33
12	Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, Calif. 93401, Merlin E. Eisenbise, president	8,430	51
34	Cypress College, Cypress, Calif. 90630, Omar Scheidt, president	18,754	120
10	De Anza College, Cupertino, Calif. 95014, A. Robert DeHart, president	32,664	176
14	Diablo Valley College, Concord, Calif. 94523, William P. Niland, president	12,413	84
6	Dominican Col. San Rafael, San Rafael, Calif. 94901, Sister Mary Samuel Conlan, president	700	4
27	Don Bosco Technical Institute, Rosemead, Calif. 91770, Rev. Thomas Prendiville, SDB, president	4,910	36
29	East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90022 John K. Wells, president	23,395	147
99	Edison Tech. College, Van Nuys, Calif. 91403, George I. Alagna, president	8,004	54
17	El Camino College, El Camino Col. Calif., 90506, Stuart E. Marsee, president	24,522	165
1	Empire College of Commerce, Santa Rosa, Calif. 95404, Samuel Bassett, president	10,049	53
2	Feather River Col., Quincy, Calif., 95971, Dale Wren, president	3,484	17
10	Foothill College, Los Altos Hills, Calif. 94022, Hubert H. Semans, president	23,570	123
16	Fresno City College, Fresno, Calif. 93704, Clyde McCully, president	27,989	205
16	Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif. 93726, Norman Baxter, president	111,166	613
34	Fullerton Junior College, Fullerton, Calif. 92631, John W. Casey, president	5,287	38
10	Gavilan College, Gilroy, Calif. 95020, Ralph Schroder, president	$21,982	134
20	Glendale College, Glendale, Calif. 91208, John T. McCuen, president	5,531	34
5	Golden Gate College, San Francisco, Calif. 94105, Otto Butz, president	11,150	61
32	Golden West College, Huntington Beach, Calif. 92647, R. Dudley Boyce, president	12,677	85
7	Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, Calif. 94709, John Dillenberger, president	3,335	27
34	Granite Computer Institute, Gardena, Calif. 90249, Frank J. O'Kane, president	5,556	30
36	Grossmont College, El Cajon, Calif. 92020, Ervin F. Metzgar, president	35,279	258
12	Hartnell College, Salinas, Calif. 93901 Gibb R. Madsen, super-president	11,183	56
24	Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, Joseph B. Platt, president	1,080	8
5	Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco, Calif. 94102 Arthur M. Sammis, dean	29,116	147
99	Heald Business College—Oakland, Oakland, Calif. 94612, Sherwood Burgess, vice president and direct	7,845	39
1	Humboldt State College, Arcata, Calif. 95521, C. H. Siemens, president	37,595	290
15	Humphreys College, Stockton, Calif. 95207, J. R. Humphreys, president.	4,978	34
20	Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90027, Helen Kelley, president	10,242	55
38	Imperial Valley Col., Imperial, Calif. 92251, Terrel Spencer, president	22,155	153
14	John F. Kennedy Univ., Martinez, Calif. 94553, Harry L. Morrison, president	1,780	12
24	La Verne College, La Verne, Calif. 91750, Leland Newcomer, president	3,920	26
7	Laney College, Oakland, Calif. 94606, Herbert M. Stein, president	70,377	521
2	Lassen College, Susanville, Calif. 96130, Robert Theiler, president	3,168	20
33	Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, Calif. 92354, David J. Bieber, president	27,562	135
6	Lone Mountain College, San Francisco, Calif. 94118, Mother Gertrude Patch, president	4,241	31
32	Long Beach City College, Long Beach, Calif. 90808, Wiley D. Garner, president	7,546	53
27	Los Angeles Baptist Col. & Sem. Newhall, Calif. 93121, John R. Dunkin, president	6,336	40
29	Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90029, Louis Kaufman, president	84,654	516
21	Los Angeles Col. Optometry, Los Angeles, Calif. 90007, Charles A. Abel, dean	958	7
17	Los Angeles Harbor Col., Wilmington, Calif. 90744, Wendell C. Black, president	2,722	17
22	Los Angeles Pierce Col., Woodland Hills, Calif. 91364, John A. Nicklin, president	2,940	26
31	Los Angeles Southwest Col., Los Angeles, Calif. 90047, Leadie Clark, acting president	10,526	77
21	Los Angeles Tr. Tech. Col., Los Angeles, Calif. 90015, Fred J. Brinkman, president	4,912	30
22	Los Angeles Valley Col., Van Nuys, Calif. 91401, Dr. Robert Horton, president	22,176	163
28	Loyola U. of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. 90045, Very Rev. Donald Paul Merrifiel, president	9,073	59
30	Loyola University School of Law, Los Angeles, Calif. 90015, Leo J. O'Brien, dean	15,182	77
28	Marymount College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90045, Sister M. Raymund McKay, president	7,807	41
16	Merced Col., Merced, Calif. 95340, Lowell F. Baker, president	42,702	288
7	Merritt College, Oakland, Calif. 94609, Noruel Smith, president	55,094	343
7	Mills College, Oakland, Calif. 94613, Robert J. Wert, president	14,022	70
35	Mira Costa Col., Oceanside, Calif. 92504, John MacDonald, president	14,716	66
15	Modesto Jr. College, Modesto, Calif. 95350, Roy G. Mikalson, president	35,245	256
12	Monterey Inst of Foreign Studies, Monterey, Calif. 93940, Fulton Freeman, president	3,734	22
12	Monterey Peninsula Col., Monterey, Calif. 93940, George F. Faul, president	10,150	69
13	Moorpark College, Moorpark, Calif. 93021, John J. Collins, president	15,829	107
24	Mount San Antonio College, Walnut, Calif. 91789, Marie Mills, president	21,815	162
38	Mount San Jacinto College, Gilman Hot Springs, Calif. 92340, Milo P. Johnson, president and superintendent	4,308	27
28	Mount St. Marys College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90049, Sister Cecelia Louise, president	8,737	24
99	Nairobi College, East Palo Alto, Calif. 94303, Donald R. Smothers, president	67,720	684
1	Napa College, Napa, Calif. 94558, George Clark, president	9,818	68
31	Northrop Inst. of Tech., Inglewood, Calif. 90306, Homer H. Grant, Jr., president	1,192	5
24	Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90041, Richard C. Gilman, president	7,704	38
9	Ohlone College, Fremont, Calif. 94537, Stephen E. Epler, president	4,561	24
35	Orange Coast Col Costa, Mesa, Calif. 92626, Robert B. Moore, president	6,435	54
30	Otis Art Inst. of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif. 90057, Andreas S. Andersen, president	8,466	57

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	CALIFORNIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 203)—Con.		
32	Pacific Christian College, Long Beach, Calif. 90804, Medford Jones, president	$609	4
99	Pacific Col. of Med. & Dental Assist., San Diego, Calif. 92103, Ben Ferber, president	1,205	8
16	Pacific College of Fresno, Fresno, Calif. 93702, Arthur J. Wiebe, president	8,563	53
24	Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena, Calif. 91105, E. Robert La Crosse, Jr., president	2,414	17
1	Pacific Union College, Angwin, Calif. 94508, F. O. Rittenhouse, president	17,449	109
38	Palo Verde College, Blythe, Calif. 92225, David L. Brown, acting president	2,944	25
35	Palomar College, San Marcos, Calif. 92069, Frederick R. Huber, president	15,857	89
20	Pasadena City College, Pasadena, Calif. 91106, Armen Sarafian, president	47,520	301
20	Pasadena College, Pasadena, Calif. 91104, W. Shelburne Brown, president	19,768	106
31	Peperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90044, M. Norvel Young, president	12,592	76
24	Pitzer College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, Robert H. Atwell, president	6,177	35
24	Pomona College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, David Alexander, president	4,499	28
18	Porterville College, Porterville, Calif. 93258, Orlin H. Shires, president	8,548	62
29	Queen of Angels Sch of Nursing, Los Angeles, Calif. 90026, M. J. Zurhoefer, acting administrator	3,492	32
16	Reedley College, Reedley, Calif. 93654, Clifford M. Boyer, president	6,184	50
19	Rio Hondo College, Whittier, Calif. 90608, Walter M. Garcia, president	41,827	224
38	Riverside City College, Riverside, Calif. 92506, R. H. Bradshaw, president	32,589	202
3	Sacramento City College, Sacramento, Calif. 95822, Sam Kipp, president	50,070	271
3	Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Calif. 95819, Bernard Hyink, president	114,543	788
33	San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino, Calif. 92403, Arthur M. Jensen, president	20,667	131
37	San Diego City College, San Diego, Calif. 92101, Rex Gorton, president	17,957	126
36	San Diego Mesa College, San Diego, Calif. 92111, Ellis Benson, president	13,307	90
36	San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif. 92115, Malcolm A. Love, president	101,060	598
27	San Fernando Vly St. Coll, Northridge, Calif. 91316, James W. Cleary, president	187,066	983
5	San Francisco Art Inst, San Francisco, Calif. 94133, Theodore L. Eliot, exec director	1,306	9
6	San Francisco Cons Music, San Fransisco, Calif. 94122, Milton Salkind, director	1,077	7
6	San Francisco State Col., San Francisco, Calif. 94132, S. J. Hayakawa, president	286,909	1,610
15	San Joaquin Delta Jr. College, Stockton, Calif. 95204, Joseph Blanchard, president	184,245	1,073
9	San Jose Bible College, San Jose, Calif. 95108, Woodrow Phillips, president	2,914	20
10	San Jose City College, San Jose, Calif. 95114, Otto Roenmich, president	21,558	129
9	San Jose Hospitals School of Nrsg., San Jose, Calif. 95114, David E. Olsson, president	1,546	10
10	San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif. 95114, John Bunzel, president	286,519	1,754
35	Santa Ana College, Santa Ana, Calif. 92706, John E. Johnson, president	16,624	105
13	Santa Barbara City Col., Santa Barbara, Calif. 93105, Glenn Gooder, supt. president	12,672	85
28	Santa Monica College, Santa Monica, Calif. 90406, Wade F. Thomas Jr., president	11,767	79
6	Santa Rosa Jr. College, Santa Rosa, Calif. 95401, Brook Tauzer, acting president	9,085	46
24	Sawyer College at Pomona, Pomona, Calif. 91766, M. B. Berson, president	658	4
13	Sawyer College at Ventura, Ventura, Calif. 93003, M. B. Berson, president	1,097	7
99	Sawyer College of Business, Los Angeles, Calif. 90014, E. E. Green, president	31,680	201
24	Sch. of Theology at Claremont, Claremont, Calif. 91711, Gordon Michalson, president	4,158	26
24	Scripps College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, Mark H. Curtis, president	2,052	18
2	Shasta College, Redding, Calif. 96001, Gilbert A. Collyer, president	8,950	60
2	Sierra College, Rocklin, Calif. 95677, Harold H. Weaver, president	11,944	106
6	Simpson Bible College, San Francisco, Calif. 94134, Mark W. Lee, president	3,497	24
99	Skadron College of Business, San Bernardino, Calif. 92410, Erwin S. Skadron, director	2,582	17
11	Skyline College, San Brono, Calif. 94406, Phillip Garlington, president	25,547	146
4	Solano College, Vallejo, Calif. 94590, N. Dallas Evans, president	24,380	151
1	Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, Calif. 94928, Thomas H. McGrath, president	38,608	240
35	Southern California Col., Costa Mesa, Calif. 92626, Emil A. Balliet, president	43,507	175
37	Southwestern College, Chula Vista, Calif. 92010, Chester S. Devore, president	18,401	139
20	Southwestern Univ. Sch. of Law, Los Angeles, Calif. 90015, John F. Parker, president	$936	6
14	St. Marys Col. of California, St. Marys Col., Calif. 94575, Brother Mel Anderson, president	4,289	20
10	Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. 94305, Richard Lyman, acting president	38,761	217
15	Stanislaus State College, Turlock, Calif. 95380, Carl Gatlin, president	10,278	73
18	Taft College, Taft, Calif. 93268, Garlyn A. Basham, president	2,610	17
7	U. of Calif. Berkeley, Berkeley, Calif. 94720, Roger Heyns, chancellor	307,600	1,654
35	U. of Calif. San Diego, La Jolla, Calif. 92038, Herbert F. York, acting chancellor	55,266	243
5	U. of California, San Fran. Med. Ctr., San Francisco, Calif. 94122, Philip R. Lee, chancellor	44,704	175
36	U.S. Internal Univ., San Diego, Calif. 92106, William C. Rust, president	7,555	53
36	U. San Diego Col. for Men, San Diego, Calif. 92110, Very Rev. John E. Baer, president	28,829	144
28	Univ. of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024, Charles E. Young, chancellor	179,339	755
38	Univ. of California Riverside, Riverside, Calif. 92502, Ivan Hinderaker, chancellor	45,734	270
13	Univ. of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93106, Vernon I. Cheadle, chancellor	147,314	763
12	Univ. of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, Calif. 95060, Dean E. McHenry, chancellor	19,915	111
36	Univ. of San Diego Sch. of Law, San Diego, Calif. 92110, Joseph S. Brock, acting dean	11,300	68
6	Univ. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif. 94117, Rev. Albert R. Jonsen, president	6,674	38
21	Univ. of Sthrn. California, Los Angeles, Calif. 90007, John R. Hubbard, president	61,864	309
4	University of California Davis, Davis, Calif. 95616, James Meyer, chancellor	123,512	639
35	University of California Irvine, Irvine, Calif. 92664, Charles J. Hitch, chancellor	34,213	189
33	University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif. 92373, Eugene Dawson, president	12,711	70
10	University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, Calif. 95053, Very Rev. Thomas D. Terry, president	15,653	105
15	University of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif. 95204, Robert E. Burns, president	16,473	101
15	Valley Commercial College, Modesto, Calif. 95354, Tom Harris, president	1,754	12
25	Valley Vocational Ctr., City of Industry, Calif. 91744, Thomas J. Johnson, president	5,479	44
13	Ventura College, Ventura, Calif. 93003, Ray C. Loehr, president	26,611	129
33	Victor Valley College, Victorville, Calif. 92392, Burt Wadsworth, president	8,221	47
16	West Hills Col., Coalinga, Calif. 93210, Robert A. Annand, president & superintendent	2,687	21
26	West Los Angeles Col., Culver City, Calif. 90230, Morris J. Heldman, president	3,225	24
10	West Valley Col., Campbell, Calif. 95008, James P. Hardy, president	20,288	127
13	Westmont College, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93103, John William Snyder, president	13,381	78
19	Whittier College, Whittier, Calif. 90608, Fredrick M. Binder, president	4,118	25
4	Yuba College, Marysville, Calif. 95901, Daniel Walker supt. and president	14,958	112
	COLORADO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 29)		
	Total	785,936	4,503
4	Adams State College, Alamosa, Colo. 81101, John A. Marvel, president	15,002	100
4	Aims College, Greeley, Colo. 80631, Ed Beaty, president	5,948	43
2	Arapahoe Cmty. Col., Littleton, Colo. 80120, Dr. Allan P. Crawfurd, president	5,778	32
1	Central Bus. Col. Inc., Denver, Colo. 80203, Malcom Houghton, president	14,796	89
1	Cmtv. Col. of Denver, Denver, Colo. 80216, Leland B. Luchsinger, president	55,771	271
3	Colorado College, Colorado Spgs., Colo. 80903, Lloyd E. Worner, president	1,858	13
4	Colorado Mountain College, Glenwood Springs, Colo. 81601, Elbie Gann, president	3,305	22
4	Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo. 80521, Dr. A. Ray Chamberlain, president	112,213	756
3	El Paso Community College, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80903, Dr. Robert O. Hatton, president	7,084	35
4	Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colo. 81301, Rexer Berndt, president	11,773	69
1	Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colo. 80210, Smith J. Jones, Jr., president	5,577	25
3	Lamar Community College, Lamar, Colo. 81052, Dr. Donald L. Keith, president	5,966	37
1	Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colo. 80236, Patricia Jean Manion, president	2,602	18
4	Mesa College, Grand Junction, Colo. 81501, Theodore E. Albers, president	8,365	43
1	Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colo. 80204, Kenneth Phillips, president	23,800	199
4	Northeastern Jr. College, Sterling, Colo. 80751, E. S. French, president	19,170	137
3	Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colo. 81050, William L. McDivitt, president	8,420	44

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	COLORADO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 29)—Con.		
1	Parks School of Business, Denver, Colo. 80203, Orin A. Sealy, director	$8,345	53
4	Rangely College, Rangely, Colo. 81648, John E. Roberts, president	4,461	27
1	Regis College, Denver, Colo. 80221, Very Reverend Louis Mattione, president	7,220	53
3	Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colo. 81005, J. Victor Hopper, president	13,384	78
4	Southwest Data Institute, Durango, Colo. 81301, Dale S. Gibb, president	879	6
1	Temple Buell College, Denver, Colo. 80220, Dumont F. Kenny, president	5,261	34
3	Trinidad State Junior College, Trinidad, Colo. 81082, Guy C. Davis, president	55,624	303
2	University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 80302, Dr. Frederick P. Thieme, president	335,691	1,704
1	University of Denver, Denver, Colo. 80210, Maurice B. B. Mitchell, chancellor	13,013	91
4	University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo. 80631, Darrell Holmes, president	20,105	137
4	U.S. International Uniu-Colo Alpine, Steamboat Springs, Colo. 80477, William C. Rust, president	1,041	6
4	Western State Col. of Colorado, Gunnison, Colo. 81230, Harlan Bryant, president	13,384	78
	CONNECTICUT (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 40)		
	Total	920,268	4,702
3	Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Conn. 06511, Sister Marie Louise Hubert, president	15,600	67
2	Annhurst College, South Woodstock, Conn. 06281, Sister Cecile Comtois, president	2,403	11
4	Bridgeport Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Bridgeport, Conn. 06602, Clarence W. Bushnell, administrator	1,822	9
6	Central Con. State Col., New Britain, Conn. 06050, F. Don James, president	27,251	130
2	Connecticut College, New London, Conn. 06320, Charles E. Shain, president	19,892	90
2	Eastern Conn. State College, Williamantic, Conn. 06226, Charles Webb, president	11,750	69
4	Fairfield University, Fairfield, Conn. 06430, Very Rev. William C. McInnes, president	19,143	101
1	Greater Hartford Cmty. Col., Hartford, Conn. 06106, Arthur C. Banks, president	7,206	32
1	Hartford Col. for Women, Hartford, Conn. 06105, Laura A. Johnson, president	2,056	9
1	Hartford State Tech. Col., Hartford, Conn. 06106, Thomas Raimondi, president	6,514	42
3	Housatonic Cmty. Col., Stratford, Conn. 06497, Edward Liston, president	9,735	62
1	Manchester Community Col., Manchester, Conn. 06040, Frederick W. Lowe, Jr., president	3,516	13
3	Mattatuck Cmty. Col., Waterbury, Conn. 06702, Charles B. Kinney, president	13,119	84
2	Middlesex Cmty. College, Middletown, Conn. 06458, Philip D. Wheaton, president	27,581	97
2	Mitchell College, New London, Conn. 06320, Robert C. Weller, president	2,298	22
2	Mohegan Comm. College, Norwich, Conn. 06360, Robert N. Rue, president	11,633	77
1	Morse of Hartford, Hartford, Conn. 06103, Jerome Tagg, executive vice president	1,630	7
3	New Haven College, West Haven, Conn. 06505, Marvin K. Peterson, president	53,855	289
6	Northwestern Conn. Cmty. College, Winsted, Conn. 06098, Regina M. Duffy, president	4,392	22
4	Norwalk Community Col., Norwalk, Conn. 06854, Everett I. L. Baker, dean	11,416	50
4	Norwalk State Tech. Col., S. Norwalk, Conn. 06854, Frank L. Juszli, president	3,436	19
5	Post Jr. College, Waterbury, Conn. 06702, F. Burton Cook, president	15,036	76
3	Quinnipiac College, Hamden, Conn. 06518, John H. Herder, president	31,899	182
4	Sacred Heart Univ., Bridgeport, Conn. 06604, William H. Conley, president	4,863	30
4	Silvermine College of Art, New Canaan, Conn. 06840, Stephen Jay, president	6,608	37
3	South Central City Col., New Haven, Conn. 06511, Albert Hendrick, acting president	7,269	40
3	Southern Conn. State Col., New Haven, Conn. 06515, Hilton C. Buley, president	78,529	375
1	St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn. 06117, SR Mary Consolata, president	4,251	20
4	St. Vincents Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Bridgeport, Conn. 06606, SR Mary Agnes, administrator	4,406	22
2	Thames Vly. St. Tech. Inst., Norwich, Conn. 06360, Donald Ralph Welter, president	9,350	57
1	Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 06106, Dr. Theodore C. Lockwood, president	7,647	48
5	Tunxis Cmty. College, Farmington, Conn. 06032, Dr. Benjamin G. Davis	17,346	85
4	University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn. 06602. Thurston E. Manning, president	15,480	78
2	University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn. 06268, Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., president	229,364	1,167
1	University of Hartford, W. Hartford, Conn. 06117, Archibald M. Woodruff, chancellor	34,272	239
5	Waterbury Hospital Sch. of Nursing, Waterbury, Conn. 06708, Charoltte C. Wright, director	3,400	13
5	Waterbury State Tech. Col., Waterbury, Conn. 06708, Kenneth W. Fogg, president	$4,683	37
2	Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 06810, Collin G. Campbell, president	29,314	130
5	Western Conn State Col., Danbury, Conn. 06810, Ruth A. Haas, president	4,611	25
3	Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 06520, Kingham Brewster Jr., president	155,692	739
	DELAWARE (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 6)		
	Total	166,923	908
1	Brandywine Junior College, Wilmingham, Del. 19800, Sidney Peters, president	91,34	52
11	Del. Tech. and Cmty. Col., Dover 19947, Paul K. Weatherly, president	12,184	72
11	Delaware State College, Dover, Del. 19901, Luna I. Mishoe, president	89,785	483
99	Goldy Beacon Jr. College, Wilmington, Del. 19899, Clarence A. Fulmer, president	11,800	58
11	University of Delaware, Newark, Del. 19711, Edward A. Trabant, acting president	35,990	209
99	Wilmington College, Wilmington, Del. 19720, Donald E. Ross, president	8,850	34
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 13)		
	Total	406,881	2,247
	American University, Washington, D.C. 20016, George H. Williams, president	15,218	91
	Catholic Univ. of America, Washington, D.C. 20017, Clarence Walton, president	19,565	120
	Cortez W. Peters Business Col., Washington, D.C. 20018, Cortez W. Peters, president	24,140	220
	D.C. Teachers College, Washington, D.C. 20009, Paul Cooke, president	16,760	142
	Federal City College, Washington, D.C. 20001, Harland Randolph, president	153,310	595
	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. 20006, Lloyd H. Elliott, president	16,908	110
	Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007, Rev. Robert J. Henle, SJ, president	27,054	170
	Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20001, James E. Cheek, president	82,889	350
	Immaculata Col. of Wash., Washington, D.C., 20016, Sister Marian Brady, SP, president	1,086	9
	Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C., 20036, Lincoln Gordon, president	1,642	17
	Strayer College, Washington, D.C. 20005, Murray J. Donoho, president	1,352	10
	Trinity College, Washington, D.C. 20017, Sister Margaret Claydon, president	6,618	46
	Washington Tech. Inst., Washington, D.C. 20005, Cleveland L. Dennard, president	40,339	367
	FLORIDA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 57)		
	Total	2,405,910	12,507
11	Barry College, Miami, Fla. 33136, Sister M. Dorothy Browne, president	16,158	79
4	Bethune Cookman College, Daytona Beach, Fla. 32015 Richard V. Moore, president	33,716	166
10	Biscayne College, Miami, Fla. 33054, John H. McDonnel, OSA, president	11,168	44
5	Brevard Jr. College, Cocoa, Fla. 32922, Maxwell G. King, president	53,059	241
10	Broward Cmty. College, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla. 33314, Hugh Adams, president	50,053	271
4	Central Florida Jr. Col., Ocala, Fla. 32670, Henry Goodlett, president	20,024	113
1	Chipola Jr. College, Marianna, Fla. 32446, Raymond M. Deming, president	35,380	163
4	Daytona Beach Jr. College, Daytona Beach, Fla. 32015, Roy F. Bergengren, Jr., president	22,856	140
7	Edison Junior College, Fort Myers, Fla. 33901, David G. Robinson, president	13,165	76
3	Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, Fla. 32209, William B. Stewart, president	55,410	257
4	Embry-Riddle Aero. Inst., Daytona Beach, Fla. 32015, Jack R. Hunt, president	23,717	84
2	Florida A. & M. University, Tallahassee, Fla. 32307, Benjamin Perry, president	83,669	366
9	Florida Atlantic Univ., Boca Raton, Fla. 33432, Kenneth R. Williams, president	55,315	282
5	Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Fla. 32901, Jerome P. Keuper, president	24,409	125
3	Florida Jr. Col. at Jacksonville, Jacksonville, Fla. 32207, Benjamin R. Wygal, president	25,208	134
12	Florida Keys Jr. College, Key West, Fla. 33040, John S. Smith, president	27,867	134
11	Florida Memorial College, Miami, Fla. 33165, R. W. Puryear, president	89,094	424
8	Florida Presbyterian Col., St. Petersburg, Fla. 33733, Billy O. Wireman, president	25,098	144
7	Florida Southern College, Lakeland, Fla. 33802, Charles T. Thrift, Jr., president	17,568	82
2	Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla., 32306 J. Stanley Marshall, president	113,680	545

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	FLORIDA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 57)—Continued		
5	Florida Technological Univ., Orlando, Fla. 32801, Dr. Charles Millican, president	$27,408	215
10	Fort Lauderdale University, Fort Lauderdale, Fla. 33301, Dr. Stanley J. Drake, president	7,537	47
1	Gulf Coast Jr. College, Panama City, Fla. 32401, Richard E. Morley, president	16,560	85
6	Hillsborough Jr. Col., Tampa, Fla. 33606, Morton S. Shanberg, president	15,857	117
9	Indian River Jr. College, Fort Pierce, Fla. 33450, Herman Heise, president	50,138	246
3	Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Fla. 32211, Robert H. Spiro, president	22,667	133
3	Jones College, Jacksonville, Fla. 32211, Jack H. Jones, president	24,374	137
2	Lake City JC & Forest Ranger Sch., Lake City, Fla. 32055, H. E. Phillips, president	47,309	257
4	Lake-Sumter Jr. College, Leesburg, Fla. 32748, Paul P. Williams, president	5,442	33
7	Manatee Jr. College, Bradenton, Fla. 33505, Samuel R. Neel, president	18,055	100
9	Marymount College, Boca Raton, Fla. 33432, Gerard Fagan, president	6,875	37
3	Massey Bus. Col, Jacksonville, Fla. 32206, C. A. Barringer, president	23,529	113
11	Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Fla. 33156, Peter Masiko, Jr., president	415,866	2,328
7	New College, Sarasota, Fla. 33578, John Elmendorf, president	19,123	64
2	North Florida Jr. College, Madison, Fla. 32340, Stephen H. McMahon, president	31,372	162
1	Okaloosa Walton Jr. Col, Valparaiso, Fla. 32580, J. E. McCracken, president	9,411	45
9	Palm Beach Atlantic College, W. Palm Beach, Fla. 33401, Dr. Jess Moody, president	7,322	48
9	Palm Beach Jr. College, Lake Worth, Fla. 33460, Harold C. Manor, president	7,529	34
1	Pensacola Jr. College, Pensacola, Fla. 32504, T. Felton Harrison, president	17,882	86
7	Polk Jr. Col, Winter Haven, Fla. 33880, Fred T. Lenfestey, president	16,513	86
5	Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla. 32789, Jack B. Critchfield, president	22,587	91
2	Santa Fe Jr. Col, Gainesville, Fla. 32601, Joseph Fordyce, president	23,845	129
4	Seminole Jr. Col, Sanford, Fla. 32771, Earl S. Weldon, president	18,039	99
9	South Florida Junior Col, Avon Park, Fla. 33825, William A. Stallard, president	1,756	8
7	South-Eastern Bible Col., Lakeland, Fla. 33801, Cyril E. Homer, president	21,898	127
2	St. Johns River Jr. College, Palatka, Fla. 32077, Charles La Pradd, president	21,905	128
9	St. Joseph College of Fla., Jensen Beach, Fla. 33457, Sister M. Martha SSJ, president	6,636	32
8	St. Leo College, St. Leo Fla. 33574, Marion Bowman, Acting president	7,228	33
8	St. Petersburg Jr. College, St. Petersburg, Fla. 33733, Michael M. Bennett, president	31,702	161
4	Stetson University, De Land Fla. 32720, John E. Johns, Chief Exec. Officer	81,568	419
2	Tallahassee Cmty College, Tallahassee, Florida 32303, Fred W. Turner, president	29,359	161
6	Univ. of South Florida, Tampa, Fla. 33620, Harris W. Dean, Acting president	109,884	603
1	Univ. of West Florida, Pensacola, Fla. 32504, Harold B. Crosby, president	54,336	286
2	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla. 32601, Stephen C. O'Connell, president	217,563	1,065
12	University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla. 33124, Henry King Stanford, president	139,444	767
6	University of Tampa, Tampa, Fla. 33606, B. D. Owens, president	5,273	25
5	Valencia Jr. College, Orlando, Fla. 32802, James Gollattscheck, president	25,504	130
	GEORGIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 52)		
	Total	2,598,571	11,458
2	Abraham Baldwin Agric Col., Tifton, Ga. 31794, J. Clyde Driggers, president	48,348	232
2	Albany Jr. College, Albany Georgia 31705, B. R. Tilley, president	18,177	83
2	Albany State College, Albany, Ga. 31705, Charles Hayes, president	80,249	327
1	Armstrong State College, Savannah, Ga. 31406, Henry L. Ashmore, president	30,320	132
5	Atlanta Area Tech. Sch., Atlanta, Ga. 30310, Robert Ferguson, director	31,500	143
5	Atlanta Baptist Col., Atlanta, Ga. 30341, Monroe F. Swilley, director	20,999	91
5	Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, Thomas D. Jarrett, Chr. Intrm. Comm	27,160	116
10	Augusta, College, Augusta, Ga. 30904, George A. Christenberry, president	40,000	152
7	Berry College, Mount Berry, Ga. 30149, John R. Bertrand, president	49,998	217
5	Blayton Bus Sch, Atlanta, Ga. 30331, Doris A. Blayton, president	13,997	61
1	Brewton Parker College, Mount Vernon, Ga. 30445, J. Theodore Phillips, president	17,497	76
8	Brunswick Jr. College, Brunswick, Ga. 31520, John W. Teel, president	$26,138	102
5	Clark College, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, Vivian W. Henderson, president	100,000	534
5	Clayton Jr. Col., Forest Park, Ga. 30050, Harry S. Downs, president	35,000	152
3	Columbus College, Columbus, Ga. 31907, Thomas Y. Whitley, president	46,547	219
7	Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, Tenn. 37350, Marion D. Barnes, president	34,678	154
7	Dalton Junior College, Dalton, Ga. 30720, Derrell C. Roberts, president	10,450	56
4	DeKalb College, Clarkston, Ga. 30021, James Hinson, president	26,750	93
9	Emmanuel College, Franklin Springs, Ga. 30639, Culbreth Melton, president	11,667	63
4	Emory University, Atlanta, Ga. 30322, Sanford S. Atwood, president	29,999	98
7	Floyd Jr. College, Rome, Ga. 30161, David B. McCorkle, president	4,608	28
3	Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Ga. 31030, Waldo W. E. Blanchet, president	150,000	696
9	Gainesville Jr. College, Gainesville, Ga. 30501, Hugh M. Mills, Jr., president	16,100	77
10	Georgia College at Milledgeville, Milledgeville, Ga. 31061, J. Whitney Bunting, acting president	39,997	185
5	Georgia Institute of Tech., Atlanta, Ga. 30332, Arthur G. Hansen, president	69,997	243
1	Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Ga. 30458, John O. Edison, president	51,134	242
3	Georgia Southwestern Col., Americus, Ga. 31709, William B. King, president	34,997	178
5	Georgia State Univ., Atlanta, Ga. 30303, Noah Langdale, Jr., president	74,998	335
6	Gordon Military College, Barnesville, Ga. 30204, Joseph Bray, president	8,298	54
7	Kennesaw Jr. College, Marietta, Ga. 30060, Horace W. Sturgis, president	3,497	23
6	La Grange College, La Grange, Ga. 30240, Waights G. Henry, Jr., president	21,538	112
6	Macon Jr. College, Macon, Ga. 31206, Jack Carlton, president	9,786	43
10	Medical Col. of Georgia, Augusta, Ga. 30902, Harry B. Orear, president	8,940	36
6	Mercer University, Macon, Ga. 31207, Rufus C. Harris, president	37,498	163
8	Middle Georgia College, Cochran, Ga. 31014, Louis C. Alderman, president	48,870	213
5	Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, Hugh M. Gloster, president	87,798	382
5	Morris Brown College, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, John A. Middleton, president	245,000	977
2	Norman College, Norman Park, Ga., 31771, Thomas G. Renfroe, president	4,150	25
9	North Georgia College, Dahlonega, Ga., 30533, John H. Owen, president	35,746	185
4	Oglethorpe College, Atlanta, Ga., 30319, Paul Kenneth Vonk, president	25,997	100
10	Paine College, Augusta, Ga., 30901, E. Clayton Calhoun, president	109,300	475
9	Piedmont College, Demorest, Ga., 30535, James E. Walter, president	24,065	119
9	Reinhardt College, Waleska, Ga., 30183, J. R. Burgess, Jr., president	31,825	124
1	Savannah State College, Savannah, Ga., 31404, Howard Jordan Jr., president	29,998	135
8	South Georgia College, Douglas, Ga., 31533, Denton R. Coker, president	72,499	326
5	Spelman College, Atlanta, Ga., 30314, A. E. Manley, president	137,997	593
9	Toccoa Falls Inst. Inc., Toccoa Falls, Ga., 30577, Julian A. Bandy, president	62,498	248
9	Truett McConnell Col., Cleveland, Ga., 30528, Warner Earle Fusselle, president	9,998	43
10	University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., 30601, Fred C. Davison, president	181,618	767
8	Valdosta State College, Valdosta, Ga., 31601, S. Walter Martin, president	50,747	274
6	West Georgia College, Carrollton, Ga., 30117, James E. Boyd, president	200,002	924
9	Young Harris College, Young Harris, Ga., 30582, Douglas R. Sasser, president	9,599	42
	HAWAII (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 12)		
	Total	294,637	1,434
12	Cannons Col. of Commerce, Honolulu Hawa., 96813, Olenn B. Hinchey, vice president	1,503	12
12	Chaminade Col. of Honolulu, Honolulu, Hawaii 96816, Bro. Robert Maguire, president	3,507	22
12	Hawaii Cmty. College, Hilo, Hawaii 96720, Mitsugu Sumada, principal	10,845	35
99	Hawaii Pacific College, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, Dr. George A. Warmer, president	3,671	25
12	Honolulu Community College, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817, James W. Thornton, Jr., provost	46,329	227
12	Kapiolani Community College, Honolulu, Hawaii 96814, Raymond Y. C. Won, provost	21,531	9
12	Kauai Community College, Lihue Kauai, Hawaii 96766, Philip Ige, provost	8,409	41
12	Leeward Oahu Cmty. Col., Pearl City, Hawaii 96782 Leonard D. Tuthill, provost	24,958	130

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	HAWAII (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 12)—Continued		
12	Maui Community College, Kahului, Hawaii 96732, Harold Luntey, provost	$13,420	67
12	Mauna Olu College, Paia Maui, Hawaii 96779, Cummins E. Speakman, Jr., president	12,111	59
12	Univ. of Hawaii, Hilo Campus, Hilo, Hawaii 96720, Dr. Charles Neff, provost	12,801	79
12	University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, Harlan Cleveland, president	135,552	688
	IDAHO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 8)		
	Total	151,745	1,289
1	Boise State College, Boise, Idaho 83701, John B. Barnes, president	16,250	148
2	Col. of Southern Idaho, Twin Falls, Idaho 83301, James L. Taylor, president	20,595	164
1	College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho 83605, Warren B. Knox, president	15,750	120
2	Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho 83201, William E. Davis, president	81,227	697
1	Lewis-Clark Normal School, Lewiston, Idaho 83501, Jerold Dugger, president	1,737	16
1	North Idaho Junior College, Coeur D'Alene, Idaho, 83814, Garry G. Schuler, president	1,436	15
1	Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa, Idaho 83651, John E. Riley, president	3,500	40
1	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83843, Ernest E. Hartung, president	11,250	89
	ILLINOIS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 113)		
	Total	3,618,528	18,849
11	Amundsen-Mayfair College, Chicago, Ill. 60630, Theodore G. Phillips, president	15,432	107
19	Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill. 61201, Dr. C. W. Sorensen, president	3,716	31
15	Aurora College, Aurora, Ill. 60507, Dr. James E. Crimi, president	3,655	21
12	Barat College, Lake Forest, Ill. 60045, Mother Margaret Burke, president	33,723	140
23	Belleville Area College, Belleville, Ill. 62221, H. J. Haberaecker, president	5,952	32
19	Black Hawk College, Moline, Ill., 61265, Alban E. Reid, Jr., president	17,829	81
18	Bradley University, Peoria, Ill. 61606, T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr., president	25,355	128
99	Business Methods Institute, Chicago, Ill. 60601, Rudolph Schaefer, president	5,767	21
19	Carl Sandburg College, Galesburg, Ill. 61401, Eltis Henson, president	5,738	26
7	Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Ill. 60606, Donald A. Canar, president	427,666	2,172
2	Chicago College of Osteopathic, Chicago, Ill. 60615, Thaddeus P. Kanalek, president	2,500	11
3	Chicago State College, Chicago, Ill. 60621, Milton B. Byrd, president	120,579	699
11	City College of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60634, Ernest V. Clements, president	8,797	56
14	College of Dupage, Glen Ellyn, Ill. 60137, Rodney Berg, president	16,617	92
12	College of Lake County, Grayslake, Ill. 60030, Richard G. Erzen, president	6,842	34
9	Columbia College, Chicago, Ill. 60611, Dr. Mirron Alexandroff, president	2,235	10
10	Concordia Teachers Col., River Forest, Ill. 60305, M. L. Koehneke, president	708	8
17	Danville Jr. College, Danville, Ill. 61832, Mary Miller, president	37,870	166
7	DePaul University, Chicago, Ill. 60604, Very Rev. John R. Cortelyou, president	29,751	157
22	Eastern Illinois Univ., Charleston, Ill. 61920, Dr. Quincy Doudna, president	54,739	314
15	Elgin Community College, Elgin, Ill. 60120, G. I. Renner, president	9,645	63
14	Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill. 60126, Dr. Donald C. Kleckner, president	16,128	93
18	Eureka College, Eureka, Ill. 61530, Dr. Ira W. Langston, president	8,797	52
2	Fenger-Southeast Col., Chicago, Ill. 60617, Doyle Bonjour, acting president	53,762	291
13	Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 60201, Merlyn Northfelt, president	4,643	25
14	George Williams College, Downers Grove, Ill. 60515, Dr. Richard E. Hamlin, president	22,238	112
4	Governors St. Univ., Park Forest South, Ill. 60466, William Engbretson, president	3,914	42
19	Graham Hosp. Assc. Sch. of Nursing, Canton, Ill. 61520, Kenneth C. Etcheson, administrator	4,887	21
23	Greenville College, Greenville, Ill. 62246, Orley R. Herron, Jr., president	6,158	58
13	Hebrew Theol College, Skokie, Ill. 60076, Harold P. Smith, administrator, vice pres	5,180	26
16	Highland Cmty Col, Freeport, Ill. 61032, Kenneth E. Borland, president	5,376	34
99	Il Masonic Med Ctr Sch of Nursing, Chicago, Ill. 60657, Allan Hicks, executive vice president	11,729	48
23	Ill. Central College, East Peoria, Ill. 61611, Kenneth L. Edwards, president	19,247	120
17	Ill. State University, Normal, Ill. 61761, Francis R. Geigle, acting president	$111,815	677
01	Illinois Col of Optometry, Chicago, Ill. 60616, Eugene W. Strawn, president	4,398	31
20	Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill. 62650, Dr. L. Vernon Caine, president	2,595	14
22	Illinois Comm. Coll., Champaign, Ill. 61820, D. F. Colbert, president	2,423	17
01	Illinois Inst. of Tech., Chicago, Ill. 60616, John T. Rettaliata, president	3,665	20
15	Illinois Valley Cmty. Col., Oglesby, Ill. 61301, R. Earl Trobaugh, director	2,296	11
17	Illinois Wesleyan Univ., Bloomington, Ill. 61701, Robert S. Eckley, president	23,329	125
99	Institute of Drafting & Technology, Morrison, Ill. 61270 E. G. Suechting, president	3,421	16
23	John A. Logan Col., Carterville, 62918, Nathan A. Ivey, president	3,909	25
14	Joliet Jr. College, Joliet, Ill. 60436, Douglas Graham, acting president	6,133	27
15	Judson College, Elgin, Illinois 60120, Harm A. Weber, president	4,398	25
17	Kankakee Community College, Kankakee, Ill. 60901, John R. Samlin, president	8,797	35
23	Kaskaskia Jr. Col., No. 501, Centralia, Ill. 62801, Eugene McClintock, president	8,308	69
13	Kendall College, Evanston, Ill. 60204, Dr. Wesley M. Westerberg, president	23,215	116
3	Kennedy-King Col., Chicago, Ill. 60621, Maceo T. Bowie, president	282,251	1,390
16	Kishwaukee College, Malta, Ill. 60150, W. Lamar Fly, president	5,865	32
19	Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. 61401, Sharvy G. Umbeck, president	3,180	27
12	Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill. 60045, Eugene Hotchliss, president	12,218	66
22	Lake Land College, Mattoon, Ill. 61938, Virgil H. Judge, president	11,291	68
14	Lewis St. Francis of Illinois Lockport 60441, Paul French, president	27,858	79
22	Lincoln College, Lincoln, Ill. 62656 Dr. Raymond N. Dooley, president	1,466	8
20	Lincoln Land Cmty. Col., Springfield, Ill. 62703, Robert L. Poorman, president	2,443	14
23	Lincoln Trail College, Robinson 62454, Joseph Piland, president	5,787	41
7	Loop College, Chicago, Ill. 60601, David H. Heller, president	32,447	232
9	Loyola University, Chicago, Ill. 60626, Raymond C. Baumhart, president	40,959	270
7	Maccormac College, Chicago, Ill. 60604, Gordon C. Borchardt, president	3,128	18
20	Macmurray College, Jacksonville, Ill. 62650, Dr. John J. Wittich, president	19,549	93
7	Malcolm X. Col., Chicago, Ill. 60612, Charles G. Hurst, president	208,037	1,070
12	McHenry Co. Jr. Col., Dist. 528, Crystal Lake, Ill. 60014, John Garrett, president	4,500	20
24	McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill. 62254, Dr. Eric N Rackham, president	7,331	41
16	Midstate Col. of Commerce, Rockford, Ill. 61101, Michael P. Dineen, president	3,421	16
18	Midstate Col. of Commerce, Peoria, Ill. 61602, A. B. Bunch, president	5,669	22
22	Millikin University, Decatur, Ill. 62522, J. Roger Miller, president	2,393	20
19	Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill. 61462, Richard D. Stine, president	3,164	25
4	Moraine Valley Cmty. Col., Oak Lawn, Ill. 60465, Robert E. Turner, president	5,056	28
9	Mundelein College, Chicago, Ill. 60626, Sister Mary Ann Ida Gannon, president	34,849	153
13	National College of Educ., Evanston, Ill. 60201, Dr. K. Richard Johnson, president	7,331	47
11	Niles College Loyola Univ., Chicago, Ill. 60631, Eugene F. Lyons, president	1,994	14
11	North Park College, Chicago, Ill. 60625, Lloyd Ahlem, president	1,994	26
11	Northeastern Ill. State Col., Chicago, Ill. 60625, J. M. Sachs, president	101,204	575
14	Northern Bapt. Theol. Sem., Oakbrook, Ill. 60523, Bryan F. Archibald, president	848	5
15	Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb, Ill. 60115, Rhoten Smith, president	72,823	486
13	Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 60201, Dr. J. Roscoe Miller, chancellor	93,053	412
17	Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Ill. 60901, Dr. H. W. Reed, president	2,392	20
23	Olney Central College, Olney, Ill. 62450, Gail L. Lathrop, dean	10,547	66
22	Parkland College, Champaign, Ill. 61820, William M. Staerkel, president	4,623	28
4	Prairie State Col., Chicago Hghts., Ill. 60411, Ashley Johnson, president	29,150	158
20	Quincy College, Quincy, Ill. 62301, Titus Ludes, president	6,859	49
21	Rend Lake Col., Mt. Vernon, Ill. 62864, James M. Snyder, president	5,384	27
20	Robert Morris College, Carthage, Ill. 62321, Dean C. Nichols, dean of academic affairs	4,887	26
16	Rock Valley College, Rockford, Illinois 61111, Karl J. Jacobs, president	21,646	113

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	ILLINOIS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 113)—Continued		
7	Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill. 60605, Dr. Rolf A. Weil, president	$43,107	196
10	Rosary College, River Forest, Ill. 60305, Candida Lund, president	6,138	37
20	Sangamon State University, Springfield, Ill. 62701, Robert C. Spencer, president	7,575	55
16	Sauk Valley College, Dixon, Ill. 61021, Edward J. Sabol, president	36,593	166
7	Schools of the Art Inst. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60603, Donald J. Irving, president	10,761	58
21	Shawnee Cmty College, Ullin, Ill. 62992, Dr. Loren E. Klaus, president	11,603	71
21	Southeastern Illinois Jr. Col., Harrisburg, Ill. 62946, Joseph C. Deaton, dean	10,330	40
24	Southern Ill. U. Edwardsville Camp, Edwardsville, Ill. 62025, John S. Rendleman, chancellor	90,418	487
21	Southern Ill. Univ. Carbondale, Carbondale, Ill. 62901, Robert Layer, chancellor	165,884	1,128
3	Southwest College, Chicago, Ill. 60652, Stephen Nicholson, president	30,363	137
19	Spoon River College, Canton, Ill. 61520, Hearl C. Bishop, president	3,040	24
19	St. Anthonys Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Rock Island, Ill. 61201, Sister Mary Rose, GSF, president	3,421	16
14	St. Procopius College, Lisle, Ill. 60532, Rev. Roman Galiardi, OSB, president	7,695	43
3	St. Xavier College, Chicago, Ill. 60655, Harry A. Marmion, president	25,713	108
24	State Cmty. Col. of E. St. Louis, East St. Louis, Ill. 62201, Gerald Smith, Executive secretary	351,990	1,539
18	The Methodist Hosp. Central Illinois, Peoria, Ill. 61603, W. V. Herrin, administrator	6,000	24
4	Thornton Cmty. College, Harvey, Ill. 60426, J. O. Dalby, president	7,069	35
4	Tolentine College, Olympia Fields, Ill. 60461, Very Rev. Robert E. Burns, OSA, president	2,443	17
4	Trinity Christian Col., Palos Heights, Ill. 60463, Gordon R. Werkema, president	11,253	60
12	Trinity College, Deerfield, Ill. 60615, Rev. Harry L. Evans, president	32,298	159
10	Triton College, River Grove, Ill. 60164, Herbert Zeitlin, president	17,149	91
7	Univ. of Ill at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Ill. 60680, Norman A. Parker, chancellor	182,106	846
7	Univ. of Ill. at Med. Center, Chicago, Ill. 60612, Joseph S. Begando, chancellor	7,819	33
2	University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60637, Edward H. Levi, president	63,537	268
22	University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 61801, Jack W. Peltason, president	146,624	634
21	Wabash Valley College, Mt. Carmel, Ill. 62863, James S. Spencer, chancellor	10,603	63
15	Waubonsee Cmty. Col., Sugar Grove 60554, Forest Etheredge, president	3,553	19
20	Western Illinois Univ., Macomb, Ill. 61455, John T. Bernhard, president	16,407	144
13	William Rainey Harper Col., Palatine, Ill. 60067, Robert E. Lahti, president	13,562	65
	INDIANA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 44)		
	Total	2,297,147	10,208
3	Ancilla Domini Coll., Donaldson, Ind. 46513, Sister M. Joel Lampen, president	839	4
10	Anderson College, Anderson, Ind. 46011, Robert H. Reardon, president	75,587	406
10	Ball State University, Muncie Ind. 47306, John J. Pruis, president	166,835	576
3	Bethel College, Inc., Mishawaka, Ind. 46544, Ray P. Pannabecker, president	6,230	42
6	Christian Theol. Seminary, Indianapolis, Ind. 46208, Beauford A. Norris, president	61,499	224
7	DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 46135, William E. Kerstetter, president	21,955	98
10	Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. 47374, Landrum R. Bolling, president	46,406	169
4	Fort Wayne Art Inst., Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804, Russell L. Oettel, director	6,114	27
6	Franklin College, Franklin, Ind. 46131, Wesley N. Haines, president	18,000	76
3	Goshen Col., Goshen, Ind. 46526, Carl Kreider, acting president	38,168	181
3	Grace Theol. Sem. & Col., Winona Lake, Ind. 46590, Herman A. Hoyt, president	28,039	191
3	Holy Cross Jr. Col., Notre Dame, Ind. 46556, Brother John Driscoll, president	3,656	14
4	Huntington College, Huntington, Ind. 46750, E. DeWitt Baker, president	21,349	100
4	Indiana Institute of Tech., Fort Wayne, Ind. 46803, Edward A. Dugan, Jr., president	11,701	52
8	Indiana St. Univ., Evansville Campus, Evansville, Ind. 47712, David L. Rice, dean	29,095	113
7	Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Ind. 47809, Alan C. Rankin, president	128,936	652
7	Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. 47401, John W. Ryan, president	687,914	2,772
11	Indiana Voc. Tech. Col., Indianapolis, Ind. 46204, Harry A. McGuff, acting president	70,110	341
99	Lear Siegler Institute, Indianapolis, Ind. 46204, Michael S. Savely, director	$19,898	87
8	Lockyears College of Business, Evansville, Ind. 47701, C. Ray Noblett, executive vice president	54,461	254
5	Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind. 46962, A. Blair Helman, president	38,020	196
6	Marian Col. Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Ind. 46222, D. J. Guzzetta, president	36,500	163
5	Marion College, Marion, Ind. 46952, Woodrow Goodman, president	56,160	357
8	Oakland City College, Oakland City, Ind. 47560, Laurence Barrett, president	14,462	65
4	Purdue Univ., Fort Wayne Center, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46805 L. D. Nelson, acting dean	7,768	35
3	Purdue Univ., North Central Campus, Westville, Ind. 46391, Robert F. Schwarz, dean and director	13,143	70
2	Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind. 47907, F. L. Hovde, president	212,113	812
99	Purdue University, Calumet Campus, Hammond, Ind. 46323, Dr. Carl Elliott, director	7,840	41
7	Rose Polytechnic Inst., Terre Haute, Ind., 47803, John A. Logan, president	16,450	86
3	South Bend Col. of Commerce, South Bend, Ind. 46601, M. D. Puterbaugh Jr., president	4,872	22
9	Southeastern Indiana Voc. Sch., Versailles, Ind. 47042, Gerald V. Kirby, director	2,800	12
4	St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46808, Sister M. Rosanna, president	13,447	83
1	St. Josephs Col. Calumet Campus, East Chicago, Ind. 46312, Dr. Sohn M. Lefko, CPPS president	24,724	109
2	St. Josephs College, Rensselaer, Ind. 47978, Rev. Charles Banet, president	23,159	169
7	St. Mary of the Woods Col., St. Mary of Wds., Ind. 47876, Jeanne Knoerle, president	6,245	28
3	St. Marys College, Notre Dame, Ind. 46556, M. Alma Peter, acting president	11,827	54
8	St. Meinrad Col., St. Meinrad, Ind. 47577, Hilary Ottensmeyer, president	6,400	48
8	St. Meinrad Sch. of Theol., St. Meinrad, Ind. 47557, Adrian Fuerst, president	2,720	17
5	Taylor University, Upland, Ind. 46989, Milo Rediger, president	53,131	217
4	Tri-State College, Angola, Ind. 46703, R. M. Bateman, president	16,884	81
8	Univ. of Evansville, Evansville, Ind. 47704, Wallace B. Graves, president	61,906	267
3	University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind. 46556, Rev. T. M. Hesburgh, president	45,759	192
2	Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind. 46383, A. G. Huegli, president	36,563	243
8	Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind. 47591, Isaac K. Beckes, president	87,462	459
	IOWA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 51)		
	Total	1,358,538	7,094
5	American Inst. of Business, Des Moines, Iowa, 50307, Keith Fenton, president	5,400	30
6	Briar Cliff College, Sioux City, Iowa 51104, Sister Jordan Dahm, president	3,378	32
6	Buena Vista College, Storm Lake, Iowa 50588, Wendell Q. Halverson, president	25,747	140
4	Central College, Pella, Iowa 50219, Kenneth J. Weller, president	33,210	177
2	Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402, Leo Nussbaum, president	15,407	92
5	College of Automation, Des Moines, Iowa 50312, Glenn M. Luscombe, president	2,407	11
2	Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314, Samuel E. Stumpf, president	2,421	11
5	Des Moines Area Cnty. Col., Ankeny, Iowa 50021, Paul Lowery, superintendent	19,457	104
6	Divine Word College, Epworth, Iowa 52045, Harold W. Rigney, president	3,456	16
6	Dordt College, Sioux Center, Iowa 51250, B. J. Haan, president	18,930	109
5	Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa 50311, Paul F. Sharp, president	34,627	195
3	Ellsworth Cmty College, Iowa Falls, Iowa 50126, Donald W. Skinner, superintendent	26,779	171
4	Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa 50140, William I. Higdon, president	21,275	191
5	Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa 50316, Ernest D. Nielsen, president	6,479	31
3	Hamilton College, Mason City, Iowa 50401, Robert W. Hamilton, president	6,746	36
4	Indian Hills Cmty College, Ottumwa, Iowa 52502, Mel Everingham, superintendent	15,192	96
3&5	Iowa Central Cmty. Col., Area V., Ft. Dodge, Iowa 50501, Edwin Barbour, superintendent	19,008	76
6	Iowa Lake Cmty. Col., Esterville, Iowa 51334, H. Edwin Cramer, superintendent	20,376	101
5	Iowa St. U. of Sci. & Tech., Ames, Iowa 50010, W. Robert Parks, president	153,723	1,032
1	Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641, Dr. Louis Haselmayer, president	11,955	85
7	Iowa Western Cmty. Col., Area XIII, Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501, Robert Looft, superintendent	27,018	165
7	Jennie Edmundson Hosp. Sch. Nursing, Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501, Edward R. Lynn, administrator	8,603	46

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	IOWA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 51)—Continued		
2	Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404 Selby A. Ballantyne, superintendent	$14,258	100
2	Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa 52003, Burton R. McQuillan, acting president	24,210	140
2	Luther College, Decorah, Iowa 52101, E. D. Farwell, president	61,200	290
4	Marshalltown Cmty. Col., Marshalltown, Iowa 50158, Donald W. Skinner, supt	29,736	125
1	Marycrest College, Davenport, Iowa 52804, Louis C. Vaccaro, president	16,200	74
6	Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa 51106, Dr. Thomas S. Thompson, president	47,520	218
2	Mount Mercy College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402, Sister Mary Agnes, president	13,814	58
2	Mount St. Clare, Clinton, Iowa 52732, Sister Cecile Devereux, president	3,816	20
3	North Iowa Area Cmty. Col., Area II, Mason City, Iowa 50401, David Pierce, pres-superintendent	21,880	128
2	Northeast Iowa Voc. Sch., Area I, Calmar, Iowa 52132, Max R. Clark, superintendent	5,338	34
6	Northwest Iowa Voc. Sch., Area IV, Sheldon, Iowa 51201, Daniel McPherson, superintendent	11,214	51
6	Northwestern College, Orange City, Iowa 51041, Lars I. Granberg, superintendent	33,043	152
4	Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Iowa 52501, John R. Alberti, president	6,624	30
1	Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa 52556, Carl Kreisler, president	13,834	95
4	Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa 50125, Ralph C. John, president	16,776	91
1	Southeastern Iowa Area Cmty. Col., Burlington, Iowa 52601, C. W. Callison, superintendent	13,017	70
4	Southwestern Community Col., Area XIV, Creston, Iowa 50801, William R. Pierce, Jr., superintendent	6,736	39
1	St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa 52803, Rt. Rev. Sebastian Cenke, president	21,600	106
6	St. Vincent Hosp. School of Nursing, Sioux City, Ia. 51105, Richard J. Zunker, administrator	5,596	29
2	University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa 52001, Walter F. Peterson, president	15,005	79
1	University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240, Willard L. Boyd, president	238,069	967
3	University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613, John J. Kamerick, president	115,130	543
2	Upper Iowa College, Fayette, Iowa 52142, Aldrich K. Paul, president	23,212	135
4	Vennard College, University Pk., Iowa 52595, Merne A. Harris, president	12,977	62
3	Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa 50436, Gerrish Severson, acting president	20,664	103
3	Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa 50677, John W. Bachman, president	26,923	137
6	Western Iowa Tech., Sioux City, Iowa 51101, Robert Kiser, superintendent	20,192	98
6	Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa 51031, Laurence C. Smith, president	29,686	179
4	William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa 52577, Duane Moon, president	8,574	66
	KANSAS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 55)		
	Total	813,038	4,800
5	Allen County Community Jr. College, Iola, Kans. 66749, Bill Spencer, president	5,630	29
3	Baker University, Baldwin City, Kans. 66006, James E. Doty, president	4,909	28
1	Barton Co. Community Jr. College, Great Bend, Kans. 67530, C. O. Robinson, president	8,086	48
4	Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans. 67456, Arvin W. Hahn, president	2,929	20
4	Bethel College, North Newton, Kans. 67117, Orville Voth, president	6,498	33
1	Brown-Mackie Sch. of Bus. Inc., Salina, Kans. 67401, Eskil L. Anderson, president	1,255	7
5	Butler County Cmty. Jr. Col., El Dorado, Kans. 67042, Edwin J. Walbourn, president	9,724	60
4	Central College, McPherson, Kans. 67460, Bruce L. Kline, president	7,789	47
9	Central College, Inc., Witchita, Kans. 67214, Alvin S. Hennesy, president	1,507	8
1	Cloud Co. Cmty. Jr. Col., Concordia, Kans. 66901, Arley A. Bryant, president	7,701	51
5	Coffeyville Cmty. Jr. Col., Coffeyville, Kans. 67337, Russell H. Graham, president	13,245	66
1	Colby Community Jr. Col., Colby, Kans. 66701, Richard H. Mosier, president	7,957	46
5	College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans. 66801, Ronald Ebberts, president	9,745	57
5	Cowley County Community Jr. College, Arkansas City, Kans. 67005, Given Nelson, president	3,417	18
1	Dodge City Community Jr. College, Dodge City, Kans. 67801, Charles M. Barnes, president	11,117	60
3	Donnelly College, Kansas City, Kans. 66102, Sister M. Richard Pendergast, president	6,315	44
1	Fort Hays Kans. State Col., Hays, Kans. 67602, John W. Gustad, president	70,262	427
5	Fort Scott Community Jr. College, Fort Scott, Kans. 66701, Leon Foster, president	15,696	90
1	Friends Bible Col., Haviland, Kans. 67059, Wanda Mitchell, administrator	$3,832	20
4	Friends University, Wichita, Kans. 67213, Roy F. Ray, president	7,168	41
1	Garden City Community Jr. College, Garden City, Kans. 67846, L. C. Crouch, president	2,023	13
4	Hesston College, Hesston, Kans. 67062, Laban Peachey, president	6,867	42
2	Highland Cmty. Jr. Col., Highland, Kans. 66035, Tony E. Woodrum, president	2,492	15
4	Hutchinson Community Jr. College, Hutchinson, Kans. 67501, A. H. Elland, president	13,721	69
5	Independence Cmty. Jr. Col., Independence, Kans. 67301, Neil Edds, president	7,867	44
3	Johnson County Cmty. Jr. Col., Shawnee Mission, Kans. 66202, Robert Harris, president	6,738	37
5	Kans. St. Col. of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Kans. 66762, George F. Budd, president	55,389	327
3	Kansas City Kansas Cmty. Jr. Col., Kansas City, Kans. 66101, Jack M. Flint, president	2,868	15
2	Kansas St. U. Ag. & App. Sci., Manhattan, Kans. 66502, James A. McCain, president	90,469	568
5	Kansas State Teachers Col., Emporia, Kans. 66801, John E. Visser, president	74,377	443
1	Kansas Tech. Inst., Salina, Kans. 67401, Henry M. Neely, president	4,266	27
1	Kansas Wesleyan Univ., Salina, Kans. 67401, Paul W. Renich, president	8,567	56
5	Labette Community Jr. College, Parsons, Kans. 67357, Charles E. Thiebaud, president	4,020	22
2	Manhattan Bible College, Manhattan, Kans. 66502, Wilford F. Lown, president	7,632	45
1	Marymount College, Salina, Kans. 67401, Emerald V. Dechant, president	17,332	89
4	McPherson College, McPherson, Kans. 67460, J. Jack Melhorn, president	3,594	23
3	Mid America Nazarene Col., Olathe, Kans. 66061, R. Curtis Smith, president	5,574	37
1	Miltonvale Wesleyan Col., Miltonvale, Kans. 67466, Leo G. Cox, president	2,621	15
2	Mount St. Scholastica Col., Atchison, Kans. 66002, Sister Mary Noel Walter, acting president	7,749	43
1	N.W. Kansas Area Voc. Tech. Sch., Goodland, Kans. 67735, Larry Keirns, president	2,119	15
5	Neosho Co. Cmty. Jr. Col., Chanute, Kans. 66720, J. C. Sanders, president	2,955	17
3	Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans. 66067, Peter H. Armacost, president	11,710	86
1	Pratt Community Jr. College, Pratt, Kans. 67124, Raymond E. Cleveland, president	4,909	30
1	S.W. Kans Area Voc. Tech. Sch., Dodge City, Kans. 67801, R. A. Dellinger, director	1,794	11
4	Sacred Heart College, Wichita, Kans., 67213, Sister M. Sylvia Gorges, president	15,203	90
1	Seward County Cmty. Jr. Col., Liberal, Kans. 67901, Dale L. Gibson, president	5,835	28
5	Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans. 67156, C. Orville Strohl, president	5,368	34
2	St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans. 66002, Rev. Alcuin Hemmen, president	11,068	54
2	St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans. 66098, Sister Mary Janet McGilley, president	6,161	35
1	St. Mary of the Plains Col., Dodge City, Kans. 67801, Sr. M. Cecilia Bush, president	8,570	53
4	Sterling College, Sterling, Kans. 67579, William M. McCreery, president	16,400	98
4	Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kans. 67063, Roy Just, president	9,675	52
3	University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans. 66044, E. L. Chalmers, Jr., chancellor	80,630	472
2	Washburn Univ. of Topeka, Topeka, Kans. 66621, John W. Henderson, president	34,525	193
4	Wichita State University, Wichita, Kans. 67208, Clark Ahlberg, president	67,168	402
	KENTUCKY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 35)		
	Total	1,350,313	8,018
7	Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Ky. 41844, William S. Hayes, president	58,811	366
6	Asbury Theological Sem., Wilmore, Ky. 40390, Frank B. Stanger, president	7,320	36
3	Bellarmine Ursuline College, Louisville, Ky. 40205, Raymond J. Treece, executive vice president	60,907	329
6	Berea College, Berea, Ky. 40403, Willis D. Weathford, president	127,985	634
2	Brescia College, Owensboro, Ky. 42301, Sister Joan Marie Lechner, president	6,713	40
3	Bryant & Stratton Bus. Col., Louisville, Ky. 40205, Beulah W. George, president	7,342	38
5	Campbellsville College, Campbellsville, Ky., 42718, William R. Davenport, president	35,661	192
6	Centre Col of Kentucky, Danville, Ky., 40422, Thomas A. Spragens, president	11,711	66
5	Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Ky., 40769, James M. Boswell, president	63,947	333
1	Draughons Bus Col, Paducah, Ky., 42001, John L. Gregory, president	16,386	96
6	Eastern Kentucky Univ, Richmond Ky., 40475, Robert R. Martin, president	102,937	691
6	Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky., 40324, Robert L. Mills, president	20,580	87

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	KENTUCKY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 35)—Con.		
1	Institute of Electronic Technology, Paducah, Ky., 42001, Jerry Knapp, president	$19,653	96
6	Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Kentucky, 40601, Carl M. Hill, president	39,851	309
2	Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro, Ky., 42301, Howard L. Ramsey, vice president	17,877	106
7	Lees Jr College, Jackson, Ky., 41339, Troy R. Eslinger, president	80,587	485
3	Louisville Presb Seminary, Louisville, Ky., 40205, Albert Curry Winn, president	7,131	35
6	Midway Jr College, Midway, Ky., 40347, Albert N. Cox, president	30,870	179
7	Morehead State Univ, Morehead, Ky., 40351, Adron Doran, president	168,346	976
1	Murray State Univ, Murray Ky., 42071, Harry M. Sparks, president	81,226	536
4	Northern Kentucky State College, Covington, Ky., 41011, W. Frank Steely, president	3,988	31
2	Owensboro Business College, Owensboro, Ky., 42301, Wallace Joe Voyles, president	7,018	43
7	Pikeville College, Pikeville Ky. 41501, Robert S. Cope, president	18,963	132
4	Sem. of St. Pius X, Erlanger, Ky. 41018, Rev. Elmer J. Grosser, president	1,866	10
6	Southeastern Christian Col., Winchester, Ky. 40391, Victor Broaddus, president	3,308	19
3	Spalding College, Louisville, Ky. 40203, Sister Eileen M. Egan, president	25,382	120
2	St. Catharine Jr. College, St. Catharine, Ky. 40061 Sister Margaret Marie Hofstett, president	7,007	33
5	Sue Bennett College, London, Ky. 40741, Earl F. Hays, president	11,524	65
3	Sullivan Bus Col., Louisville, Ky. 40202, A. O. Sullivan, president	6,554	38
4	Thomas More Col., Covington, Ky. 41017, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy, president	19,600	92
6	Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky. 40508, Irvin E. Lunger, president	1,314	11
5	Union College, Barbourville, Ky. 40906, Mahlon A. Miller, president	30,795	158
6	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. 40506, Otis A. Singletary, president	97,957	684
3	University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky. 40208, Woodrow M. Strickler, president	24,500	143
2	Western Kentucky Univ., Bowling Green, Ky. 42101, Dero A. Downing, president	124,696	809
	LOUISIANA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 30)		
	Total	2,008,168	10,460
6	Capitol Area Voc. Sch., Baton Rouge, La. 70821, Eugene Harris, president	18,999	83
4	Centenary College, Shreveport, La. 71104, John H. Allen, president	8,649	49
1	Delgado College, New Orleans, La. 70119, Marvin Thames, president	24,648	138
1	Dillard University, New Orleans, La. 70122, Broadus N. Butler, president	123,795	530
3	Evangeline Area Tri-Parish Voc.-Tech., St. Martinville, La. 70582, Elijah Reed, director	10,349	47
5	Grambling College, Grambling, La. 71245, R. W. E. Jones, president	327,319	1,689
6	Hammond Area Voc. Sch., Hammond, La. 70401, W. D. Allen, director	3,199	14
5	La. Business College, Monroe, La. 71201, Robert G. Kirkley, president	1,838	10
6	La. State Univ. & A. & M. Col., Baton Rouge, La. 70803, Cecil G. Taylor, chancellor	88,543	435
8	La. State Univ. Alexandria, Alexandria, La. 71301, Morris Abrams, dean	7,236	43
7	La. State Univ. Eunice, Eunice, La. 70535, John A. Hunter, president	12,556	57
4	La. State Univ. Shreveport, Shreveport, La. 71105, John A. Hunter, president	10,220	40
8	Louisiana College, Pineville, La. 71360, G. Earl Guinn, president	14,022	65
1	Louisiana St. Univ. in New Orleans, New Orleans, La. 70122, Homer L. Hitt, chancellor	139,859	660
5	Louisiana Tech. University, Ruston, La. 71270, F. Jay Taylor, president	123,016	750
2	Loyola University, New Orleans, La. 70118, Michael F. Kennelly, SJ, president	25,762	143
7	McNeese State University, Lake Charles, La. 70601, Thomas S. Leary, president	88,357	510
2	Meadows Draughon Coll., New Orleans, La. 70119, Thomas Herrington, president	10,002	47
3	Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, La. 70301, Vernon F. Galliano president	50,275	258
5	Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe, La. 71201, George Thomas Walker, president	241,557	1,201
8	Northwestern State Univ., Natchitoches, La. 71457, Arnold R. Kilpatrick, president	111,811	600
2	Notre Dame Sem., New Orleans, La. 70118, Monsignor Alexander Sigur, president	14,565	76
7	Opelousas Area Voc. Sch., Opelousas, La. 70570, Joseph S. Castain, director	4,749	21
6	Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, La. 70401, Clea E. Parker, president	54,330	303
6	Southern Univ. & A. & M. Col., Baton Rouge, La. 70813, G. Leon Netterville, Jr., president	198,316	1,319
6	St. Joseph Seminary College, Saint Benedict, La. 70457, Very Rev. Marian Larmann, OSB, Rector-President	$3,181	18
2	St. Marys Dominican Col., New Orleans, La. 70118, Sister Mary Ursula Cooper, president	2,433	12
2	Tulane Univ. of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. 70118, Herbert E. Longenecker, president	33,288	216
3	Univ. Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, La. 70501, Clyde L. Rougeou, president	81,760	432
2	Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. 70125, Norman C. Francis, president	173,534	694
	MAINE (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 26)		
	Total	428,533	2,166
1	Andover Inst. of Bus., Portland, Me. 04101, Jerome Tagg, exec. vice president	2,253	12
2	Bates College, Lewiston, Me. 04240, Thomas Hedley Reynolds, president	2,207	18
2	Beal Business College, Bangor, Me. 04401, David R. Tibbetts, president	1,000	4
1	Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 04011, Roger Howell, Jr., president	6,432	42
1	Colby College, Waterville, Me. 04901, Robert E. L. Strider II, president	5,197	25
2	Eastern Maine Voc. Tech. Inst., Bangor, Me. 04401, Francis B. Sprague, director	5,126	30
2	Husson College, Bangor, Me. 04401, Bareu Kibarian, president	9,309	48
2	Maine Maritime Academy, Castine, Me. 04421, Rear Admiral E. A. Rodgers, superintendent	1,953	9
1	Nasson College, Springvale, Me. 04083, John Stephen Bailey, president	4,104	25
2	Northern Cons. of Music, Bangor, Me. 04401, William R. Mague, director	433	3
2	Northern Maine Voc. & Tech. Inst., Presque Isle, Me. 04769, Harold L. Mailman, director	1,903	15
2	Ricker College, Houlton, Me. 04730, Robert Matson, president	4,552	24
1	Southern Maine Voc. Tech. Inst., South Portland, Me. 04106, John S. Greer, director	7,449	34
1	St. Francis College, Biddeford, Me. 04005, Richard J. Spath, president	9,397	63
1	St. Josephs College, North Windham, Me. 04062, Bernard Paul Currier, president	5,083	27
1	Thomas College, Waterville, Me. 04901, John L. Thomas, Jr., president	3,480	21
1	Unity College, Unity, Maine, 04988, Lawrence M. Reichel, president	5,685	34
1	Univ. of Maine at Augusta, Augusta, Me. 04330, Lloyd J. Jewett, provost	3,447	18
1	Univ. of Maine at Portland Gorham, Portland, 04103, William J. MacLeod, president	106,574	514
2	University of Maine, Portland 04102, Winthrop C. Libby, president	176,379	852
2	University of Maine at Farmington, Farmington, Me. 04938, Einar A. Olsen, president	14,170	99
2	University of Maine at Fort Kent, Fort Kent, Me. 04743, Joseph M. Fox, president	12,032	51
2	University of Maine at Machias, Machias, Me. 04654, Lincoln A. Senneta, president	7,305	44
2	University of Maine at Presque Isle, Presque Isle, Me. 04769, Stanley F. Salwak, president	27,970	132
2	Washington Cty. Voc.-Tech. Institute, Calais, Me. 04619, Peter G. Pierce, director	3,935	18
1	Westbrook Jr. College, Portland, Me. 04103, James F. Dickinson, president	1,158	4
	MARYLAND (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 41)		
	Total	1,369,518	6,645
6	Alleghany Community Col., Cumberland, Md. 21502, W. Ardell Haines, president	11,000	65
1	Anne Arundel Cmty. College, Arnold 21012, Robert P. Ludlum, president	15,844	109
3	Balt. Col. of Commerce, Baltimore, Md. 21201, D. Deane Wyatt, president	4,149	18
99	Baltimore Institute, Baltimore, Md. 21201, B. Herbert Brown, president	19,920	115
5	Bowie State College, Bowie, Md. 20715, Samuel Lloyd Myers, president	92,880	334
8	Capitol Inst. of Tech., Kensington 20795, Martin A. Mason, actg president	2,499	11
6	Catonsville Cmty. College, Catonsville, Md. 21228, B. A. Barringer, president	11,034	57
1	Cecil Community College, Elkton, Md. 21921, Dr. Robert L. Nash, president	7,868	55
5	Charles Co. Community Col., La Plata, Md. 20646, J. N. Carsey, president	8,000	48
1	Chesapeake College, Wye Mills 21679, George Silver, president	10,067	67
7	Cmty Col. of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md. 21215, Harry Bard, president	20,000	83
4	Col. of Notre Dame of Md., Baltimoree, Md. 21210, Sister Mary E. McGuire, S.S.N.D., acting president	4,800	20
8	Columbia Union College, Takoma Park, Md. 20012, George H. Akers, president	5,933	43
7	Coppin State College, Baltimore, Md. 21216, Calvin Burnett, president	40,487	304
2	Essex Community College, Essex, Md. 21221, Vernon Wanty, president	18,107	88

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MARYLAND (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 41)—Con.		
6	Frederick Cmty. College, Frederick, Md. 21701, Lewis W. Stephens, president	$4,884	25
6	Frostburg State College, Frostburg, Md. 21532, Nelson P. Guild, president	36,531	235
8	Gardner School of Business, Silver Spring, Md. 20901, C. K. Gold, president	27,207	143
2	Goucher College, Towson, Md. 21204, Marvin B. Perry, president	20,224	95
6	Hagerstown Jr. College, Hagerstown, Md. 21740, Atlee C. Kepler, president	17,200	86
2	Hartford Junior College, Bel Air, Md. 21014, Joseph N. Hankin, president	20,982	143
6	Howard Community College, Columbia, Md. 21043, Dr. Alfred Smith, president	7,693	69
4	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 21218, Lincoln Gordon, president	72,000	278
8	Lear Siegler Inst., East Silver Spring, Md. 20901, C. K. Gold, regional director	35,098	167
4	Loyola College, Baltimore, Md. 21210, Very Rev. Joseph A. Sellinger, president	14,196	139
4	Maryland Inst. Col. of Art, Baltimore, Md. 21217, Eugene W. Leake, Jr., president	17,572	49
8	Montgomery Community College, Rockville, Md. 20850, William C. Strasser, president	17,651	101
4	Morgan State College, Baltimore, Md. 21212, Thomas P. Fraser, interim president	222,696	1,083
7	Mount Providence Jr. Col., Baltimore, Md. 21227, Sister Mary Alice, OSP, president	15,329	69
7	Ner Israel Rabbinical Col., Baltimore, Md. 21215, Rabbi Jacob I. Ruderman, president	18,294	119
5	Prince Georges Cmty. Col., Largo, Md. 20027, Watson F. Pindell, president	25,600	217
1	Salisbury State College, Salisbury, Md. 21801, Norman C. Crawford, president	3,081	18
6	St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg, Md. 21727, Sister Margaret Dougherty, president	6,947	38
1	St. Marys College of Md., St. Marys City, Md. 20686, J. Renwick Jackson, Jr., president	18,840	87
2	Towson State College, Baltimore, Md. 21204, James Fisher, president	41,200	217
1	Univ. of Maryland St. Col., Princess Anne, Md. 21853, Howard E. Wright, acting chancellor	135,089	461
7	Univ. of Md. Baltimore Co. Campus, Batimore, Md. 21228, Albin O. Kuhn, vice president	48,393	176
4	University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md. 21201, H. Mebane Turner, president	6,152	26
5	University of Md. College Park, College Park, Md. 20740, Wilson H. Elkins, president	244,521	1,083
7	Villa Julie College, Inc., Stevenson, Md. 21153, Sister Mary Stephen, president	15,913	87
1	Washington College, Chestertown, Md. 21620, Charles J. Merdinger, president	3,637	17
	MASSACHUSETTS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 107)		
	Total	1,842,413	12,392
2	American Internatl. Col., Springfield, Mass. 01109, Harry J. Courniotes, president	11,636	84
1	Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 01002, John William Ward, president	8,364	51
	Andover Inst. of Bus.—Andover, Andover, Ma. 01810, Jerome Tagg, executive vice president	1,586	7
11	Andover Inst. of Bus.—Brockton, Brockton, Ma. 02401, Jerome Tagg, executive vice president	1,060	5
10	Andover Newton Theological School, Newton-Center, Ma. 02159, Roy Pearson, president	12,240	76
4	Anna Maria Col. for Women, Paxton, Mass. 01612, Sr. Irene Socquet, SSA, president	3,549	24
4	Assumption College, Worcester, Mass. 01609, Rev. Georges Bissonnette, president	11,750	94
3	Atlantic Union College, So. Lancaster, Mass. 01561, William G. Nelson, actg. president	11,998	75
9	Babson College, Babson Park, Mass. 01257, Henry A. Kriebel, president	2,114	10
2	Bay Path Junior College, Longmeadow, Mass. 01108, Douglas D. Perkins, president	2,321	32
9	Bay State Jr. Col. of Bus., Boston, Mass. 02116, Louis F. Musco, president	760	11
4	Becker Jr. College, Worcester, Mass. 01609, Donald H. Huges, chancellor	967	7
9	Bentley College Acc. & Fin., Waltham, Mass. 02154, Gregory Adamian, pres. pro-tem	23,256	188
999	Berklee College of Music, Boston, Ma. 02215, Lawrence Berk, president	9,521	76
1	Berkshire Christian Col., Lenox, Mass. 01240, Ernest Palmer, president	2,241	16
1	Berkshire Cmty .College, Pittsfield, Mass 01201, Thomas E. O'Connell, president	13,041	100
99	Blue Hills Tech. Inst., Canton, Ma. 02021, William A. Dwyer, director	6,154	41
8	Boston College, Chestnut, Hill Mass. 02167, Rev. W. Seavey Joyce, S. J., president	158,517	951
9	Boston State College, Boston, Mass. 02115, Robert J. Bond, president	71,237	372
8	Boston University, Boston, Mass. 02215, Calvin Lee, acting president	176,256	1,549
3	Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. 02154, Dr. Charles I. Schottland, acting president	37,944	217
12	Bridgewater State College, Bridgewater, Mass. 02323, Adrian Rondileau, president	10,575	70
10	Bristol Community College, Fall River, Mass. 02720, Jack P. Hudnall, president	$20,626	123
9	Bryant and Stratton Commercial Sch, Boston, Mass. 02116, L. P. White, president	13,346	91
5	Bryant McIntosh Business School, Lawrence, Mass. 01840, Howard Reith, president	5,456	55
12	Cape Cod Community Col, Hyannis, Mass. 02601, E. Carleton Nickerson, president	18,878	95
8	Cardinal Cushing College, Brookline, Mass. 02146, Sr. M. Madonna Murphy, CSC, president	1,114	10
9	Carnegie Institute, Boston, Mass. 02114, William R. Keany, president	1,917	15
9	Catherine Laboure Sch of Nursing, Boston, Mass. 02124, Sister Helen Kelley, president-board of direct	1,806	13
4	Clark University, Worcester, Mass. 01610, Glenn Ferguson, president	6,364	47
2	Col of Our Lady of Elms, Chicopee, Mass. 01013, Very Rev. Thomas F. Devine, president	4,902	38
4	Col of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. 01610, John E. Brooks, SJ, president	16,002	108
11	Curry College, Milton, Mass. 02186, John S. Hafer, president	4,406	33
99	Diman Regional Voc Tech Inst, Fall River, Mass. 02723, John P. Harrington, superintendent-director	734	4
11	Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy, Mass. 02170, Leslie Parrott, president	9,028	83
9	Emerson College, Boston, Mass. 02116, Richard Chapin, president	14,688	91
9	Emmanuel College, Boston, Mass. 02115, Sister Marie Barry, president	23,094	153
9	Fisher Junior College, Boston, Mass. 02116, Scott A. Fisher, president	572	3
3	Fitchburg State College, Fitchburg, Mass. 01420, James J. Hammond, president	3,818	26
4	Framingham State College, Framingham, Mass. 01701, D. Justin McCarthy, president	9,332	62
9	Garland Jr. College, Boston, Mass. 02215, Canon G. Gardner, acting president	230	1
6	Gordon Col. & Gordon Divinity Sch., Wenham, Mass. 01984, Harold J. Ockenga, president	6,854	44
6	Gordon-Conwell Theol Seminary, So. Hamilton, Mass. 01982, Dr. Harold J. Ockenga, president	4,047	30
9	Grahm Jr. Col., Boston, Mass. 02215, Milton L. Grahm, president	5,337	54
99	Greater Lawrence Regional Tech. Inst., Andover, Mass. 01810, James A. Booth, superintendent-director	1,468	8
1	Greenfield Cmty. Col., Greenfield, Mass. 01301, Lewis C. Turner, president	4,494	37
99	Hampshire College, Amherst, Mass. 01002, Franklin Patterson, president	2,285	29
8	Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, Nathan M. Pusey, president	97,920	664
8	Hebrew Tchrs. College, Brookline, Mass. 02146, Eli Grad, president	1,370	9
8	Hellenic Col., Brookline, Mass. 02146, Leonidas C. Contus, president	5,997	42
1	Holyoke Community College, Holyoke, Mass. 01040, George E. Frost, president	5,205	38
2	Leicester Junior College, Leicester, Mass. 01524, Henry C. Borger, president	1,224	8
5	Lowell State College, Lowell, Mass. 01850, Daniel H. Oleary, president	10,554	66
5	Lowell Technological Inst., Lowell, Mass. 01854, Martin J. Lydon, president	14,670	119
6	Marian Court Secretarial School, Swampscott, Mass. 01907, M. Patrick Burke, director	1,814	9
10	Mass. Bay Community Col., Watertown, Mass. 02172 John F. McKenzie, president	2,407	24
9	Mass. Col. of Optometry, Boston, Mass. 02116, William R. Baldwin, president	2,448	17
8	Mass. Inst. of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. 02139, Howard W. Johnson, president	58,752	393
9	Massachusetts Col. of Art, Boston, Mass. 02215, John F. Nolen, acting president	9,449	51
12	Massasoit Community College, North Abington, Mass. 02351, John Musselman, president	4,226	42
6	Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass. 01845, Rev. John R. Aherne, president	5,875	47
2	Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 01075, David B. Truman, president	14,688	95
3	Mount Wachusett Cmty. Col., Gardner, Mass. 01440, Arthur F. Haley, president	3,794	38
99	New England School of Law, Boston, Mass. 02108, James Lawton, president	3,126	31
9	Newbury Sch. of Business, Boston, Mass. 02116, Edward J. Tassinari, president	2,471	17
3	Newton Col. Sacred Heart, Newton, Mass. 02159, James J. Whelan, president	12,240	73
3	Newton Jr. College, Newtonville, Mass. 02160, Charles W. Dudley, president	895	6
1	Newton Wellesley Hospital, Newton Lower Falls, Maine 02162	802	7
2	Nichols Col. of Business Adm., Dudley, Mass. 01572, Gordon B. Cross, president	1,779	17
1	North Adams State College, North Adams, Mass. 01247, James T. Amsler, president	1,713	18
6	North Shore Cmty. Col. Beverly, Mass. 01915, Harold E. Shively, president	25,373	157
1	Northampton Junior Col., Northampton, Mass. 01060, Richard D. Pickett, president	927	10
9	Northeastern University, Boston, Mass. 02115, Asa S. Knowles, president	177,480	1,409

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MASSACHUSETTS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 107)—Con.		
6	Northern Essex Cmty. Col., Haverhill, Mass. 01832, Harold Bentley, president	$12,355	117
9	Perry Normal School, Boston, Maine 02116, Frederick G. Perry, president	4,406	29
11	Quincy Jr. College, Quincy, Mass. 02169, Kenneth P. White, president	9,097	55
4	Quinsigamond Cmty. College, Worcester, Mass. 01605, Paul G. Preus, president	11,400	81
8	Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, Mary I. Bunting, president	17,136	96
3	Regis College, Weston, Mass. 02193, Sister M. Jeanne D. Arc, president	41,900	180
6	Salem State College, Salem, Mass. 01970, Frederick A. Meier, president	23,970	170
4	Salter Sec. Sch., Inc., Worcester, Mass. 01609, Mrs. Dorothy L. Salter, president	1,713	10
9	Sch. of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 02115, William A. Bagnall, dean	7,435	33
9	Simmons College, Boston, Mass. 02115, William Holmes, Jr., president	12,729	101
1	Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 01060, Thomas C. Mendenhall, president	15,912	87
99	Somerville Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Somerville, Mass. 02143, Normand E. Girard, administrator	1,224	9
12	Southeastern Mass. Univ., N. Dartmouth, Mass. 02747, Dr. Joseph L. Driscoll, president	41,462	257
2	Springfield College, Springfield, Mass. 01109, Wilbert E. Locklin, president	5,241	51
2	Springfield Tech. Cmty. Col., Springfield, Mass. 01105, Edmund T. Garvey, president	8,925	93
9	St. Johns Seminary, Brighton, Mass. 02135, Rev. Msgr. John A. Broderick, president	5,261	25
3	Stevens College, Hubbardston, Mass. 01452, Ernest D. Robinson, acting president	1,263	12
10	Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass. 02356, Rev. John T. Corr, president	8,323	57
9	Suffolk University, Boston, Mass. 02114, Thomas Fulham, president	28,852	224
12	Swain School of Design, New Bedford, Mass. 02740, George Perkins, president	1,846	11
7	Tufts University, Medford, Mass. 02155, Burton C. Hallowell, president	41,126	284
1	Univ. of Mass. All Campuses, Amherst, Mass. 01002, Robert Wood, president	250,989	1,159
10	Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 02181, Ruth M Adams, president	9,122	95
9	Wentworth Coll. of Technology, Boston, Mass. 02115, H. Russell, president	1,973	21
9	Wentworth Institute, Boston, Mass. 02115, H. Russell Beatty, president	6,644	57
2	Western New England Col., Springfield, Mass. 01119, Beaumont A. Herman, president	1,723	12
1	Westfield State College, Westfield, Mass. 01085, Leonard J. Savignano, president	17,380	127
9	Wheelock College, Boston, Mass. 02215, Mrs. Margaret H. Merry, president	4,284	27
99	Whidden Mem. Hosp., Sch. of Nursing, Everett, Mass. 02149, R.C. Mittica, administrator	2,466	12
1	Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 01267, John E. Sawyer, president	4,603	60
4	Worcester Jr. College, Worcester, Mass. 01608, Clifton W. Emery, Jr., president	954	6
4	Worcester Poly. Institute, Worcester, Mass. 01609, George W. Hazzard, president	11,031	64
4	Worcester State College, Worcester, Mass. 01602, Robert Leestamper president	3,304	42
4	Worchester Industrial Tech. Inst., Worchester, Mass. Robert Butler, administrator	1,370	12
	MICHIGAN (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 79)		
	Total	3,117,371	16,524
2	Adrian College, Adrian, Mich. 49221, John H. Dawson, president	2,414	17
3	Albion College, Albion, Mich. 49224, Bernard T. Lomas, president	18,460	77
10	Alma College, Alma, Mich. 48801, Robert D. Swanson, president	26,980	108
11	Alpena Community College, Alpena, Mich. 49707, Steward Olmstead, acting president	51,391	204
4	Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich. 49104, Richard Hammill, president	1,562	12
5	Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49506, Richard Hammill, president	14,135	79
3	Argubright Business College, Battle Creek, Mich. 49014, Robert W. Sneden, president	1,800	9
11	Bay de Noc Community Col., Escanaba, Mich. 49829, Richard L. Rinehart, president	26,912	108
5	Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49506, William Spoelhof, president	43,310	214
13	Carnegie Inst. of Detroit, 200 Pk. Ave., Detroit, Mich. 48226, E. L. Koenemann, president	4,970	21
12	Center Campus Macomb Cmty. College, Mount Clemens, Mich. 48043, John Dimitry, president	3,984	23
10	Central Michigan Univ., Mount Pleasant, Mich. 48858, William B. Boyd, president	63,900	356
2	Concordia Lutheran Jr. Col., Ann Arbor, Mich. 48105, P. A. Zimmerman, president	4,521	17
5	Davenport Col. of Business, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502, Robert W. Sneden, president	10,800	72
10	Delta College, University Center, Mich. 48710, Donald J. Carlyon, president	$29,840	212
16	Detroit College of Business, Dearborn, Mich. 48126, Robert W. Sneden, president	5,680	32
99	Detroit Engineering Institute, Detroit, Mich. 48226, F. Edgar Lamb, president	1,902	12
13	Detroit Institute of Tech., Detroit, Mich. 48201, Dewey F. Barich, president	6,390	38
18	Duns Scotus College, Southfield, Mich. 48076, Corman Mullen, president	710	4
2	Eastern Michigan Univ., Ypsilanti, Mich. 48197, Harold E. Sponberg, president	200,220	1,043
10	Ferris State College, Big Rapids, Mich. 49307, Victor F. Spathelf, president	26,064	161
7	Genessee Cmty. College, Flint, Mich. 48503, Charles Pappas, president	41,230	284
4	Glen Oaks Cmty. Col., Centerville, Mich. 49032, Harold V. Sheffer, president	18,744	79
11	Gogebic Community College, Ironwood, Mich. 49938, James L. Perry, president	27,722	128
5	Grand Rapids Bapt Col. & Sem., Grand Rapids, Mich. 49505, W. Wilbert Welch, president	4,615	20
5	Grand Rapids Jr. College, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502, C. Robert Muth, Superintendent	50,665	232
9	Grand Valley State Col., Allendale, Mich. 49401, Arend D. Lubbers, president	68,182	348
16	Henry Ford Community Col., Dearborn, Mich. 48128, James O. McCann, president	22,720	104
1	Highland Park Cmty College, Highland Park, Mich. 48203, Paul H. Jones, dean	45,113	258
4	Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich. 49242, J. Donald Phillips, president	4,237	27
9	Hope College, Holland, Mich. 49423, Clarence Handlogton, president	13,194	102
6	Jackson Cmty College, Jackson, Mich. 49201, Harold D. McAnich, president	22,698	178
3	Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001, Weimer K. Hicks, president	16,656	136
3	Kalamazoo Valley Cmty Col., Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001, Dale B. Lake, president	11,429	71
3	Kellogg Community College, Battle Creek, Mich. 49017, Richard F. Whitmore, director	10,830	68
10	Kirtland Cmty Col., Roscommon, Mich. 48653, Robert A. Stenger, president	11,360	45
4	Lake Michigan College, Benton Harbor, Mich. 49022, James H. Lehman, president	29,949	153
11	Lake Superior St Col., Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. 49783, Kenneth J. Shouldice, chancellor	103,549	409
6	Lansing Business University, Lansing, Mich. 48933, Martin Wynaldi, director	4,113	20
6	Lansing Community College, Lansing, Mich. 48914, Philip J. Gannon, president	18,786	95
18	Lawrence Institute of Technology, Southfield, Mich. 48075, Wayne Buell, president	5,758	32
13	Lewis Business College, Detroit, Mich. 48202, Majorie Harris, president	10,069	41
12	Macomb County Community College, Warren, Mich. 48093, John Dimitry, president	42,282	226
19	Madonna College, Livonia, Mich. 48150, Sister Mary Danatha, president	26,551	135
17	Marygrove College, Detroit, Mich. 48221, Arthur W. Brown, president	19,830	113
17	Mercy College of Detroit, President 48219, Sister Karl George, acting president	23,474	92
11	Michigan Technological Univ., Houghton, Mich. 49931, Raymond L. Smith, president	44,287	212
18	Michigan Christian Junior College, Rochester, Mich. 48063, E. Lucien Palmer, president	1,440	11
6	Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich. 48823, Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., president	386,968	2,333
2	Monroe County Community College, Monroe, Michigan, 48161, Ronald Campbell, president	10,206	43
10	Montcalm Cmty. Col., Sidney, Mich. 48885, Donald Fink, president	9,372	39
9	Muskegon Bus. Col., Muskegon, Mich. 49942, Robert Jewell, president	6,000	26
9	Muskegon County Cmty. College, Muskegon, Mich. 49440, Charles Green, president	22,223	96
3	Nazareth College, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49074, Mary Bader, president	8,520	42
11	North Central Michigan Col., Petoskey, Mich. 49770, A. D. Shankland, dean	3,167	23
11	Northern Michigan Univ., Marquette, Mich. 49855, John X. Jamrich, president	104,466	464
9	Northwestern Michigan Col., Traverse City, Mich. 49684, James M. Davis, director	4,899	31
10	Northwood Institute, Midland, Mich. 48640, Arthur E. Turner, president	13,490	63
18	Oakland Cmty. College, Bloomfield Hills, Mich. 48013, Joseph Hill, president	78,401	351
18	Oakland University, Rochester, Mich. 48063, Donald D. Dowd, president	90,880	384
3	Olivet College, Olivet, Mich. 49076, Ray B. Loeschner, president	9,695	53
6	Owosso College, Owosso, Mich. 48867, Russell V. Delong, president	9,556	55
3	Parsons Business School, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49006, Robert Sneden, president	2,500	17
1	Sacred Heart Seminary, Detroit, Mich. 48206, Thaddeus Ozog, president	15,620	78
8	Saginaw Business Inst., Saginaw, Mich. 48607, Angelo Guerriero, director	2,343	10

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MICHIGAN (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 79)—Con.		
8	Saginaw Valley Col., Univ. Center, Mich. 48710, Samuel D. Marble, president	$14,386	97
19	Schoolcraft College, Livonia, Mich. 48151, Eric J. Bradner, president	25,560	125
1	Shaw College at Detroit, Detroit, Mich. 48202, Romallus O. Murphy, president	119,481	549
2	Siena Heights College, Adrian, Mich. 49221, Richard Reaume, acting president	5,635	36
4	Southwestern Michigan Col., Dowagiac, Mich. 49047, Stanley W. Hergenroeder, president	9,003	49
8	St. Clair Co. Cmty. Col., Port Huron, Mich. 48060, Richard L. Norris, acting president	30,530	144
11	Suomi College, Hancock, Mich 49930, Ralph J. Jalkanen, president	35,112	149
1	University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich 48221, Rev. Malcolm Carron, president	51,830	218
2	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104, R. W. Fleming, president	140,745	867
2	Washtenaw CMTY College, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107, David H. Ponitz, president	52,806	251
99	Wayne CTY Community College, Detroit, Mich. 48201, Murray Jackson, acting president	119,139	800
13	Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich. 48202, William R. Keast, president	368,481	1,932
6	West Shore CMTY Col., Scottsville, Mich 49454, John M. Eaton, president	8,520	46
3	Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001, James W. Miller, president	112,409	727
	MINNESOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 73)		
	Total	1,650,417	8,659
7	Alexandria Area Voc-Tech School, Alexandria, Mn., 56308, Vernon R. Mack, Director	15,094	99
3	Anoka Area Voc-Tech School, Anoka Mn., 55303, Howard Rosenwinkel, director	3,734	22
3	Anoka Ramsey St. Jr. Col., Coon Rapids, Minn. 55433, Dr. Ronald H Denison, president	6,176	40
7	Area Voc Tech. School, Thief River Falls, Mn., 56701 Arnt M. Aune, president	3,071	19
5	Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn 55404, Oscar A. Anderson, president	3,831	27
1	Austin State Jr. College, Austin, Minn. 55912, Curtis Mac Donald president	16,562	80
7	Bemidji State College, Bemidji, Minn. 56601, Robert Decker, president	138,978	614
2	Bethany Lutheran Col. & Sem. Inc., Mankato, Minn. 56001, Raymond M. Branstad, president	2,110	13
4	Bethel College, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, Carl H. Lundquist, president	16,214	76
6	Brainerd Area Voc-Tech. School, Brainerd, Minn. 56401, Harry Nysather, president	17,455	105
6	Brainerd State Junior College, Brainerd, Minn. 56401, J. E. Chalberg, president	12,713	53
6	Canby Area Voc. Tech. Institute, Canby, Minn. 56220, Dewain Englund, president	7,495	45
5	Career Academy of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 55404, A. L. Rubinger, president	4,735	29
1	Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 55057, Howard Swearer president	22,648	105
6	College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minn. 56374, Stanley J. Idzerda, president	14,463	87
4	College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minn. 55116, Sister Fides Huber, president	10,191	44
8	College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minn. 55811, Sister Mary Richard Boo, president	22,081	95
1	College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn. 55987, Sister M. Joyce Rowland, president	19,457	101
4	College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, Msgr. Terrence J. Murphy, president	8,029	59
7	Concordia Col. Moorhead, Moorhead, Minn. 56560, Joseph L. Knutson, president	11,162	103
4	Concordia, Col. St. Paul, acting president, 55104, H. W. Otte, president	9,471	57
7	Corbett College, Crookston, Minn. 56716, Mother Mary John Flynn, president	823	4
6	Crosier Seminary, Onamia, Minn. 56359, Very Rev. John Neville, president and rector	1,235	6
2	Dr. Martin Luther Col., New Ulm, Minn. 56073, Conrad Frey, president	2,728	21
8	Duluth area Inst of Tech, Duluth, Minn. 55811, Elden Johns, assistant director	4,377	28
99	Eveleth area Technical School, Eveleth, Minn. 55734, Edward F. Russ, director	4,405	27
1	Faribault area Voc Tech School, Faribault, Minn. 55021, Raymond J. Freund, president	852	6
7	Fergus Falls State Junior College, Fergus Falls, Minn. 56537, Wesley A. Waage, president	5,970	33
3	Golden Valley Lutheran College, Minneapolis, Minn. 55422, Bernt C. Opsal, president	1,647	9
6	Granite Falls area Voc Tech School, Granite Falls, Minn. 56241, Wendell Howard, director	4,540	26
2	Gustavus Adolphus College, St Peter, Minn. 56082, Frank R. Barth, president	9,031	61
4	Hamline University, St Paul, Minn. 55101, Richard Bailey president	8,904	45
8	Hibbing area Tech Institute, Hibbing Minn. 55746, William E. Magajna, director	2,144	12
8	Hibbing State Jr College, Hibbing, Minn. 55746, H. C. Kelley, president	13,331	78
2	Hutchinson Voc-Tech Training Center, Hutchinson, Minn. 55350, Warren E. Macemon, director Voc-Tech Ed	$3,322	17
1	Inver Hills State Junior College, Inver Grove Heights, Minn., 55075, Dr. Arthur Gessner, president	5,764	39
8	Itasca State Jr College, Grand Rapids, Minn. 55744, Harold E Wilson, dean	10,294	58
4	Lakewood State Jr Col., White Bear Lake Minn. 55110, Carl Gerber, president	3,345	46
1	Lea College, Albert Lea, Minn. 56007, Quentin Hartwig, dean of the college	15,657	57
4	Macalester College, St Paul Minn. 55101, Arthur S. Fleming, president	14,731	96
2	Mankato Area Voc. Tech. Inst., North Mankato, Minn. 56001, Frank G. Kalin, director	1,893	14
2	Mankato State College, Mankato, Minn. 56001, James Nickerson, president	89,5[illegible]6	516
8	Mesabi State Jr. Col., Virginia, Minn. 55792, Gilbert M. Staupe, dean	32,737	165
5	Metropolitan St. J.C., Minneapolis, Minn. 55409, Robert Jensen, president	6,920	37
5	Minneapolis Area Voc. Tech. School, Minneapolis, Minn. 55404, John B. Davis, Jr., superintendent	27,090	152
5	Minneapolis College of Art & Design, Minneapolis, Minn. 55404, Arnold Herstand, director	2,708	18
7	Moorhead Area Technical Institute, Moorhead, Minn. 56560, John Nettleton, superintendent	31,216	144
7	Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minn. 56560, Roland Dille, president	136,404	634
3	Normandale St. Jr. Col., Bloomington, Minn. 55431, Dale A. Lorenz, president	5,199	41
3	North Hennepin State Jr. Col., Minneapolis 55428, John F. Helling, president	6,537	39
7	Northland State Jr. Col., Thief River Falls, Minn. 56701, Victor Charles, president	10,963	48
8	Rainy River State Jr. College, International Falls, Minn. 56649, Wallace A. Simpson, president	5,353	26
1	Rochester Area Vocational Inst., Rochester, Minn. 55901, Emil Heintz, director	1,544	9
1	Rochester State Junior College, Rochester, Minn. 55901, Charles E. Hill, president	25,999	131
4	Saint Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, Msgr. Wm. L. Baumgaertner, president	641	6
6	Southwest Minn. State Col., Marshall, Minn. 56258, Howard A. Bellows, president	69,584	424
2	Southwest Minn. Voc. School, Jackson, Minn. 56143, Delbert C. Schwieger, director	4,343	29
6	St. Cloud Area Voc.-Tech. School, St. Cloud, Minn. 56301, James C. Wakefield, director	7,524	41
99	St. Cloud Business Coll., St. Cloud, Minn. 56301, James W. Sexton, president	1,544	10
6	St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minn. 56301, Robert H. Wick, president	81,112	550
6	St. Johns University, Collegeville, Minn. 56321, Colman Barry, president	48,384	271
1	St. Marys College, Winona, Minn. 55987, George Pahl, president	6,639	41
1	St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. 55057, Sidney A. Rand, president	1,583	26
7	Staples Area Voc. Tech. School, Staples Minn., 56479, Michael J. Matanich, president	6,667	54
5	U. of Minn. Minneapolis-St. Paul-Crookston, Minneapolis, Minn. 55455, Malcolm Moos, president	311,635	1,477
8	University of Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, Minn. 55812, R. W. Darland, provost	121,588	510
6	University of Minnesota Morris, Morris, Minn. 56267, John Q. Imholte, acting provost	41,178	231
8	Vermilion State Jr. Col., Ely, Minn. 55731, C. Don Miller, president	2,641	17
6	Willmar Area Voc.-Tech. Institute, Willmar, Minn. 56201, Michael Cullen, director	26,157	129
6	Willmar State Junior College, Willmar, Minn. 56201, John Torgelson, president	4,370	35
1	Winona Area Technical School, Winona, Minn. 55987, William L. Hemsey, director	4,453	18
1	Winona State College, Winona, Minn. 55987, Robert Dufresne, president	41,307	231
2	Worthington State, Jr. Col., Worthington, Minn. 56187, W. Donald Olsen, president	6,228	43
	MISSISSIPPI (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 37)		
	Total	1,324,770	8,031
3	Alcorn A & M College, Lorman, Miss. 39096, Walter Washington, president	72,958	521
3	Belhaven College, Jackson, Miss. 39202, Howard J. Cleland, president	12,684	80
2	Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain, Miss. 38610, E. Harold Fisher, president	5,796	36
2	Coahoma Jr. College, Clarksdale, Miss. 38614, James E. Miller, president	48,819	291
3	Copiah Lincoln Jr. Col., Wesson, Miss. 39191, Billy B. Thames, president	6,793	39
1	Delta State College, Cleveland, Miss. 38732, James M. Ewing, president	68,754	412
4	East Central Jr. College, Decatur, Miss. 39327, Charles V. Wright, president	4,197	26
4	East Mississippi, Jr. Col., Scooba, Miss. 39358, Earl A. Stennis, president	5,880	36
3	Hinds Jr. College, Raymond, Miss. 39154, Robert M. Mayo, president	9,994	62
4	Holmes Jr. College, Goodman, Miss. 39079, Frank B. Branch, president	8,652	46

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MISSISSIPPI (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 37)—Con.		
2	Itawamba Jr. College, Fulton, Miss. 38843, J. S. Crubaugh, president	$28,242	163
3	Jackson State College, Jackson, Miss. 39217, John A. Peoples, Jr., president	96,977	573
5	Jones County Jr. College, Ellisville, Miss. 39437, Terrell Tisdale, president	11,214	67
1	Mary Holmes Jr. College, West Point, Miss. 39773, John W. Walton, president	40,391	272
4	Meridian Municipal Junior College, Meridan, Miss. 39301, William F. Scaggs, dean	31,455	180
3	Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss. 39210, Edward M. Collins, president	22,806	140
5	Miss Gulf Coast, J. C. Dist., Perkinston, Miss. 39573, J. J. Hayden Jr., president	14,658	59
1	Miss State Col. for Women, Columbus, Miss. 39701, Charles P. Hogarth, president	12,201	71
1	Miss Valley State College, Itta Bena, Miss. 38941, Dr. J. H. White, president	172,906	1,031
3	Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss. 39056, W. Lewis Nobles, president	12,779	87
1	Mississippi Delta Jr. Col., Moorhead, Miss. 38761, J. T. Hall, president	8,250	79
2	Mississippi Indus. College, Holly Springs, Miss. 38635, E. E. Rankin, President	12,023	79
1	Mississippi State Univ., State College, Miss. 39762, William L. Giles, president	175,308	1,017
2	Northeast Mississippi Jr. Col., Booneville, Miss. 38829, Harold T. White, president	32,780	173
2	Northwest Mississippi Jr. Col., Senatobia, Miss. 38668, R. D. McLendon, president	25,746	160
5	Pearl River Jr. College, Poplarville, Miss. 39470, Marvin R. White, president	14,358	84
5	Phillips Business College, Gulfport, Miss. 39501, Gerald C. Phillips, president	2,917	18
5	Prentiss Norm. and Indus. Inst., Prentiss, Miss. 39474, Mrs. J. E. Johnson, president	39,140	221
2	Rust College, Holly Springs, Miss. 38635, William A. McMillan, president	74,268	508
4	Saints Junior College, Lexington, Miss. 39095, Dr. Arenia C. Mallory, president	5,502	25
3	Southwest Mississippi Jr. Col., Summit, Miss. 39666, H. T. Huddleston, president	2,163	13
3	Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Miss. 39174, George A. Owens, president	34,061	207
5	Univ. of Southern Miss., Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401, William, D. McCain, president	45,673	291
2	University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 38677, Porter L. Fortune, Jr., chancellor	102,758	607
3	Utica Jr. College, Utica, Miss. 39175, J. L. Stokes, president	23,077	133
5	William Carey College, Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401, J. Ralph Noonkester, president	33,600	189
1	Wood Jr. College, Mathiston, Miss. 39752, Dr. Felix Sutphin, president	4,990	35
	MISSOURI (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 57)		
	Total	2,056,722	10,244
5	Avila College, Kansas City, Mo. 64145, SR. Olive Louise Dallavis, president	18,087	99
7	Central Bible College, Springfield, Mo. 65802, Philip Crouch, president	25,756	132
8	Central Methodist College, Fayette, Mo. 65248, Harold Hamilton, president	7,121	28
4	Central Missouri St. Col., Warrensburg, Mo. 64093, Warren C. Lovinger, president	59,410	314
8	Columbia College, Columbia, Mo. 65201, W. Merle Hill, president	2,022	21
2	Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. 63105, Rev. John H. Tietjen, president	30,255	159
4	Cottey College, Nevada, Mo. 64772, Jon O. Hondrum, president	2,236	13
7	Crowder College, Neosho, Mo. 64850, Dell Reed, president	14,569	83
9	Culver Stockton College, Canton, Mo. 63435, Fred Helsabeck, president	9,759	53
7	Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 65802, Carl Stillwell, acting president	15,688	78
9	East Central Junior College, Union, Mo., 63084, Donald D. Shook, president	4,644	28
2	Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo. 63119, Robert T. Fauth, president	8,302	58
7	Evangel College, Springfield, Mo. 65802, J. Robert Ashcroft, president	22,397	139
2	Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo. 63105, Sister Roberta Schmidt, president	20,816	88
3	Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, Mo. 63103, Richard Stumpe, president	62,551	317
8	Jefferson Col., Hillsboro, Mo. 63050, B. Ray Henry, president	5,984	26
5	Jr. College Dist. of Metro. Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo. 64111, Dr. Leslie Koltai, chancellor	44,140	130
2	Jr. College Dist. of St. Louis County, Clayton, Mo. 63105, Joseph P. Cosand, president	238,645	1,333
5	Kansas City Art Institute, Kansas City, Mo. 64111, John W. Lottes, president	11,375	68
5	Kansas City Col. of Osteo. and Surgery, Kansas City, Mo. 64124, Rudolph S. Bremen, president	5,889	24
9	Kirksville Col. Osteopathy, Kirksville, Mo. 63501, Morris Thompson, president	4,616	22
8	Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo. 65101, Walter C. Daniel, president	80,206	385
6	Linn Area Voc. Tech. Col., Linn, Mo. 65051, Thurman L. Willett, president	$8,589	46
2	Maryville Col. Sacred Heart, St. Louis, Mo. 63141, Harriet Switzer, president	6,500	31
10	Mineral Area College, Flat River, Mo. 63601, Richard B. Caster, president	9,784	38
9	Missouri Bapt. College Campus, Hannibal, Mo. 63401, Frank B. Kellogg, president	8,299	33
7	Missouri Southern College, Joplin, Mo. 64801, Leon C. Billingsly, president	32,955	148
4	Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Mo. 65340, W. L. Tomkins, president	8,443	44
6	Missouri Western Junior College, St. Joseph, Mo. 64501, M. O. Looney, president	40,224	208
9	Moberly Jr. College, Moberly, Mo. 65270, William Clark, president	3,839	19
9	Northeast Missouri S T C, Kirksville, Mo. 63501, Charles McClain, president	53,906	307
6	Northwest Missouri St. Col., Maryville, Mo. 64468, Robert P. Foster, president	70,163	400
6	Park College, Parkville, Mo. 64152, Donald M. MacKenzie, president	7,915	47
5	Rockhurst College, Kansas ity, Mo. 64110, Maurice E, Van Ackeren, president	30,290	169
8	Rolla Area Voc. Sch., Rolla, Mo. 65401, Daniel O. Smith, superintendent	1,257	6
10	Southeast Missouri St. Col., Cape Girardeau, Mo. 63701, Mark F. Scully, president	43,680	255
7	Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar, Mo. 65613, James L. Sells, president	50,705	257
7	Southwest Missouri St. Col., Springfield, Mo. 65802, Arthur L. Mallory, president	125,773	649
3	St. Louis Col. of Pharmacy, St. Louis, Mo. 63110, Charles C. Rabe, president	6,261	38
3	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. 63103, Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, president	96,859	409
9	St. Marys College of OFallon, OFallon, Mo. 63366, Sr. Rose Agnes Beckerle, president	9,985	48
4	St. Pauls College, Concordia, Mo. 64020, Lambert J. Mehl, president	5,287	27
4	State Fair Cmty. Col., Sedalia, Mo. 65301, Fred Davis, President	12,576	39
8	Stephens College, Columbia, Mo. 65201, Seymour Smith, President	8,049	43
5	Tarkio College, Tarkio, Mo. 64491, Eldon Breazier, Acting President	21,198	134
7	The School of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, Mo. 65726, M. Graham Clark, President	81,891	469
10	Three Rivers Junior College, Poplar Bluff, Mo. 63901, H. Tudor Westover, President	30,308	162
9	Trenton Jr. College, Trenton, Mo. 64683, William K. Ray, President	8,237	30
5	U. of Missouri at Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo. 64110, James C. Olson, Chancellor	96,046	391
8	U. of Missouri at Rolla, Rolla, Mo. 65401, Merl Baker, Chancellor	26,445	154
1	U. of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo. 63121, Glen R. Driscoll, Chancellor	17,420	137
8	University of Missouri at Columbia, Columbia, Mo. 65201, John Schwada, Chancellor	355,212	1,418
2	Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 63130, Thomas Hopkinson Eliot, Chancellor	38,433	169
2	Webster College, St. Louis, Mo. 63119, Leigh Gerdine, President	26,000	182
9	Westminster College, Fulton, Mo. 65251, Robert L. D. Davidson, President	6,402	40
6	William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. 64068, Thomas Field, President	11,282	82
9	William Woods College, Fulton, Mo. 65251, R. B. Cutlip, President	4,050	22
	MONTANA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 18)		
	Total	675,480	3,983
1	Bozeman Voc-Tech School, Bozeman, Mont. 59716 Milton Negus, Superintendent Dist. No. 7	1,833	10
1	Butte Voc.-Tech Center, Butte, Mont., 59701, Maurice Driscoll, president	33,867	130
1	Carroll College, Helena, Mont. 59601, Rev. Joseph D. Harrington, president	43,953	290
2	College of Great Falls, Great Falls, Mont. 59401, E. Milton Brassell, president	15,912	89
2	Dawson College, Glendive, Mont. 59330, James Hoffman, president	2,484	20
2	Eastern Montana Col., Billings, Mont. 59101, Stanley J. Heywood, president	88,458	425
1	Flathead Cmty College, Kalispell, Mont. 59901, Larry Blake, president	24,147	154
2	Great Falls Commercial College, Great Falls, Mont. 59401, E. L. Reed, president	4,284	27
2	Great Falls Voc.-Tech Center, Great Falls, Mont. 59401, Jim H. Carey, director	2,839	16
1	Helena Voc.-Tech Center, Helena, Mont. 59601, William A. Korizek, director	8,160	50
2	Miles Community College, Miles City, Mont. 59301, Vernon Kailey, president	5,204	36
1	Missoula Technical Ctr, Missoula, Mont. 59801, Gene Downey, director	18,035	93
1	Montana Col. of Mineral Sci. & Tech., Butte, Mont. 59701, Edwin G. Koch, president	26,009	138
1	Montana State Univ., Bozeman, Mont. 59715, Carl McIntosh, president	149,456	847

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MONTANA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 18)—Con.		
2	Northern Montana College, Havre, Mont. 59501, Joseph R. Crowley, president	$37,538	159
2	Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Mont. 59102, Lawrence F. Small, president	9,282	56
1	Univ. of Montana, Missoula, Mont. 59801, Robert Pantzer, president	150,501	1,163
1	Western Montana Col., Dillon, Mont. 59725, James E. Short, President	53,518	260
	NEBRASKA (Number of Institutions, 27)		
	Total	661,861	3,547
2	Bellevue College, Bellevue, Nebr. 68005, Richard D. Winchell, President	1,500	7
3	Central Nebraska Technical Sch., Hastings, Nebr. 68901, Chester H. Gausman, Superintendent	12,000	43
3	Chadron State College, Chadron, Nebr. 69337, Edwin C. Nelson, President	78,540	443
2	College of St. Mary, Omaha, Nebr. 68124, Mary Costello, President	10,245	57
1	Concordia Teachers Col., Seward, Nebr. 68434, W. Theo. Janzow, President	12,112	58
2	Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr. 68131, Joseph J. Labaj, President	18,593	129
2	Dana College, Blair, Nebr. 68008, C. C. Madsen, President	12,454	66
1	Doane College, Crete, Nebr. 68333, Philip R. Heckman, President	2,069	13
1	Fairbury Junior College, Fairbury, Nebr. 68352, Ivan R. Simpson, President	5,474	47
3	Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr. 68901, Theron B. Maxson, President	2,500	11
3	Hiram Scott College, Scottsbluff, Nebr. 69361, Walter E. Weese, Acting Pres	3,000	13
1	John F. Kennedy College, Wahoo, Nebr. 68066, Ted Dillon, President	6,998	30
3	Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebr. 68847, Milton J. Hassel, President	54,318	285
3	McCook College, McCook, Nebr. 69001, Charles Clauser, President	4,718	30
1	Midland Lutheran Col., Fremont, Nebr. 68025, Dale Lund, President	17,979	99
1	Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., Lincoln, Nebr. 68504, Vance D. Rogers, president	12,997	67
3	Nebraska Western Col., Scotts Bluff 69361, William Ptacek, president	11,040	54
2	Nettleton Business College, Omaha, NB. 68105, Vivian Hoglund, president	2,315	33
3	North Platte Col., North Platte, Nebr. 69101, William Hasemeyer, president	2,094	11
1	Northeastern Nebraska, Norfolk, Nebr. 68701, Michael E. Paradise, president	21,695	97
1	Peru State College, Peru, Nebr. 68421, Neal S. Gomon, president	29,703	136
1	Platte Jr. Col., Columbus, Nebr. 68601, Donald L. Newport, president	7,922	41
1	Union College, Lincoln, Nebr. 68506, Robert H. Brown, president	9,787	56
1	Univ. of Nebr. at Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebr. 68508, Joseph Soshnik, president	229,503	1,269
2	Univ. of Nebr. at Omaha, Omaha, Nebr. 68101, Kirk Naylor, president	34,800	199
1	Wayne State College, Wayne, Nebr. 68787, W. A. Brandenburg, president	49,478	217
1	York College, York, Nebr 68467, Dale R. Larsen, president	8,027	36
	NEVADA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 3)		
	Total	79,706	588
11	Elko Cmty. College, Elko, Nev. 89801, Elmer L. Kuntz, president	1,312	12
11	Univ. of Nevada-Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nev. 89100, Roman J. Zorn, president	21,460	164
11	Univ. of Nevada-Reno, Reno, Nev. 89507, N. Edd Miller, president	56,934	412
	NEW HAMPSHIRE (Number of Institutions, 25)		
	Total	198,890	1,422
1	Belknap College, Center Harbor, NH. 03226, William K. Widger, Jr., president	4,758	36
2	Colby Jr. Col., New London, N.H. 03257, Everett M. Woodman, President	5,188	24
6	Concord Comm. College, Manchester, N.H. 03103, Charles A. Barkie, Director	575	4
2	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H. 03755, John G. Kemeny, President	21,613	144
2	Franconia College, Franconia, N.H. 03580, Leon Botstein, President	2,282	17
2	Franklin Pierce Col., Rindge, N.H. 03461, Frank S. Dipeitro, President	5,188	28
2	Keene State College, Keene, N.H. 03431, Leo F. Redfern, President	19,114	128
1	Mount St. Mary College, Hooksett, N.H. 03106, Sister Mary Vianney Fulham, President	4,773	35
2	N.H. Tech. Institute, Concord, N.H. 03301, George M. Strout, Director	1,950	17
2	N.H. Voc. Inst. Berlin, Berlin, N.H. 03570, Edward C. Oleson, Director	$1,470	7
2	N.H. Voc. Inst. Claremont, Claremont, N.H. 03743, Roland V. Stoodley, Jr., Director	790	6
1	N.H. Voc. Inst. Laconia, Laconia, N.H. 03246, Robert H. Turner, Director	1,127	11
1	N.H. Voc. Inst. Manchester, Manchester, N.H. 03104, George C. Knox, Principal	498	4
1	N.H. Voc. Inst. Portsmouth, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801, Emerson A. McCourt, Director	2,158	10
2	Nathaniel Hawthorne College, Antrim, N.H. 03440, Kenneth F. McLaughlin, President	3,298	25
2	New England Aero. Inst., Nashua, N.H. 03060, Brig. Gen. Harrison R. Thyng, Director	3,840	22
2	New England College, Henniker, N.H. 03242, Jere Chase, President	6,780	46
1	New Hampshire Col. Acc. and Commerce Manchester, N.H. 03101, Gertrude Shapiro, President	9,916	109
2	New Hampshire Voc-Tech College, Nashua, N.H. 03060, Robert E. Bloomfield, Director	529	6
1	Notre Dame College, Manchester N.H. 03104, Sister Jeannette Vezeau, President	2,381	16
2	Plymouth State Col., Plymouth, N.H. 03264, Harold E. Hyde, President	7,174	63
2	Rivier College, Nashua, N.H. 03060, Sister Gloria LeMilux, President	3,203	24
1	St. Anselms College, Manchester, N.H. 03102, Rev. Placidus H. Riley, President	25,316	131
1	Univ. of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H. 03824, John W. McConnell, President	64,332	501
1	White Pines College, Chester, N.H. 03036, Faith Preston, President	637	8
	NEW JERSEY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 53)		
	Total	1,616,121	8,398
7	Alphonous College, Woodcliff Lake, N.J. 07680, Sister Veronica, C.S.J.B., President	2,889	14
2	Atlantic Cmty. Col., May Landing 08330, William Young, President	15,871	91
7	Bergen Community College, Paramus, N.J. 07652, Sidney Silverman, President	19,385	98
11	Berkeley School, The E. Orange, N.J. 07017, Larry L. Luing, Exec. Vice Pres	6,429	36
3	Beth Medrach Govoha of America, 150 5th Ave., New York, N.Y. 10011, Martin Klein, Dean	41,044	202
10	Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, N.J. 07003, Kenneth B. O'Brien, President	74,678	350
3	Brookdale Cmty. Col., Lincroft, N.J. 07738, Ervin L. Harlacher, President	19,970	117
6	Burlington County Col., Pemberton, N.J. 08068, N. Dean Evans, President	13,329	77
12	Caldwell Col. for Women, Caldwell, N.J. 07006, Sister Anne John OP, president	6,207	31
1	Camden County Cmty. Col., Blackwood, N.J. 08012, Otto R. Mauke, president	86,661	399
5	College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station, N.J. 07961, Sister Hildegarde Marie Mahone, president	6,665	29
5	County Col. of Morris, Dover, N.J. 07801, Sherman H. Masten, president	29,563	153
2	Cumberland Co. Col., Vineland, N.J. 08360, William J. Sample, president	2,888	20
4	Don Bosco College, Newton, N.J. 07860, Rev. Joseph S. Bajorek, president	2,122	11
5	Drew University, Madison, N.J. 07940, Robert Fisher Oxnam, president	8,870	42
7	Englewood Cliffs College, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 07632, Sister M. Madeleine, president	4,844	23
10	Essex Coll. of Bus., Newark, N.J. 07102, Robert Kisberg, president	2,878	16
9	Fairleigh Dickinson Univ., Rutherford, N.J. 07070, J. Osborn Fuller, president	36,983	209
3	Georgian Court College, Lakewood, N.J. 08701, Mary Stephanie Slogan, president	2,399	14
1	Glassboro State College, Glassboro, N.J. 08028, Dr. Mark Chamberlain, president	66,648	325
1	Gloucester County College, Sewell, N.J. 08080, William L. Apelz, president	16,883	78
7	Granite Cmptr. Inst., Paramus, N.J. 07652, Frank J. O. Kane, president	2,858	15
13	Jersey City State College, Jersey City, N.J. 07305, James H. Mullen, president	77,970	453
9	Luther Col. of Bible & Liberal Arts, Teaneck, N.J. 07666, The Rev. J. Phillip Worthington, president	4,887	21
4	Mercer Co. Community College, Trenton, N.J. 08608, Richard K. Greenfield, president	28,359	158
15	Middlesex County Col., Edison, N.J. 08817, Frank M. Chambers, president	30,672	161
13	Monmouth College, W. Lon Branch, N.J. 07764, William G. Van Note, president	21,889	133
10	Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, N.J. 07043 Thomas Richardson, president	22,842	126
99	New Jersey Col. of Med. and Dentistry, Newark, N.J. 07103, Robert R. Cadmus, president	21,358	108
10	Newark Col. of Engineering, Newark, N.J. 07102, William Hazell, president	15,228	85
12	Newark State College, Union, N.J. 07083, Nathan Weiss, president	23,777	132
12	Nthestrn. Col. Bible Inst. Essex Fells, N.J. 07021, Charles W. Anderson, president	3,258	19

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NEW JERSEY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 53)—Con.		
6	Ocean County Col., Toms River, N.J. 08753, Andrew S. Moreland, president	$12,462	64
8	Paterson State College, Wayne, N.J. 07470, James Karge Olsen, president	45,570	178
4	Princeton Theological Sem., Princeton, N.J. 08540, James I. McCord, president	17,773	66
4	Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. 08450, Robert F. Goheen, president	94,640	411
7	Ramapo College of N.J., Mahwah, N.J. 07430, George T. Potter, president	9,024	43
15	Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, N.J. 08903, Mason W. Gross, president	345,535	1,963
6	Ryder Technical Institute, Pennsauken, N.J. 08110, M. Michael Freedland, president	1,995	13
11	Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., 07079, Thomas Fahy, president	22,212	140
5	Somerset Co. Col., Somerville 08876, Henry C. J. Evans, president	4,000	17
14	St. Peters College, Jersey City, N.J. 07306, Victor R. Yanitelli, president	184,449	959
99	St. Peters Gen. Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, New Brunswick, N.J. 08903, Joan Manion, Hospital administrator	3,554	19
14	Stevens Institute of Tech., Hoboken, N.J. 07030, Jess H. Davis, president	46,000	201
2	Stockton State Coll., Pleasantville, N.J. 08240, Richard Bjork, president	11,028	68
8	Tombrock College, West Paterson 07424, Rose Claire Gonzalez, exec. vice president	18,974	101
4	Trenton State College, Trenton, N.J. 08625, Robert Heussler, president	13,878	85
12	Union College, Cranford, N.J. 07016, Kenneth W. Iverson, president	7,350	38
99	Union County Technical Institute, Scotch Plains, N.J. 07076, George H. Baxel, president	4,887	21
11	Upsala College, East Orange, N.J. 07019, Carl G. Fjellman, president	28,411	130
5	Walsh College, Morristown, N.J. 07960, Sr. Margherita Marchione, president	5,670	26
4	Westminster Choir College, Princeton, N.J. 08540, Ray E. Robinson, president	3,518	28
	NEW MEXICO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 16)		
	Total	382,208	2,518
1	Albuquerque Tech-Voc Institute, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103, Tom Wiley, president	5,504	39
2	College of Artesia, Artesia, N. M. 88210, James E. Gibson, president	8,096	51
1	College of Santa Fe, Santa Fe, N. M. 87501, Brother Cyprian Luke, president	14,942	110
2	Eastern N. Mex. Univ., Roswell Campus, Roswell, N. Mex. 88201, Dale E. Traylor, director	4,712	34
2	Eastern New Mexico Univ., Portales, N. Mex. 88130, Charles W. Meister, president	41,603	333
2	N. Mex. Inst. Mining & Tech., Socorro, N. Mex. 87801, S. A. Colgate, president	7,405	49
1	New Mexico Highlands Univ., Las Vegas, N. Mex. 87701, R. C. Smith, president	47,971	303
2	New Mexico Jr. Col., Hobbs, N. Mex. 88240, Jodie Smith, president	3,560	22
2	New Mexico Military Inst., Roswell, N. Mex. 88201, Sam W. Agee, superintendent	1,253	16
2	New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces, N. Mex. 88001, Gerald W. Thomas, president	104,621	582
1	Northern N. Mex. Tech. Voc. Sch., El Rito, N. Mex. 87530, Albert Catanach, superintendent	27,500	160
1	Santa Fe Business College, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87501, Agnes I. Williams, business administrator	2,092	15
1	St. Johns College In Santa Fe, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87501, Richard D. Weigle, president	1,470	10
1	University of Albuquerque, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 87105, Frank A. Kleinhenz, acting president	28,676	187
1	University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 87106, Ferrell Heady, president	65,076	481
2	Western New Mexico Univ., Silver City, N. Mex. 88061, John H. Snedeker, president	17,727	126
	NEW YORK (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 184)		
	Total	5,911,260	30,812
4	Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y. 11530, Charles Viever, actg. president	7,864	46
30	Adirondack Community Col., Glens Falls, N.Y. 12801, Charles R. Eisenhart, president	4,225	20
29	Albany Bus. Col., Albany, N.Y. 12210, Prentiss Carnell, president	2,681	19
29	Albany Law School Union Univ., Albany N.Y., 12208, Samull M. Hesson, dean	8,291	35
38	Alfred University, Alfred, N.Y. 14802, Leland Miles, president	11,754	52
35	Auburn Community College, Auburn, N.Y. 13021, Albert T. Skinner, president	2,706	18
28	Bard College, Annandl, ON HDSN., N.Y. 12504, Reamer Kline, president	8,289	39
20	Barnard Col. Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. 10027, Martha E. Peterson, president	36,199	156
12	BE ER Shmuel Talmudical Acad., 1363 50th New York, N.Y., 11219, Rabbi Moshe Hordvitz, exec. vice president	$6,153	33
28	Bennett College, Millbrook, N.Y. 12545, Donald A. Eldridge, president	3,043	11
19	Beth Jacob Hebrew Teachers Col., New York, N.Y., 10002, Israel Garber, executive vice president	11,686	52
25	Briarcliff College, Briarcliff Manor N.Y. 10510, Thomas E. Baker, president	1,500	7
15	Brooklyn Law School, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201, Jerome Prince, president	5,714	20
33	Broome Tech. Community Col., Binghamton, N.Y. 13902, Cecil C. Tyrrell, president	20,941	92
41	Bryant & Stratton Business Inst., Buffalo, N.Y. 14202, Richard J. Oneil, president	7,568	75
41	Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14202, Very Rev. James M. Demske, president	18,002	104
99	Cath. Col. of the Immac. Conception, Douglaston, N.Y. 11362, Thomas J. Gradilone, president	5,045	24
32	Cazenovia College, Cazenovia, N.Y. 13035, Rhea M. Eckel, president	1,081	7
12	Central Yeshiva Tomchei, T. L., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11230, Rabbi Israel Jacobson, chairman exec. comm	24,941	111
99	City University of New York, New York, N.Y. 10021, Albert H. Bowker, chancellor	2,130,264	11,586
31	Clarkson Col. of Tech., Potsdam, N.Y. 13676, John W. Graham, Jr., president	8,225	48
30	Clinton County Cmty. Col., Plattsburg, N.Y. 12901, James D. Pletcher, acting president	6,001	33
35	Cmty. Col. of Finger Lakes, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424, Roy I. Satre, Jr., president	6,259	34
23	Col. of Mount St. Vincent, Riverdale, N.Y. 10471, Sister Mary David, president	11,532	58
19	Col. of Pharm. Sciences, Columbia U., New York, N.Y. 10023, Joseph L. Kanig, dean	7,208	35
36	Colgate Rochester Div. Sch., Rochester, N.Y. 14620 Arthur R. McKay, president	11,532	54
32	Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y. 13346, Thomas A. Bartlett, president	9,605	82
26	College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801, Dorothy Anne Kelly, acting president	9,037	39
20	Columbia University, New York, N.Y. 10027, William McGill, president	252,280	1,430
28	Columbia-Greene Community College, Athens, N.Y. 12015, Edward J. Owen, president	7,870	40
25	Concordia Collegiate Inst., Bronxville, N.Y. 10708, Albert E. Meyer, president	13,164	49
17	Cooper Union, New York, N.Y. 10003, John F. White, president	8,444	43
33	Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850, Dr. Dale R. Corson, president	39,644	193
38	Corning Community College, Corning, N.Y. 14830, Robert W. Frederick, Jr., president	15,688	71
27	Dominican Col. of Blauvelt, Blauvelt, N.Y. 10913, Sister M. Natalie, president	853	12
1	Dowling College, Oakdale, N.Y. 11769, Allyn P. Robinson, dean	37,842	178
28	Dutchess Cmty. College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601, James F. Hall, president	15,214	84
41	Dyouville College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14201, Sister Mary Charlotte Barton, president	15,230	74
15	Eastern Sch. for Physicians Aides, New York, N.Y. 10003, Charles R. Mathis, Jr., president	6,998	34
36	Eastman Sch. of Music, Rochester, N.Y. 14604, Walter Hendle, director	2,883	20
35	Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, N.Y. 13148, John Rosenkrans, president	10,534	50
25	Elizabeth Seton College, Yonkers, N.Y 10701, Sister Delores Mary Kelly, president	1,351	8
33	Elmira College, Elmira, N.Y. 14901, J. Ralph Murray, president	5,485	39
39	Erie Community College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14221, James E. Shenton, president	16,578	85
19	Fashion Institute of Tech., New York, N.Y. 10001, Lawrence L. Jarvie, president	8,512	36
17	Finch College, New York, N.Y. 10021, Rodney O. Felder, president	1,437	10
24	Fordham University, Bronx 10458, Rev. Michael P. Walsh, president	34,598	177
3	Friends World College, Westbury, N.Y. 11590, Sidney Harman, president	11,310	43
30	Fulton-Montgomery Cmty College, Johnstown, N.Y. 12095, William L. Gragg, president	7,208	37
37	Genessee Cmty. Col., Batavia, N.Y. 14020, Cornelius V. Robbins, president	8,819	46
26	Good Counsel College, White Plains, N.Y. 10603, Charles E. Ford, president	4,876	24
32	Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y. 13323, John Chandler president	4,999	22
9	Harlem Hosp. Center School of Nurs., New York, N.Y. 10037, Elliot Robert, executive director	14,416	99
27	Harriman College, Harriman, N.Y. 10926, Sister M. Agnes, CSAC, president	5,056	21
35	Hartwick College, Oneonta, N.Y. 13820, Adolph G. Anderson, president	14,103	80
32	Herkimer Co. Cmty. College, Ilion, N.Y. 13357, Robert McClaughlin, president	3,708	27
39	Hilbert College, Hamburg, N.Y. 14075, Sister Mary Edwina Bogel, president	5,502	32
35	Hobart and Wm. Smith Colleges, Geneva, N.Y. 14456, Dr. Allan Andrew Kuusisto, president	3,032	19
4	Hofstra University, Hempstead, L.I., N.Y. 11550, Clifford L. Lord, president	61,692	280

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NEW YORK (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 184)—Con.		
38	Houghton College, Houghton, N.Y. 14744, Stephen W. Paine, actg. president	$5,045	30
29	Hudson Valley Cmty. Col., Troy, N.Y. 12180, James J. Fitzgibbons, president	20,110	113
26	Iona College, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801, Bro. Joseph G. McKenna, president	16,728	95
33	Ithaca College, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850, Ellis Phillips, Jr., president	9,570	64
38	Jamestown Business College, Jamestown, N.Y. 14701, Ernest E. Roblee, president	792	5
38	Jamestown Community Col., Jamestown, N.Y. 14701, Roger C. Seager, president	7,527	45
31	Jefferson Community Col., Watertown, N.Y. 13601, James E. McVean, president	5,766	33
20	Jewish Theol. Sem. of Amer., New York, N.Y. 10027, David Kogen, admin. vice chancellor	2,162	16
35	Keuka College, Keuka Park, N.Y. 14478, G. Wayne Glick, president	10,812	66
12	Kings Co. Hosp. Ctr. Sch. of Nursing, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11203, Gordon M. Derzon, executive director	6,357	31
25	Kings College, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y. 10510, Robert A. Cook, president	5,928	36
32	Kirkland College, Clinton, N.Y. 13323, Samuel F. Babbitt, president	2,971	18
34	Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y. 13214, Very Rev. William L. Reilly, president	10,812	66
3	Long Island University, Greenvale, Long Island, N.Y. 11548, John Kiermaier, president	66,004	353
18	M. J. Lewi Col. of Podiatry, New York, N.Y. 10035, Charles J. Turck, president	2,944	13
23	Manhattan College, New York, N.Y. 10471, Brother Gregory Nugent president	66,992	306
18	Manhattan School of Music, New York, N.Y. 10027, George Schick, president	10,499	46
26	Manhattanville College, Purchase, N.Y. 10577, Mother Elizabeth McCormack, president	9,010	44
17	Mannes College of Music, New York, N.Y. 10021, Hubert Doris, president	2,883	16
29	Maria College, Albany, N.Y. 12208, Sister M. Berchmans Mahoney, president	4,426	20
34	Maria Regina College, Syracuse, N.Y. 13208, Sister Mary Rosalie, president	6,278	26
28	Marist College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601, Brother Linus R. Foy, president	12,614	61
25	Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591, John J. Meng, president	16,813	92
17	Marymount Manhattan Col., New York, N.Y. 10021, Sister M. Colette Mahoney, president	16,218	94
31	Mater Dei College, Ogdensburg, N.Y. 13669, Mother M. Immaculata, president	1,677	11
25	Mercy College, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. 10522, Helen W. Coogan, president	3,531	21
13	Mesivta Tor. Mod. Rabb. Sem., 425 E. 9th, New York, N.Y. 11218, Louis J. Septimus, chr. of the board	20,034	95
99	Mesivta—East Pkway Rab. Seminary, Brooklyn 11203, Mordechal Weinberg, president	7,261	34
19	Mesivtha Tifereth Jerusalem of Amer., New York, New York 10002, Rabbi Moses Feinstein, president	11,607	84
17	Mills College of Educ., New York, N.Y. 10011, Margaret M. Devine, president	887	5
13	Mirrer Yeshiva Central Inst., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11223, Rabbi Moses Kalmanowitz, dean	12,239	55
24	Misericordia Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Bronx 10466, Catherine Morin, director	8,925	39
32	Mohawk Valley Cmty Col., Utica, N.Y. 13501, W. Stewart Tosh, president	17,168	92
5	Molloy Cath. Col. for Women, Rockville Center, N.Y. 11570, Mother M. Celeste, president	1,469	9
36	Monroe Community College, Rochester, N.Y. 14623, Leroy V. Good, president	58,292	244
27	Mount St. Mary College, Newburgh, N.Y. 12550, Sister Mary Francis, president	10,981	56
4	Nassau Cmty College, Garden City, N.Y. 11533, George F. Chambers, president	13,832	74
36	Nazareth Col. of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y. 14610, Sister Helen Daniel Malone, president	6,826	34
19	New York Inst. of Tech., Old Westbury, N.Y. 11568, Alexander Schure, president	21,796	139
19	New York Law School, New York, N.Y. 10013, Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., president	12,616	38
18	New York Medical College, New York, N.Y. 10029, Dr. Frederick L. Stone, President	20,551	41
17	New York Theol. Seminary, New York, N.Y. 10017, George W. Webber, President	5,189	25
17	New York University, New York, N.Y. 10003 James M. Hester, President	214,060	899
40	Niagara County Cmty. Col., Niagara Falls, N.Y. 14303 Ernest Notar, President	8,649	55
40	Niagara University, Niagara Univ., N.Y. 14109, Very Rev. Kenneth F. Slattery, President	11,769	61
31	North Country Cmty. Col., Saranac Lake, N.Y. 12983, George D. Hodson, President	13,390	78
27	Nyack Missionary College, Nyack, N.Y. 10960, Harold W. Boon, President	4,473	24
34	Onondaga Cmty. College, Syracuse, N.Y. 13210, Marvin A. Rapp, President	34,436	142
27	Orange County Cmty. Col., Middletown, N.Y. 10940, Robert T. Novak, President	28,832	114
27	Our Lady of Hope Mission Seminary Newburgh, N.Y. 12550, The Rev. Joseph C. Schwab, Dmt., President	$2,522	13
19	Pace College, New York, N.Y. 10038, Edward J. Mortola, President	21,624	142
17	Parsons School of Design, New York, N.Y. 10022, David C. Levy, President	4,114	20
31	Paul Smiths Col. Arts Sci., Paul Smiths, N.Y. 12970, Chester L. Buxton, President	3,964	21
14	Polytechnic Inst. Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201, Benjamin Adler, Acting President	38,690	176
34	Powelson Inst., Syracuse, N.Y. 13202, Robert J. Dermody, President	6,442	35
14	Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11205, Henry Saltzman, President	44,651	182
8	Queens Hosp. Ctr. Sch. of Nursing, Jamaica, N.Y. 11432, Robert A. Vitello, executive director	5,040	27
19	Rabbi Col. Bobover Yesh Bnei Zion, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11219, Aaron Teitelbaum, president	8,140	51
19	Rabbi Jacob Joseph Rabbinical Coll., New York, N.Y. 10002, Irving M. Bunim, president	14,842	81
13	Rabbinical Acad. M. R. Chaim Berlin, Brooklyn 11230 Bezalel Refman, executive vice president	18,338	88
19	Rabbinical Col. Chsan Sofer of N.Y., Brooklyn 11204, Akiba Ehrenfield, exec. vice president	9,792	51
12	Rabbinical Col. Kamenitz Yeshiva AM, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11219, Joseph Shaw, president	15,560	73
12	Rabbinical Sem Netzach Israel, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11213, Rabbi Israel Gustman, president	10,865	52
8	Rabbinical Sem. of America, Forest Hills, New York 11375, Rabbi A. H. Leibowitz, president	3,604	27
30	Rensselaer Poly. Institute, Troy, N.Y. 12181, Richard G. Folsom, president	28,832	165
37	Roberts Wesleyan College, Rochester 14624, Lawrence R. Schoenhals, president	21,624	100
37	Rochester Business Inst., Rochester, N.Y. 14604, Bernard Fortunoff, president	7,366	42
37	Rochester Inst. Technology, Rochester, N.Y. 14623, Paul A. Miller, president	9,634	52
27	Rockland Cmty. College, Suffern, N.Y. 10901, Seymour Eskow, president	12,137	67
39	Rosary Hill College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14226, Angela Canavan, president	18,105	84
25	Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y. 10708, Charles Decarlo, president	18,020	95
29	Schenectady Cmty. Col., Schenectady, N.Y. 12305, Robert Larrson, president	20,182	96
17	School of Visual Arts, New York, N.Y. 10010, S. H. Rhodes, director	6,974	41
29	Siena College, Loudonville, N.Y. 12211, Matthew Conlin Ofm, president	27,030	138
15	St. Francis College, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201, Rev. Bro. Donald Sullivan, president	29,151	113
36	St. John Fisher Col., Inc., Rochester, N.Y. 14618, Rev. Charles J. Lavery, president	2,800	15
7	St. Johns University, Jamacia, N.Y. 11432, Rev. Joseph T. Cahill, president	66,674	312
31	St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y. 13617, Frank P. Piskor, president	3,243	19
27	St. Thomas Aquinas College, Sparkill, N.Y. 10976, Sister Mary Ann Biller, president	5,246	28
25	St. Vladimir Orth. Theo. Sem., Tuckahoe, N.Y. 10707, Metropolitan Ireney, president	1,524	9
1	Suffolk Cmty. College, Selden, N.Y. 11784, Albert M. Ammerman, president	39,432	199
27	Sullivan County Cmty. Col., South Fallsburg, N.Y. 12779, Richard F. Grego, president	6,575	38
38	Suny Ag. & Tech., Alfred, Alfred, N.Y. 14802, David H. Huntington, president	29,372	149
31	Suny Ag. & Tech., Canton, Canton, N.Y. 13617, Albert E. French, president	20,147	84
28	Suny Ag. & Tech., Cobleskill, Cobleskill, N.Y. 12043, Walton A. Brown, president	15,119	103
27	Suny Ag. & Tech., Dehli, Delhi, N.Y. 13753, William R. Kunsela, president	21,315	115
2	Suny Ag. & Tech., Farmingdale, Farmingdale, L.I., N.Y. 11735, Charles W. Laffin, Jr., president	28,832	134
32	Suny Ag. & Tech., Morrisville, Morrisville, N.Y. 13408, Royson N. Whipple, president	14,357	69
29	SUNY at Albany, Albany, N.Y. 12203, Louis T. Benezet, president	93,704	570
33	SUNY at Binghamton, Binghamton, N.Y. 13901, Bruce Dearig, president	27,244	146
39	SUNY at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14214, Robert Ketter, president	234,827	1,055
3	SUNY at Old Westbury, Old Westbury, 11568, John D. Maguire, president	13,050	81
1	SUNY at Stony Brk, Stony Brook, N.Y. 11790, John S. Toll, president	43,968	228
41	SUNY Col. at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14222, Elbert K. Fretwell, president	132,137	649
35	SUNY Col. at Courtland, Courtland, N.Y. 13045, Richard C. Jones, president	54,060	277
38	SUNY Col. at Fredonia, Fredonia, N.Y. 14063, Oscar E. Lanford, president	32,436	192
37	SUNY Col. at Geneseo, Geneseo, N.Y. 14454, Robert W. Macvittie, president	77,380	455
28	SUNY Col. at New Paltz, New Paltz, N.Y. 12561, John J. Neumaier, president	33,727	217
35	SUNY Col. at Oneonta, Oneonta, N.Y. 13820, Clifford Craven, president	27,030	185

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NEW YORK (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 184)—Con.		
31	SUNY Col. at Oswego, Oswego, N.Y. 13126, Dallas Beal, president	$28,832	175
30	SUNY Col. at Plattsburgh, Plattsburgh, N.Y. 12901, George W. Angell, president	62,907	320
31	SUNY Col. at Potsdam, Potsdam, N.Y. 13676, Thomas Barrington, president	14,981	100
34	SUNY Col. of Forestry at Syracuse U., Syracuse, N.Y. 13210, Edward E. Palmer, president	4,955	31
37	SUNY College at Brockport, Brockport, N.Y. 14420, Albert W. Brown, president	48,124	247
12	Suny Downstate Med. Ctr., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11203 Chandler C. Brooks, acting president	2,826	19
24	Suny Maritime College, Fort Schuyler, N.Y. 10465, Edward J. O'Donnel, president	1,452	10
34	Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. 13210, John E. Corbally, Jr., chancellor	37,430	278
20	The Julliard School, New York, N.Y. 10023, Peter Mennin, president	3,332	17
17	The Wood School, New York, N.Y. 10017, Vincent Devenoge, president	4,820	27
33	Tompkins-Cortland Cmty. Col., Groton, N.Y. 13073, Hushang Bahar, president	29,638	131
41	Trociare College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14220, Mary Carmina, president	2,365	15
28	Ulster County Cmty. Col., Stone Ridge N.Y. 12484, George B. Erbstein, president	16,218	99
29	Union College, Schnectady, N.Y. 12308, Harold C. Mar, president	5,053	29
20	Union Theological Sem., New York, N.Y. 10027 Lawrence N. Jones, acting president	19,451	114
36	University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y. 14627, W. Allen Wallis, president	5,172	27
32	Utica Col. of Syracuse Univ., Utica, N.Y. 13502, Ambrose J. DeFlumere, president	14,785	95
32	Utica School of Commerce. Utica, N.Y. 13501, Roger L. Williams, president	3,487	19
28	Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601, Alan Simpson, president	11,342	57
41	Villa Maria Col. of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14225, Mother Mary Pachomia, president	4,630	22
31	Wadhams Hall Seminary, Ogdensburg, N.Y. 13669, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Floyd J. Brown, president	432	3
16	Wagner College, Staten Island, N.Y. 10301, Arthur O. Davidson, president	19,101	110
35	Wells College, Aurora, N.Y. 13026, John D. Wilson, president	3,379	19
26	Westchester Cmty. College, Valhalla, N.Y. 12992, Philip C. Martin, president	10,195	75
15	Yeshiva Beth Shearim Mishine, 5305 16th Ave. NYC, N.Y. 11204, Rabbi Samuel Blum, exec. director	12,248	63
20	Yeshiva University, New York. N.Y. 10033, Samuel Belkin, president	216,240	951
	NORTH CAROLINA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 108)		
	Total	3,103,817	15,440
8	Anson Technical Institute, Ansonville, N.C. 28007, Donald R. Warren, president	3,360	18
9	Appalachian State University, Boone, N.C. 28608, Herbert W. Wey, president	123,274	540
11	Asheville-Buncombe Tech. Institute, Asheville, N.C. 28801, Thomas W. Simpson, president	2,400	13
2	Atlantic Christian Col., Wilson N.C. 27893, Arthur D. Wenger, president	36,360	170
9	Barber-Scotia College, Concord, N.C. 28025, Jerome L. Gresham, president	40,443	247
1	Beaufort Co. Technical Inst., Washington, N.C. 27889, Charles H. Byrd, president	14,829	73
10	Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, N.C. 28012, John P. Bradley, president	7,840	38
6	Bennett College, Greensboro, N.C. 27402, Issac H. Miller, Jr., president	48,423	257
17	Bladen Tech. Inst., Elizabethtown, N.C. 28337, George I. Resseguie, president	3,949	24
11	Brevard College. Brevard, N.C. 28712, Robert A. Davis, president	8,897	34
9	Caldwell Tech. Inst., Lenoire, N.C. 28803, H. Edwin Beam, president	14,388	81
3	Campbell College, Buies Creek, N.C. 27506, Norman A. Wiggins, president	58,200	284
3	Carteret Technical Inst., Morehead City, N.C. 28557, Henry J. McGee Jr., president	5,500	27
9	Catawba College, Salisbury, N.C. 28144, Martin L. Shotzberger, president	3,931	18
1	Catawba Valley Tech. Institute, Hickory, N.C. 28601, Robert E. Papp, president	10,800	49
8	Central Carolina Tech. Inst., Sanford, N.C. 27330, J. F. Hockaday, president	8,400	43
8	Central Piedmont Cmty. Col., Charlotte, N.C. 28204, Richard H. Hagemeyer, president	25,800	120
1	Chowan College, Murfreesboro, N.C. 27855, Bruce E. Whitaker, president	12,541	61
5	Cleveland Technical Institute, Shelby, N.C. 28150, James B. Petty, president	6,279	30
1	College of the Albemarle, Elizabeth City, N.C. 27909, S. B. Petteway, president	16,481	99
3	Costal Carolina Cmty. College, Jacksonville, N.C. 28540, James L. Henderson Jr., president	7,200	42
1	Craven Co. Tech. Inst., New Bern, N.C. 28560, Thurman Brock, president	$5,736	31
6	Davidson Co. Cmty. Col., Lexington, N.C. 27292, Grady E. Love, president	7,105	31
8	Davidson College, Davidson, N.C. 28036, Samuel R. Spencer, president	14,732	79
5	Duke University, Durham, N.C. 27706, Terry Sanford, chancellor	50,400	197
5	Durham Business College, Durham, N.C. 27707, Mrs. L. McCauley Harris, president	40,200	204
5	Durham Tech. Inst., Durham, N.C. 27703, H. K. Collins, president	11,023	50
1	East Carolina Univ., Greeville, N.C. 27834, Leo W. Jenkins, President	94,050	428
2	Edgecombe County Technical Insti., Tarboro, N.C. 27886, Charles B. McIntyre, President	11,412	52
1	Elizabeth City State University, Elizabeth City, N.C. 27909, Marion D. Thorpe, President	146,072	737
6	Elon College, Elon College, N.C. 27244, J. Earl Danieley, President	20,400	100
7	Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, N.C, 28301, Charles A. Lyons Jr., President	175,488	859
7	Fayetteville Tech. Inst., Fayetteville, N.C., 28303, Howard E. Boudreau, President	13,271	67
5	Forsyth Technical Inst., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27103, Ernest B Parry, President	9,390	52
10	Gardner Webb College, Boiling Springs, N.C. 28017, E. Eugene Poston, President	39,600	194
10	Gaston College Gastonia, N.C. 28034, W. B. Sugg, President	11,700	67
6	Greensboro College, Greensboro, N.C. 27402, David G. Mobberley, President	13,008	51
6	Guilford College, Greensboro, N.C. 27410, Grimsley T. Hobbs, President	1,951	12
6	Guilford Technical Institute, Jamestown, N.C. 27282, Luther R. Medlin, President	7,988	42
2	Halifax County Technical Institute, Weidon, 27890, Phillip W. Taylor, President	10,336	44
11	Haywood Tech. Inst., Clyde, N.C. 28721, M. C. Nix, President	1,990	9
6	High Point College High Point, N.C. 27262, Wendell M. Patton Jr., President	4,627	19
11	Isothermal Cmty Col., Spindale, N.C. 28160, Fred J. Eason, President	6,609	36
3	James Sprunt Institute, Kenansville, N.C. 27699, Dixon S. Hall, president	6,685	44
8	Johnson C. Smith Univ., Charlotte, N.C. 28208, Lionel H. Newsom, president	66,756	358
99	Johnston Cty. Tech. Institute, Smithfield, N.C. 27577, John L. Tart, president	5,847	31
5	Kernersville Wesleyan College, Kernersville, N.C. 27284, Gordon E. Miller, president	2,304	10
2	Kittrell Col., Kittrell, N.C. 27544, Rev. L. G. Horton, president	66,774	309
10	Lees McRae College, Banner Elk, N.C. 28604, H. C. Evans, president	21,000	113
2	Lenoir Co. Cmty. Col., Kinston, N.C. 28501, Ben E. Fountain, Jr., president	15,158	68
10	Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory, N.C. 28601, Raymond M. Bost, president	6,000	35
9	Livingstone College, Salisbury, N.C. 28144 F. George Shipman, president	49,189	312
2	Louisburg College, Louisburg, N.C. 27549, C. W. Robbins, president	8,724	47
11	Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, N.C. 28754, Dr. Fred Bentley, president	31,024	121
1	Martin Tech. Inst., Williamston, N.C. 27892, E. M. Hunt, president	5,838	28
4	Meredith College, Raleigh, N.C. 27602, E. Bruce Heilman, president	15,600	66
7	Methodist College, Fayetteville, N.C. 28301, L. Stacy Weaver, president	12,600	62
7	Miller-Motte Bus. Col., Wilmington, N.C. 28401, Homer W. Miller, president	6,796	34
10	Mitchell College, Statesville, N.C. 28677, Barton Herrscher, president	8,500	42
8	Montgomery Tech. Inst., Troy, N.C. 27371, David H. Bland, President	1,645	8
11	Montreat-Anderson Col., Montreat, N.C. 28757, C. Grier Davis, President	12,000	57
3	Mount Olive Jr. Col., Inc., Mount Olive, N.C. 28365, W. Burkette Raper, President	16,200	96
6	N.C. Agric. & Tech. St. Univ., Greensboro, N.C. 27411, L. C. Dowdy, President	210,420	1,254
5	N.C. School of the Arts, Winston-Salem, N.C. 27107, Robert Ward, President	15,000	65
2	Nash Technical Inst., Rocky Mount, N.C. 27801, Jack Ballard, President	10,836	50
4	N.C. State U. at Raleigh, Raleigh, N.C. 27607, John T. Caldwell, Chancellor	99,000	486
5	North Carolina Central Univ., Durham, N.C. 27707, Albert N. Whiting, President	179,992	874
4	North Carolina Wesleyan College, Rocky Mt., N.C., 27801 Thomas A. Collins, President	2,895	15
1	Pamlico Technical Institute, Alliance, N.C. 28509, Paul H. Johnson, President	3,100	13
7	Pembroke State University, Pembroke, N.C. 28372, English E. Jones, President	36,350	180
2	Person Tech. Inst, Roxboro, N.C. 27573, Craven H. Sumerell, President	1,934	8
9	Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer, N.C. 28109, Jack J. Early, President	11,550	57

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NORTH CAROLINA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 108)—Continued		
1	Pitt Technical Inst., Greenville, N.C. 27834, William F. Fulford, Acting President	$9,600	43
8	Queens College, Inc., Charlotte, N.C. 28207, John E. Smylie, President	7,978	43
4	Randolph Technical Institute, Asheboro, N.C. 27203, M. H. Branson, President	2,610	10
8	Richmond Tech. Inst., Hamlet, N.C. 28345, Joseph H. Nanney, acting president	5,542	25
1	Roanoke-Chowan Tech. Inst., Amoskie, N.C. 27910, J. W. Young, president	6,000	26
7	Robeson Tech. Inst., St. Pauls, N.C. 28384, R. Craig Allen, president	2,617	14
5	Rockingham Cmty. Col., Wentworth, N.C. 27375, Gerald B. James, president	16,599	93
8	Rowan Tech. Inst., Salisbury, N.C. 28114, C. Merrill Hamilton, president	2,220	8
10	Scared Heart College, Belmont, N.C. 28012, Sister M. Stephen, president	11,458	68
3	Sampson Tech. Inst., Clinton, N.C. 28328, James E. Vann, president	6,062	29
4	Sandhills Cmty. Col., Southern Pines, N.C. 28387, Raymond A. Stone, president	15,000	84
4	Shaw University, Raleigh, N.C. 27602, King V. Cheek, president	116,849	701
7	Southeastern Cmty. Col., Whiteville, N.C. 28472, W. T. Cottingham, president	22,578	102
11	Southwestern Tech. Inst., Sylva, N.C. 28779, Edward E. Bryson, president	8,561	39
3	Southwood College, Salemburg, N.C. 28385, William J. Blanchard, president	4,412	30
7	St. Andrews Presby. Col., Laurinburg, N.C. 28352, Donald Hart, president	21,000	90
4	St. Augustines Col., Raleigh, N.C. 27602, Prezell R. Robinson, president	143,132	634
9	Surry Cmty. Col., Dobson, N.C. 27017, I. John Krepick, president	13,507	63
6	Tech. Inst. of Alamance, Burlington, N.C. 27215, William E. Taylor, president	6,804	36
4	Univ. of N.C. at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514, J. Carlyle Sitterson, chancellor	114,569	618
6	Univ. of N.C. at Greensboro, Greensboro, N.C. 27412, James S. Ferguson, Chancellor	61,249	287
11	Univ. of N.C. at Asheville, Asheville, N.C. 28802, William E. Highsmith, chancellor	21,102	112
8	Univ. of N.C. at Charlotte, Charlotte, N.C. 28205, Dean W. Colvard, chancellor	27,000	145
7	Univ. of N.C. at Wilmington, Wilmington, N.C. 28401, William H. Wagoner, president	9,081	42
11	Vance County Technical Institute, Henderson, N.C. 27536, Dr. Donald R. Mohorn, president	5,904	20
4	W. W. Holding Technical Inst., Raleigh, N.C. 27603, Robert W. Lemay, Jr., president	5,037	21
5	Wake Forest Univ., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27106, James R. Scales, president	12,772	58
11	Warren Wilson College, Inc., Swannanoa, N.C., 28778, Arthur M. Bannerman, president	71,575	366
3	Wayne Cmty. Col., Goldsboro, N.C. 27530, Clyde A. Erwin, president	18,470	112
11	Western Carolina College, Cullowhee, N.C. 28723, Alex S. Pow, president	65,100	321
10	Western Piedmont Cmty. Col,, Morganton, N.C. 28655, Gordon C. Blank, president	6,823	37
9	Wilkes Cmty. Col., Wilkesboro, N.C. 28697, H.E. Thompson, president	4,320	20
8	Wingate College, Wingate, N.C. 28174, Budd E. Smith, president	4,500	22
5	Winston-Salem Bus. Col., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102, J. Robert Middleton, president	7,500	40
5	Winston-Salem State University, Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102, Kenneth R. Williams, president	158,386	601
7	Womick Selenia Bus. College, Lumberton, N.C. 28358 H. Worth Womick, Jr	1,800	8
	NORTH DAKOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 16) Totals	218,075	1,611
2	Bismarck Jr. College, Bismarck, N. Dak. 58501, Ralph Werner, president	3,900	34
2	Dickinson State College, Dickinson, N. Dak. 58601, R. C. Gillund, president	11,400	96
1	Jamestown College, Jamestown, N. Dak. 58401, Roy J. Stuckey, president	7,529	58
1	Lake Region Jr. College, Devils Lake, N. Dak. 58301, Merril Berg, dean	2,880	28
2	Mary College, Bismarck, N. Dak. 58501, Harold Miller, president	12,549	98
1	Mayville State College, Mayville, N. Dak. 58257, T. S. Jenkins, president	8,800	62
2	Minot Col. of Business, Minot, N. Dak. 58702, Lloyd W. Hansen, president	2,351	17
2	Minot State College, Minot, N. Dak. 58701, Gordon Olson, president	10,040	94
1	N. Dak. State School Sci., Wahpeton, N. Dak. 58075, Clare T. Blikre, president	18,071	118
2	NSDU—Bottineau Branch & Inst. Forestry, Bottineau, N. Dak. 58318, C. N. Nelson, president	432	4
1	North Dakota State Univ., Fargo, N. Dak. 58102, Laurel Loftsgard, president	42,450	291
2	Northwest Bible College, Minot, N. Dak. 58701, Laud O. Vaught, president	$624	5
1	U. of North Dakota Ellendale Br., Ellendale, N. Dak. 58436, Merton W. Andresen, dean	4,712	30
1	Univ. of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak. 58202, Thomas J. Clifford, president	74,393	542
2	Univ. of North Dakota, Williston, N. Dak. 58801, Garvin L. Stevens, dean	5,130	34
1	Valley City State College, Valley City, N. Dak. 58072, Howard Rose, president	12,734	100
	OHIO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 81)		
	Total	4,439,999	20,625
7	Antioch College, Yellow Sprgs., Ohio 45387, James P. Dixon, president	259,687	1,301
1	Art Academy of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, Phillip H. Adams, director	533	3
17	Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio 44805, Glenn L. Clayton, president	8,447	33
1	Athenaeum of Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio 45212, Robert H. Tensing, president	11,000	46
23	Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio 44017, Alfred B. Bonds, president	89,999	250
18	Belmont County Tech. Inst., St. Clairsville, Ohio 43950, John J. Shannon, superintendent	3,286	21
12	Bliss College, Columbus, Ohio 43215, Gerald Wickham, president	10,000	43
4	Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio 45817, Mark Houshower, acting president	38,000	154
11	Borromeo Sem. of Ohio, Wickliffe, Ohio 44092, Robert C. Wolfe, rector	5,600	22
5	Bowling Green State Univ., Bowling Green, Ohio 43402, Hollis A. Moore, president	35,549	161
12	Capital University, Columbus, Ohio 43209, Thomas H. Langevin, president	48,482	217
22	Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio 44106, Louis A. Toepfer, acting president	116,162	600
7	Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio 45384, Lewis A. Jackson, acting president	315,609	1,524
7	Clark Co. Tech. Inst., Springfield, Ohio 45502, R. O. Brinkman, president	2,500	17
20	Cleveland State Univ., Cleveland, Ohio 44115, Harold L. Enarson, president	140,800	528
2	Col. Mt. St. Joseph on Ohio, Mt. St. Joseph, Ohio 45051, Sister Adele Clifford, president	5,306	29
18	College of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio 43952, Kevin R. Keelan, president	34,400	150
17	College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio 44691, J. Garber Drushel, president	14,133	71
12	Columbus Col. of Art & Design, Columbus, Ohio 43215, Joseph V. Canzani, dean	21,399	93
12	Columbus Technical Inst., Columbus, Ohio 43215, Clinton E. Tatsch, exec. director	14,635	98
20	Cuyahoga Community Col., Cleveland, Ohio 44115, Charles E. Chapman, president	59,596	278
17	Denison University, Granville, Ohio 43023, Joel P. Smith, president	7,675	35
1	Edgecliff Col., Cincinnati, Ohio 45206, Jane Kirchner, president	8,350	45
8	Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio 45840, Ivan E. Frick, president	11,953	54
5	Four Co. Technical Inst., Archbold, Ohio 43502, Robert J. Durbin, president	4,400	24
7	Hamma School of Theology, Springfield, Ohio 45501, Dr. Frederick K. Wentz, president	44,299	136
8	Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio 44883, Leslie H. Fishel, Jr., president	10,767	52
11	Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio 44234, Elmer Jagow, president	41,273	181
22	John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio 44118, Henry F. Birkenhauer, president	12,660	65
11	Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44240, Robert I. White, president	115,212	669
13	Lorain Co. Cmty. College, Elyria 44035, Max J. Lerner, president	36,398	183
16	Malone College, Canton, Ohio 44709, Everett L. Cattell, president	8,827	52
10	Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio 45750, Frank E. Duddy, Jr., president	21,914	154
9	Mary Manse College, Toledo, Ohio 43620, Rose Margaret Dostal, president	8,443	56
12	Meth. Theol. Sch. in Ohio, Delware, Ohio 43015, John W. Dickhaut, president	17,951	87
24	Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056, Phillip R. Zhriver, president	35,416	221
3	Miami-Jacobs Jr. Col. of Business, Dayton, Ohio 54501, Charles P. Harbottle, president	19,074	107
99	Miller & Draughan College, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, Charles Vance, president	9,600	42
16	Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio 44601, Ronald G. Weber, president	7,650	38
17	Mount Vernon Nazarene Col., Mt. Vernon, Ohio 43050, Stephenson W. Nease, president	14,638	98
10	Muskingum Area Tech. School, Zanesville, Ohio 43701, Walker J. Huffman, director	15,318	107
17	Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio 43762, William P. Miller, acting president	7,166	35
8	N. Central Ohio Tech. Inst., Mansfield, Ohio 44906, Henry R. Fallerius, president	24,558	12

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	OHIO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 81)—Con.		
22	Notre Dame College, Cleveland, Ohio 44121, Sister Mary Luke, president	$15,198	64
13	Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio 44074, Robert W. Fuller, president	20,186	136
22	Ohio Col. of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio 44106, Abe Rubin, chief admin. officer	13,284	70
12	Ohio Dominican Col., Columbus, Ohio 43219, Sister M. Suzanne Uhrhane, president	35,257	201
4	Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio 45810, Samuel L. Meyer, president	50,401	294
15	Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, Novice G. Fawcett, president	729,107	3,337
12	Ohio Technical Institute, Columbus, Ohio 43219, Eugene F. Christopher, director	20,000	67
10	Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701, Claude R. Sowle, president	312,000	1,130
12	Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware Ohio 43015, Thomas E. Wenzlau, president	23,290	113
12	Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio 43081, Lynn Warren Turner, president	86,000	386
5	Penta County Voc. Sch. Tech. Col., Perrysburg, Ohio 43551, Jacob H. See, president	7,498	33
12	Pontifical Col. Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio 43085, Rt. Rev. Thomas P. Campbell, president	4,800	26
6	Portsmouth Interstate Business Col., Portsmouth, Ohio 45662, Leo Blackburn, president	12,029	68
8	Providence Hospital Sch. of Nursing, Sandusky, Ohio 44870, Sister M. Lucia Pelo, administrator	8,849	42
11	Rabbinical Col. of Telshe, Wickliffe, Ohio 44092, Rabbi Modecai Gifter, dean	25,084	139
10	Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio 45674, Alphus R. Christensen, president	13,137	62
3	Sinclair Community College, Dayton, Ohio 45402, Marvin Knudson, president	32,376	160
1	Southern Ohio Col., Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, Kenneth L. Boerstler, director	11,458	528
3	St. Elizabeth Med. Ctr. Sch. of Nursing, Dayton, Ohio 45406, Sister M. Lucy Farrell, RN., MSN, administrator	12,000	52
20	St. John Col. of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio 44114, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lawrence P. Cahill, president	20,081	153
99	The Deaconess Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45219, Leland E. White, administrator	11,220	35
10	Tri-County Tech. Inst., Nelsonville, Ohio, 45764, John J. Light, vice president	6,377	33
3	United Theological Sem., Dayton, Ohio 45406, John R. Knecht, president	25,817	129
14	University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44304, Dominic J. Guzzetta, president	120,522	446
2	University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, Walter C. Langsam, president	100,423	476
3	University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio 45409, Very Rev. Raymond A. Roesch, president	130,000	589
9	University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606, William S. Carlson, president	89,226	446
7	Urbana College, Urbana, Ohio 43078, Paul Zehner, president	18,146	127
22	Ursuline College, Cleveland, Ohio 44124, Sister Kenan Dulzer, president	5,766	35
16	Walsh College, Canton, Ohio 44720, Robert Francoeur, president	16,800	67
24	Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio 45056, W. C. Spencer, president	8,417	49
99	Whiting Business College, Cleveland, Ohio 44113, Robert M. Whiting, president	18,524	86
7	Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio 45384, Rembert E. Stokes, president	441,267	2,029
24	Wilmington College, Wilmington Ohio 45177, W. Brooke Morgan, Acting president	42,400	203
7	Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio 45501, Dr. G. Kenneth Andeen, president	30,907	141
7	Wright State Univ., Dayton, Ohio 45431, B. Golding, president	186,803	823
1	Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio 45207, Victor B. Nieporte, acting president	8,250	36
19	Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio 44503, Albert Leroy Pugsley, president	18,434	67
	OKLAHOMA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 40)		
	Total	1,096,972	6,138
4	Altus Jr. College, Altus, Okla. 73521, Cecil R. Chesser, campus administrator	6,454	33
2	Bacone College, Bacone, Okla. 74420, Garold D. Holstine, president	26,811	116
2	Bartlesville Wesleyan Col., Bartlesville, Okla. 74003, Leo Cox, president	6,967	39
5	Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany Okla. 73008, Roy H. Cantrell, president	21,544	88
4	Cameron State Agric Col, Lawton, Okla. 73501, Don Owen, president	43,378	234
5	Central State College, Edmond, Okla. 73034, Garland Godfrey, president	26,819	167
2	Connors State College, Warner, Okla. 74469, Melvin Self, president	12,466	60
1	Draughon Sch of Bus Lsi, Tulsa, Okla. 74119, Walter J. Tribbey, president	6,196	34
3	Duncan Area Voc Tech Ctr, Duncan, Okla. 73533, Bob M. Brandeberry, supt	2,034	10
3	East Central State Col., Ada, Okla. 74820, Stanley P. Wagner, president	46,067	290
3	Eastern Okla State Col, Wilburton, Okla. 74578, James Miller, president	$9,452	69
3	Kiamichi Area Voc-Tech SD7, Wilburton, Okla. 74578, Bill G. Powers, superintendent	2,034	10
4	Langston University, Langston, Okla. 73050, William E. Sims, president	37,671	200
3	Murray State Col. of Agr. App. SC, Tishomingo, Okla. 73460, Clyde R. Kindell, president	11,79	66
2	Northeastern Oklahoma A. & M. College, Miami, Okla. 74354, D. D. Creech, president	38,427	240
2	Northeastern State Col., Tahlequah, Okla, 74464, Robert. Collier, president	124,542	827
6	Northern Okla. College, Tonkawa, Okla. 74653, Edwin E. Vineyard, president	8,379	50
6	Northwestern State Col., Alva, Okla. 73717, J. W. Martin, president	17,227	97
5	Okla. State Univ. Tech. Inst., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73106, Philip P. Chandler, director	4,669	40
6	Okla. St. U. Agric. & App. Sci., Stillwater, Okla. 74074, Robert B. Kamm, President	94,938	546
2	Okla. St. Univ. Schl. of Tech. Training, Okmulgee, Okla. 74447, Wayne W. Miller, director	155,557	598
4	Oklahoma Baptist Univ., Shawnee, Okla. 74801, Robert L. Lynn, interim president	7,277	47
5	Oklahoma Christian Col., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73111, J. O. Baird, president	15,823	79
5	Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73106, Dr. Dolphus Whitten, Jr., acting president	13,137	73
4	Oklahoma Col. of Liberal Arts, Chickasha, Okla. 73018, Robert L. Martin, president	11,505	66
2	Oklahoma Military Acad., Claremore, Okla. 74017, Col. John E. Horne, president	11,689	49
1	Oral Roberts Univ., Tulsa, Okla. 74105, Oral Roberts, president	4,520	26
4	Oscar Rose Junior College, Midwest City, Okla. 73110, Dr. Jacob Johnson, executive officer	8,167	53
6	Panhandle St. Col. Agr. and App. Sci., Goodwell, Okla. 73939, Freeman McKee, president	7,120	38
1	Phillips University, Univ. Station, Enid, Okla. 73701, Hallie G. Gantz, president	17,095	86
3	Poteau Cmty. College, Poteau, Okla., 74953, Orville Johnson, president	21,223	134
3	Seminole Junior College, Seminole, Okla., 74686, Elmer Tanner, president	9,341	50
3	Southeastern State Col., Durant, Okla., 74701, Leon Hibbs, president	62,734	398
5	Southwestern College, Okla. City, Okla., 73127, W. R. Corvin, president	3,813	35
6	Southwestern State Col., Weatherford, Okla., 73096, Al Harris, president	44,381	262
4	St. Gregorys College, Shawnee, Okla. 74801, Michael Roethler, president	2,914	22
2	Tri Co Area Voc. Tech. Sch., Bartlesville, Okla., 74003, Kenneth Phelps, superintendent	2,712	15
2	Tulsa Jr. College, Tulsa, Okla., 74119, Alfred M. Philips, president	10,894	83
4	University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., 73069, Pete Kyle McCarter, president	132,222	766
1	University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla., 74104, J. Paschal Twyman, president	6,984	42
	OREGON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 36)		
	Total	896,928	5,915
2	Blue Mountain Cmty. Col., Pendleton, Oreg., 97801, Wallace W. McCrae, president	7,325	52
2	Central Oregon Col., Bend, Oreg., 97701, Frederick H. Boyle, president	11,335	79
2	Chemeketa Cmty. Col., Salem, Oreg., 97303, Paul F. Wilmeth, director	11,421	70
1	Clackamas Cmty. College, Oregon City, Oreg., 97045, John W. Hakanson, president	6,808	57
1	Clatsop Cmty. Col., Astoria, Oreg., 97103, Philip L. Bainer, president	15,875	93
3	Columbia Christian Col., Portland, Oreg., 97220, Dr. Rex F. Johnston, president	1,895	16
3	Concordia College, Portland, Oreg. 97211, E. P. Weber, president	732	6
2	Eastern Oregon College, La Grande, Oreg. 97850, Averno M. Rempel, president	9,044	63
99	Emanuel Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Portland, Oreg. 97227, Paul R. Hanson, president	3,184	24
1	George Fox College, Newberg, Oreg. 97132, David Le Shana, actg. president	7,020	41
4	Lane Community College, Eugene, Oreg. 97402, Eldon Schafer, president	69,635	527
1	Lewis & Clark College, Portland, Oreg. 97219, John R. Howard, president	16,231	105
1	Linfield College, McMinnville, Oreg. 97128, Gordon C. Bjork, president	11,997	84
4	Linn Benton Cmty. Col., Albany, Oreg. 97321, Raymond Needham, president	6,295	44
1	Marylhurst College, Marylhurst. Oreg. 97036, Robert Krupp, president	2,199	20
2	Mount Angel College, Mt. Angel, Oreg. 97362, Christian Mondor, president	2,744	27
2	Mount Angel Seminary, St. Benedict, Oreg. 97373, Rev. Boniface Lautz Osb., president-rector	689	7
3	Mount Hood Cmty. Col., Gresham, Oreg. 97030, Earl L. Klapstein, president	18,294	125

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	OREGON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 36)—Con.		
3	Museum Art School, Portland, Oreg. 97205, William H. Givler, dean	$1,825	10
1	Oregon College of Educ., Monmuth, Oreg. 97361, Leonard W. Rice, president	53,798	285
1	Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg. 97331, Robert Mac Vicar, president	129,236	819
2	Oregon Tech. Institute, Klamath Falls, Oreg. 97601, W. D. Purvine, president	9,862	68
1	Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oreg. 97116, Brock Dixon, Provost	9,510	68
3	Portland Cmty. College, Portland, Oreg. 97201, Amo DeBernardis, President	70,747	401
3	Portland State Univ., Portland, Oreg. 97207, Gregory B. Wolfe, President	200,701	1,331
3	Reed College, Portland, Oreg. 97202, Ross B. Thompson, Acting President	12,314	83
4	Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oreg. 97520, James K. Sours, President	32,205	242
4	Southwestern Ore. Cmty. Col., Coos Bay, Oreg. 97420, Jack E. Brookins, President	8,043	67
2	Treasure Valley Cmty. Col., Ontario, Oreg. 97914, Emery Skinner, President	17,227	109
1	U. of Oreg. Dental Sch., Portland, Oreg. 97201, Louis G. Terkla, Dean	5,065	33
4	Umpqua Community Col., Roseburg, Oreg. 97470, Harry Jacoby, President	5,672	39
4	University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg. 97403, Robert D. Clark, President	123,056	806
3	University of Portland, Portland, Oreg. 97203, Rev. Paul E. Waldschmidt, President	3,880	29
3	Warner Pacific College, Portland, Oreg. 97215, E. Joe Gilliam, President	3,741	33
3	Western Conservative Theo. Sem., Portland, Or. 97215 Earl Radmacher, President	1,270	10
2	Willamette University, Salem, Oreg. 97301, Roger J. Fritz, President	6,053	42
	PENNSYLVANIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 121)		
	Total	4,772,275	23,144
6	Albright College, Reading, Pa. 19604, Arthur L. Schultz, President	1,980	8
24	Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 16335, Lawrence L. Pelletier, President	15,217	90
8	Allentown Col. St. Francis De Sales, Center Valley, Pa. 18034, Very Rev. J. Stuart Dooling, president	18,313	84
24	Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa. 16403, Henry J. Parcinski, president	4,561	24
6	Alvernia College, Reading, Pa. 19607, Mary Victorina, president	6,292	35
13	Beaver College, Glenside, Pa. 19038, Edward D. Gates, president	21,000	92
11	Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Pa. 17815, Robert J. Nossen, president	43,962	217
13	Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010, Harris L. Wofford, Jr., president	18,144	62
17	Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 17837, Frederick P. Sample, president	17,787	108
8	Bucks Co. Community Col., Newtown, Pa. 18940, Charles E. Rollins, president	25,448	130
25	Butler Co. Cmty. Col., Butler, Pa. 16001, Thomas Hoeve, president	9,878	56
7	Cabrini College, Radnor, Pa. 19088, Regina Casey, president	4,000	17
26	California State College, California, Pa. 15419, George H. Roadman, president	180,206	730
14	Carlow College, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213, Sister M. Camillus Scully, president	26,134	144
14	Carnegie Mellon Univ., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213, H. Guyford Stever, president	64,306	255
15	Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pa. 18104, Pauline Tompkins, president	3,905	22
14	Chatham College, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232, Edward D. Eddy, president	54,400	212
9	Cheyney State College, Cheyney, Pa. 19319, Wade Wilson, president	92,640	401
22	Christ the Saviour Sem., Johnstown, Pa. 15906, Most Rev. John R. Martin, rector	680	5
22	Clarion State College, Clarion, Pa. 16214, James Gemmell, President	117,412	719
14	Cmty. Col. of Allegheny Co.-Cent. Ofc., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219, Kermit C. Morrissey, President	239,889	978
25	Cmty. Col. of Beaver Co., Freedom, Pa. 15042, H. B. Monroe, President	34,240	206
7	Cmty. Col. of Delaware Co., Media, Pa. 19063, Douglas F. Libby, Jr., President	11,270	42
11	College Misericordia, Dallas, Pa. 18612, Sister Miriam Teresa O'Donnell, President	15,832	66
3	Community Col. of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107, Allen T. Bonnell, President	193,024	861
8	Del. Val. Col. of Sci. & Agri., Doylestown, Pa. 18901, James Work, President	39,790	185
19	Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 17013, Howard L. Rubendall, President	52,457	252
1	Drexel Inst. of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104, William W. Hagerty, President	78,089	402
2	Dropsie Univ., Philadelphia, Pa. 19132, Abraham I. Katsh, President	6,125	27
14	Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219, Rev. Henry J. McAnulty, President	81,183	490
15	East Stroudsburg St. Col., E. Stroudsburg, Pa. 18301, Frank D. Sills, President	$64,514	304
7	Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pa. 19087, Dr. J. Lester Harnish, President	22,181	137
24	Edinboro State College, Edinboro, Pa. 16412, Chester T. McNerney, Acting President	61,273	369
15	Electronics Training Ctr., Allentown, Pa. 18104, M. Michael Freedland, President	6,714	52
16	Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022, Morley J. Mays, president	12,943	70
7	Ellen Cushing Jr. College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010, Warren Mild, president	9,562	46
16	Franklin & Marshall Col., Lancaster, Pa. 17604, Keith Spalding, president	48,436	270
24	Gannon College, Erie, Pa. 16501, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Wilfred J. Nash, president	91,169	457
25	Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa. 15010, Edwin C. Clarke, president	9,881	43
13	Gwynedd-Mercy College, Gwynedd Valley, Pa. 19437, Sister Mary Gregory, president	4,504	18
3	Hahnemann Med. Col. & Hosp., Philadelphia, Pa. 19102, Charles S. Cameron, president	4,862	26
17	Harrisburg Area Cmty. College, Harrisburg, Pa. 17110, Clyde E. Blocker, president	13,907	61
13	Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 19041, John R. Coleman, president	18,084	69
4	Holy Family College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19114, Sister M. Aloysius, president	3,663	16
9	Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pa. 19345, Sister Mary of Lourdes, president	14,515	72
22	Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pa. 15701, William W. Hassler, president	254,368	1,316
6	Industrial Management Inst., Reading, Pa. 19601, Joseph E. Russon, president	11,781	52
22	Jefferson Co. Dubois Avts, Reynoldsville, Pa. 15851, Edward Lloyd, admin. director	3,480	15
12	Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa. 16652, John N. Stauffer, president	21,810	90
10	Keystone Jr. College, La Plume, Pa. 18440, Harry K. Miller, Jr., president	12,867	56
11	Kings College, Wilkes Barre, Pa. 18702, Rev. Lane D. Kilburn, president	80,000	376
6	Kutztown State College, Kutztown, Pa. 19530, Lawrence M. Strattan, president	48,469	200
18	La Roche College, Allison Park, Pa. 15101, Delasalle Mahler, acting president	20,826	104
5	La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19141. Brother Daniel Burke, FCS., president	46,429	326
10	Lackawanna Jr. Coll., Scranton, Pa. 18510, Cr. Walther Thomas, president	10,247	46
16	Lancaster Gen. Hosp. Sch. of Nrsg., Lancaster, Pa., Paul Wedel, president	1,592	14
16	Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa. 17003, Allan Mund, president	5,600	29
8	Lehigh Co. Community Col., Schnecksville. 18078, John G. Berrier, president	6,940	29
15	Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 18015, W. Deming Lewis, president	12,025	54
	Levitan Sch. Inc., The, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102, David S. Levitan, president	13,595	65
9	Lincoln University, Lincoln Univ., Pa. 19352, Herman Branson, president	113,187	402
23	Lock Haven State College, Lock Haven, Pa. 17745, Francis Hamblin, president	48,413	239
19	Lutheran Theol Semny., Gettysburg, Pa. 17325, Donald Heiges, president	17,500	78
11	Luzerne Co. Cmty. Col., Wilkes Barre, Pa. 18701, Guy V. Ferrell, president	14,783	67
17	Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pa. 17704, Rev. Harold H. Hutson, president	26,114	99
10	Mansfield State College, Mansfield, Pa. 16933, Lawrence Park, president	25,194	146
10	Marywood College, Scranton, Pa., 18509, Sister M. Coleman Nee, president	32,962	153
2	Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 19129, Glen R. Leymaster, president	16,091	78
2	Mercy. Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Scranton, Pa. 18501, M. William Lydon, administrator	4,000	16
24	Mercyhurst College, Erie, Pa. 16501, Sister M. Carolyn Herrmann, president	10,983	55
19	Messiah College, Grantham, Pa. 17027, D. Ray Hostetter, president	150,800	568
16	Millersville State Col., Millersville, Pa. 17551, William H. Duncan, president	44,647	250
13	Montgomery Co. Cmty. College, Conshohocken, Pa. 19428, Leroy Brendlinger, president	19,104	87
15	Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa. 18018, Dr. Herman Collier, president	10,732	47
22	Mount Aloysius, Jr., College, Cresson, Pa. 16630, Sister Mary Ursula, president	4,327	18
25	New Castle Bus. Col., New Castle, Pa. 16101, G. C. Lyon, director	22,900	108
21	New Kensington Commercial Sch., New Kensington, Pa. 15068, Harry E. Ryan, president	1,806	8
15	Northampton Co. Area Cmty. Col., Bethlehem, Pa. 18042, Pa., 18042, Richard C. Richardson, Jr., president	6,759	22
7	Northeastern Christian Junior Col., Villanova, Pa. 19085, Elza Huffard, president	13,958	70
9	Our Lady of Angels Col., Glen Riddle, Pa. 19037, Mother Mary Everilda, president	488	3
9	P. M. C. Colleges, Chester, Pa. 19013, Clarence R. Moll, president	33,180	157

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	PENNSYLVANIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 121)—Con.		
3	Peirce Junior College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102, Thomas M. Peirce III, president	$6.283	28
3	Pennsylvania Col. of Podiatry, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107, James E. Bates, president	10,736	59
23	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, Pa., 16802, J. W. Oswald, president	156,260	565
2	Phila. Col. of Tex. & Sci., Philadelphia, Pa., 19144, Bertrand W. Hayward, president	4,860	24
1	Phila. Col. Pharmacy & Sci., Philadelphia, Pa. 45817, Arthur Osol, president	2,560	14
3	Phila. College of Art, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102, George D. Culler, president	17,714	87
3	Phila. College of Bible, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103, Douglas B. MacCorkle, president	49,375	183
3	Phila. Musical Academy, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103, Joseph Castaldo, president	18,017	91
99	Philco Tech. Institute, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107, Benjamin J. Penstero, director	19,452	87
14	Point Park College, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222, Arthur M. Blum, president	28,287	126
14	Robert Morris Jr. College Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219, Charles L. Sewall, president	14,094	65
13	Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa. 19010, Mother Mary George, president	9,766	37
2	Ryder Technical Institution, Philadelphia, Pa. 19134, M. Michael Freedland, president	7,859	54
21	Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa. 15601, Mary Schmidt, acting president	21,276	106
19	Shippensburg State Col., Shippensburg, Pa. 17257, Gilmore B. Seavers, president	74,048	348
25	Slippery Rock State Col., Slippery Rock, Pa. 16057, Albert A. Watrel, president	56,446	272
13	St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa. 19151, Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Welsh, president	16,958	109
25	St. Fidelis Col. & Sem., Herman, Pa. 16039, Edmund Quinn, president	7,898	35
22	St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa. 15940, Rev. Vincent Negherbon, president	19,672	141
2	St. Josephs College, Philadephia, Pa. 19131, Terrence Toland, president	21,999	85
21	St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pa. 15650, Rev. Fintan Shoniker, OSB, president	17,855	124
17	Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa. 17870, Gustave W. Weber, president	13,870	50
7	Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 19081, Dr. Robert D. Cross, president	11,226	37
3	Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122, Paul R. Anderson, president	345,399	2,075
20	The Wheeler School, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219, Alan Baime, president	4,496	36
24	Thiel College, Greenville, Pa. 16125, Chauncey G. Bly, president	32,803	175
17	Thompson Institute, Harrisburg, Pa. 17101, Gina M. Nelson, executive vice president	2,554	28
1	Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104, Martin Meyerson, president	196,800	940
14	University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213, Wesley W. Posvar, chancellor	188,170	976
10	University of Scranton, Scranton, Pa. 18510, Very Rev. Dexter Hanley, president	93,336	467
13	Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa. 19426, William S. Pettit, president	11,651	35
24	Villa Maria College, Erie, Pa. 16505, Sister M. Lawrence, president	12,800	52
26	Washington & Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 15301, Howard J. Burnett, president	2,991	13
26	Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa. 15370, Bennett M. Rich, president	10,123	45
9	West Chester State Col., West Chester, Pa. 19380, Paul W. Rossey, president	99,200	534
25	Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. 16142, Earland I. Carlson, president	45,461	265
11	Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18703, Francis Michelimi, president	52,234	269
11	Wilkes-Barre Gen. Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18702, Thomas Saxton, administrator	3,570	16
17	Williamsport Area Cmty Col., Williamsport, Pa. 17701, Kenneth E. Carl, president	23,577	134
19	York College of Pa., York, Pa. 17405, Ray A. Miller, president	8,270	47
	RHODE ISLAND (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 12)		
	Total	337,148	1,784
1	Barrington College, Barrington, R.I. 02806, Charles E. Hummel, president	16,075	84
1	Brown University Providence, R.I 02912, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, president	52,690	219
1	Bryant College Providence, R.I 02906, Harry Evarts, acting president	20,529	113
2	Johnson & Wales J.C. of Bus., Providence, R.I. 02903, Morris Gaebe, president	20,880	127
2	Providence College, Providence, R.I. 02918, Rev. W. P. Haas, president	23,200	122
2	Rhode Island College, Providence, R.I. 02908, Joseph E. Kauffman, acting president	58,812	341
2	Rhode Island Junior Col., Providence, R.I. 02908, William, F Flanagan, president	2,601	12
1	Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, R.I. 02903, Talbot Rantoul, president	19,839	79
2	Roger Williams Col., Providence, R.I. 02903, Ralph E. Gauvey, president	$67,837	414
1	Salve Regina College, Newport, R.I. 02840, Sr. M. Christopher O'Rourke, president	8,830	55
2	Sem. of Our Lady of Prov., Warwick, R.I. 02889, Robert J. Randall, rector	6,990	33
2	Univ. of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I. 02881, Dr. Werner A. Baum, president	38,865	185
	SOUTH CAROLINA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 38)		
	Total	1,620,425	6,814
2	Allen University, Columbia, S.C. 29204, J. W. Hairston, president	140,795	589
1	Baptist Col. at Charleston, Charleston, S.C. 29411, John Hamrick, president	110,000	435
2	Benedict College, Columbia, S.C. 29204, Benjamin F. Payton, president	153,000	696
1	Berkeley Charleston Drchstr. Tch. Ed. C., North Charleston, S.C. 29405, Howard J. Hoffberg, director	9,982	49
3	Central Wesleyan College, Central S.C. 29630, Claude R. Rickman, president	12,616	54
5	Chesterfield-Marlboro Educ. Tech. Ctr., Cheraw, S.C. 29520, Thomas J. Ford, director	4,499	17
2	Claflin College, Orangeburg, S.C. 29115, H. V. Manning, president	100,000	396
6	Coker College, Hartsville, S.C. 29550 Gus Tuberville, president	22,096	96
1	College of Charleston, Charleston, S.C. 29401, Theodore S. Stern, president	16,000	70
2	Columbia College, Columbia, S.C. 29203, R. Wright Spears, president	9,000	39
2	Columbia Commercial Col., Columbia, S.C. 29201, Charles Gorman, president	16,000	70
3	Erskine College, Due West, S.C. 29639, Joseph Wightman, acting president	6,997	39
6	Florence-Darlington Tech. Educ. Ctr., Florence, S.C. 29501, Fred Fore, director	17,300	75
6	Francis Marion College, Florence, S.C. 29501, Walter Douglas Smith, President	28,080	122
5	Friendship Jr. Col., Rock Hill, S.C. 29730, James H. Goudlock, president	37,743	140
4	Furman University, Greenville, S. C. 29613, Gordon W. Blackwell, president	9,199	45
4	Greenville Tech. Educ. Center, Greenville S.C. 29605, Donnie E. Garrison, Interim Director	29,998	99
6	Horry-Marion-Georgetown Tech. Ed. Ctr., Conway S.C. 29526, George W. Dudley Jr., Director	11,500	45
3	Lander College, Greenwood, S.C. 29656, E. Don Herd Jr., Jr., president	19,198	83
5	Limestone College, Gaffney S.C. 29340, M. Stanyarne, Bell, president	11,488	48
2	Midlands Tech. Educ. Ctr., Columbia, S.C. 29205, R. L. Grigsby, Executive director	15,783	65
5	Morris College, Sumter, S.C. 29150, H. E. Hardin, Acting president	86,990	419
3	Newberry College, Newberry, S.C. 29108. A. G. D. Wiles, president	2,499	13
2	Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech. Educ. Ctr., Orangeburg, S.C. 29115, Charles P. Weber, Director	14,996	65
1	Palmer College, Charleston, S.C. 29401, Charles E. Palmer president	63,808	308
3	Piedmont Tech. Educ. Center, Greenwood, S.C. 29646 L. D. Walters, Director	9,999	43
4	Presbyterian College, Clinton S.C. 29325, Marc C. Weersing, president	3,500	16
2	South Carolina, St. College, Orangeburg, S.C. 29115, M. Maceo Nance Jr., President	58,998	257
4	Spartanburg Co. Tech. Educ. Ctr., Spartanburg, S.C. 29303, Joe D. Gault, Director	13,418	56
4	Spartanburg Jr. Co., Spartanburg, S.C. 29301, James S. Barrett, president	8,000	35
5	Sumter Area Technical Educ. Ctr., Sumter, S.C. 29150, William Cecil Walters, executive director	7,787	31
3	Tri-County Tech. Educ. Ctr., Pendleton, S.C. 29670, William T. Yarborough, executive director	15,563	56
2	Univ. of S.C. Regional Campuses, Columbia, S.C. 29208, John J. Duffy, president	156,695	553
2	Univ. of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C. 29208, Thomas F. Jones, president	198,236	880
2	Voorhees Col., Denmark, S.C. 29042, Harry P. Graham, acting president	134,998	533
5	Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S.C. 29730, Charles S. Davis, president	32,868	143
4	Wofford College, Spartanburg, S.C. 29301, Paul Hardin, III president	21,999	96
5	York Co. Technical Educ. Ctr., Rock Hill, S.C. 29730, Baxter M. Hood, director	8,797	38
	SOUTH DAKOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 17)		
	Total	406,308	2,145
1	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D. 57102, Charles L. Balcer, president	33,637	168
1	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. 57102, Charles L. Balcer, president	33,637	168
2	Black Hills State College, Spearfish, S. Dak. 57783, Meredith Freeman, president	50,000	293
1	Dakota State Col., Madison, S. Dak. 57042, Harry R. Bowes, president	30,583	221

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	SOUTH DAKOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 17)—Con.		
2	Dakota Wesleyan Univ., Mitchell, S. Dak. 57301, Robert R. Huddleston, president	$13,157	69
1	Freeman Jr. College, Freeman, S. Dak. 57029, Eldon Graber, president	700	4
2	Huron College, Huron, S. Dak. 57350, Richard H. Timmins, president	17,659	107
1	Mount Marty College, Yankton, S. Dak. 57078, Sister M. Evangeline Anderson, president	7,500	44
2	National Col. of Bus., Rapid City, SD. 57701, John W. Hauer, President	9,639	45
1	Northern State College, Aberdeen, SD. 57401, Norbert K. Baumgart, President	41,039	231
2	Northwest Col. of Commerce, Huron, SD. 57350, A. M. Bender, President	1,100	7
1	Presentation College, Aberdeen, SD. 57401, Sister Francis, Mary Dunn, President	1,500	12
2	S. Dak. Sch. Mines & Tech., Rapid City, SD. 57701, H. R. Fraser, President	32,150	127
1	Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, SD. 57101, John L. Butler, President	14,241	85
1	South Dakota State Univ., Brookings, SD. 57006, H. M. Briggs, President	67,500	333
1	Southern State College, Springfield, SD. 57062, Dr. Allen R. Millar, President	8,100	45
1	University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD. 57069, Richard L. Brown, President	69,000	299
1	Yankton College, Yankton, SD. 57078, Fred Honkala, President	8,803	60
	TENNESSEE (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 57)		
	Total	1,728,230	9,938
5	Aquinas Jr. Col., Nashville, TN. 37205, Sister Henry Suso, Fletcher Op., President	1,914	13
6	Austin Peay State Univ., Clarksville, TN. 37040, Joe Morgan, President	36,976	228
5	Belmont College, Nashville, TN. 37203, Herbert C. Gabhart, President	19,334	90
7	Bethel College, McKenzie, TN. 38201, James E. McKee, President	9,403	60
1	Bristol Commercial College, Bristol, TN. 37620, Jack O. Anderson, Education Director	1,313	15
1	Carson Newman College, Jefferson Cty, TN. 37760, John A. Fincher, President	16,596	112
3	Chattanooga St. Tech. Inst., Chattanooga, Tenn. 37403, Edgar H. Sessions, director	12,450	81
9	Christian Brothers Col., Memphis, Tenn. 38104, Malcolm O'Sullivan, president	13,241	73
3	Cleveland State Cmty. College, Cleveland, Tenn. 37311, Dave Adkisson, president	26,640	135
6	Columbia State Cmty. Col., Columbia, Tenn. 38401, Harold S. Pryor, president	11,076	94
4	Cumberland College of Tennessee, Lebanon, Tenn. 37087, Ernest L. Stockton, Jr., president	3,214	27
5	David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn. 37203, Athens C. Pullias, president	10,044	79
5	Draughons Business Col., Nashville, Tenn. 37203, C. W. Davidson, president	3,863	22
8	Dyersburg St. Cmty. Col., Dyersburg, Tenn. 38024, E. B. Eller, president	14,352	97
1	East Tenn. State Univ., Johnson City Tenn. 37601, Delos Poe Culp, president	84,604	490
5	Falls Bus. College, Nashville, Tenn., Vernon R. Johnson	7,828	40
5	Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn. 37203, James R. Lawson, president	23,107	233
7	Freed Hardeman College, Henderson, Tenn. 38340, E. Claude Gardner, president	6,967	50
5	George Peabody Col. Tchrs., Nashville, Tenn. 37203, John M. Claunch, president	22,421	110
3	Hiwassee College, Madisonville, Tenn. 37354, Horace N. Barker, president	17,789	106
7	Jackson State Cmty. College, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, F. E. Wright, president	13,211	53
1	King College, Bristol, Tenn. 37620, Powell A. Fraser, acting pres	7,973	39
2	Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn. 37921, Robert L. Owens III, President	55,212	413
7	Lambuth College, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, James S. Wilder, Jr., President	8,449	47
7	Lane College, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, Herman Stone, President	251,722	1,419
9	Le Moyne-Owen College, Memphis, Tenn. 38126, Odell Horton, President	91,170	480
3	Lee College, Cleveland, Tenn. 37311, Charles W. Conn, President	35,802	215
2	Lincoln Memorial Univ., Harrogate, Tenn. 37752, H. Y. Livesay, President	15,113	91
7	Martin College, Pulaski, Tenn. 38478, Harry D. Wagner, President	7,893	51
2	Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn. 37801, Joseph J. Copeland, President	6,436	41
3	McKenzie College, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37401, Roy McKenzie, Jr., President	12,098	74
9	Memphis Academy of Arts, Memphis, Tenn. 38112, Edwin C. Rust, Director	1,323	8
9	Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn. 38111, C. C. Humphreys, President	187,543	963
6	Middle Tenn. State Univ., Murfreesboro, Tenn. 37130, M. G. Scarlett, President	34,136	196
1	Milligan College, Inc., Milligan Coll., Tenn. 37682, Jesse W. Johnson, President	$5,487	35
3	Morristown College, Morristown, Tenn. 37814, J. Otis Erwin, President	5,892	41
4	Motlow St. Cmty. Col., Tullahoma, Tenn. 37388, Sam Ingram, President	9,051	50
5	Nashville State Techinstitute, Nashville, Tenn. 37209, Edward L. Weld, Director	13,336	98
	Roane State Comm. College, Harriman, Tenn. 37748 Cuyler A. Dunbar, President	5,328	32
5	Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn. 37203, Gerald H. Anderson, President	859	5
9	Southern Col. of Optometry Memphis, Tenn. 38104 Spurgeon B. Bure, President	2,826	16
3	Southern Missionary Col., Collegedale, Tenn. 37315 Wilbert D. Schneider, President	37,122	208
9	Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis, Tenn. 38112 William L. Bowden, Chancellor	29,082	149
9	State Tech. Inst. at Memphis, Memphis, Tenn. 38128 Charles O. Whitehead, Director	12,392	59
5	Tenn A & I St. Univ., Nashville, Tenn. 37203, A. P. Torrence, President	107,731	664
4	Tenn. Technological Univ., Cookeville, Tenn. 38501, Everett Derryberry, President	52,503	301
3	Tenn. Wesleyan College, Athens, Tenn. 37303, Charles C. Turner, Jr., President	4,839	32
8	The University of Tenn. at Martin, Martin, Tenn. 38237, Archie R. Dykes, Chancellor	31,192	222
5	Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville, Tenn. 37210, Mark R. Moore, President	23,309	170
1	Tusculum College, Greeneville, Tenn. 37743, Andrew N. Cothran, President	9,971	47
7	Union University, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, Robert E. Craig, President	11,000	71
3	Univ. of Tenn. Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37403, William H. Masterson, Chancellor	137,316	602
2	University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. 37916, Charles H. Weaver, Chancellor	119,545	670
4	University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn. 37375, Edward McCrady, Vice Chancellor	7,833	50
5	Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 37203, Alexander Heard, Chancellor	13,302	88
1	Walters St. Cmty. College, Morristown, Tenn. 37814, Dr. James W. Clark, President	6,753	41
3	William J. Bryan College, Dayton, Tenn. 37321, Theodore C. Mercer, President	10,348	51
	TEXAS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 115)		
	Total	4,857,548	25,489
17	Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Tex. 79601, John C Stevens, President	49,856	309
2	Angelina College, Lufkin, Tex. 75901, Jack W. Hudgins, President	11,788	76
21	Angelo State Univ., San Angelo, Tex. 76903, L. D. Vincent, President	38,832	201
4	Austin College, Sherman, Tex. 75090, John D. Moseley, President	10,425	71
12	Austin's College of Business, Austin, Tex. 78701, C. J. Caraway, Director	2,640	14
11	Baylor, University, Waco, Tex. 76706, Abner V. McCall, President	153,188	826
23	Bee County Col., Beeville, Tex. 78102, Grady C. Hogue, President	19,042	96
5	Bishop College, Dallas, Tex. 75241, Milton K. Curry, Jr., President	462,484	1,915
10	Blinn College, Brenham, Tex. 77833, James H. Atkinson, President	4,302	30
6	Brantley, Draughon Business Coll., Fort Worth, Tex. 76102, G. C. Stewart, Vice President and Gen. Mg	4,326	29
14	Brazosport Jr. Col. Dist., Freeport, Tex. 77541, J. R. Jackson, President	2,978	16
11	Central Texas College, Killeen, Tex. 76541, L. M. Morton, Jr. President	40,547	206
5	Christian Col. of the Southwest, Dallas, Tex. 75228, Henry Speck, Jr., President	6,500	33
17	Cisco Jr. College, Cisco, Tex. 76437, W. Leland Willis, president	25,548	130
18	Clarendon College, Clarendon, Tex. 79226, Kenneth D. Vaughan, president	24,671	132
99	Cmty. College of San Antonio, San Antonio, Tex. 78205, Richard F. McGoon, president and exec direct	11,050	58
22	College of the Mainland, Texas City, Tex. 77590, Herbert F. Stallworth, president	11,091	70
10	Concordia Lutheran College, Austin, Tex. 78705, Paul G. Elbrecht, president	5,315	24
13	Cooke County Jr. Col, Gainesville, Tex. 76240, A. E. Shasteen, president	16,250	88
3	Dallas Baptist College, Dallas, Tex. 75211, Charles P. Pitts, president	37,048	177
5	Dallas Cty. Jr. College District, Dallas, Tex. 75202, Bill J. Priest, chancellor	66,441	377
14	Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, Tex. 78404, Jean Richardson, president	44,628	279
22	Dominican College, Houston, Tex. 77021, Antoinette Boykin, president	5,082	31
18	Draughons Bus. Col.-Amarillo, Amarillo, Tex. 79105, W. E. Soule, director	3,192	18
5	Draughons Bus. Col.-Dallas, Dallas, Tex. 75201, H. E. Cannon, manager	9,915	45

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	TEXAS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 115)—Con.		
19	Draughons Bus. Col.-Lubbock, Lubbock, Tex. 79408, Ted R. Day, director	$6,375	32
13	Draughons Bus. Col.-Wichita Falls, Wichita Falls, Tex. 76301, M. L. Chandler, pres., Ltv. Ed. Systems, Inc.	2,687	13
1	E. Tex. Bapt. College, Marshall, Tex. 75670, Howard C. Bennett, president	26,650	133
4	East Texas State Univ., Commerce, Tex. 75428, Daniel W. Halladay, president	36,400	229
3	Elkins Institute Inc., Dallas, Tex. 75235, C. C. Elkins, President	1,500	7
18	Frank Phillips College, Borger, Tex. 79007, J. W. Dillard, President	5,196	27
12	Ft. Worth Christian Col., Ft. Worth Tex. 76118, A. V. Isdel, President	6,593	35
9	Galveston Cmty Col., Galveston, Tex. 77550, M. M. Plenco, President	12,025	61
4	Grayson Co. Jr. Col., Denison Tex. 75020, Cruce Stark, President	13,245	67
22	Gulf Coast Bible Col., Houston, Tex. 77008, Max R. Caulke, President	3,164	23
17	Hardin Simmons University, Abilene, Tex. 79601, Elwin L. Skiles, President	58,286	326
2	Henderson County Jr. Col., Athens Tex. 75751, Orval Pirtle, President	25,497	127
6	Hill Junior College, Hillsboro, Tex. 76645, Oran B. Bailey, President	12,137	60
999	Hotel Dieu School of Nursing, El Paso, Tex. 79902, Sister Aloysius Williams, Director	8,656	49
7	Houston Baptist Col., Houston, Tex. 77036, W. H. Hinton, President	11,050	51
17	Howard County Jr. Col., Big Spring, Tex. 79720, W. A. Hunt, President	31,720	157
17	Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex. 76801, Guy D. Newman, President	17,275	96
10	Huston Tillotson College, Austin, Tex. 78702, John T. King, President	62,675	273
20	Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, Tex. 78209, Sterling F. Wheeler, Interim President	19,592	121
1	Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins, Tex. 75765, J. O. Perpener, President	162,000	587
4	Kilgore College, Kilgore, Tex. 75662, R. C. Watson, president	23,400	113
9	Lamar State Col. Tech., Beaumont, Tex. 77704, Frank A. Thomas, Jr., acting pres	82,550	343
23	Laredo Jr. College, Laredo, Tex. 78040, Ray A. Laird, president	21,367	103
8	Lee College, Baytown, Tex. 77520, Richard Strahan, president	7,492	44
4	LeTourneau College, Longview, Tex. 75601, Harry Hardwick, president	30,791	157
1	Lon Morris College, Jacksonville, Tex. 75766, C. E. Peeples, president	9,100	43
19	Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, Tex. 79407, F. W. Mattox, president	19,987	153
11	Mary Hardin Baylor Col., Belton, Tex. 76513, William G. Tanner, president	2,,768	127
8	Massey Business College, Houston, Tex. 77002, P. E. Compton, director	9,792	57
11	McLennan Cmty. Col., Waco, Tex. 76705, Wilbur A. Ball, president	16,627	106
17	McMurry College, Abilene, Tex. 79605, Thomas K. Kim, president	39,306	224
18	Mid-Continent Campuststi, Amarillo, Tex. 79105, J. N. Baker, president	17,466	102
19	Midland College, Midland, Tex. 79701, Al G. Langford, president	1,850	13
6	Navarro Jr. College, CorsicanaTex. 75110, Ben W. Jones, president	23,725	125
13	North Texas State Univ. Denton, Tex. 76203, John Carter, acting pres	41,235	221
21	Odessa College, Odessa, Tex. 79760, Clyde Chisum, president	31,447	172
20	Our Lady of the Lake Col., San Antonio, Tex, 78207, John L. McMahon, president.	77,130	435
15	Pan American College, Edinburg, Tex. 78539, Ralph Schilling, president.	166,397	969
1	Panola College, Carthage, Tex. 75633, Q. M. Martin, president.	26,904	152
1	Paris Jr. College, Paris, Tex. 75460, Louis B. Williams, president.	10,253	62
21	Parish-Draughons Tech. Inst., San Antonio Tex. 78206 Charles W. Parish, Jr., manager.	649	3
11	Paul Quinn College, Waco, Tex. 76704, Dr. S. E. Rutland, president.	87,243	417
10	Prairie View A & M Col., Prairie View Tex. 77445, A. I. Thomas, president.	228,021	1,242
17	Ranger Jr. College, Ranger, Tex. 76470, Jack Elson, president.	66,709	362
22	Rice University, Houston, Tex. 77001, Norman Hackerman, president.	4,600	25
2	Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex. 77340, Elliot Bowers, president.	17,377	113
20	San Antonio Union, J. C. District, San Antonio, Texas, 78212, Wayland P. Moody, president.	74,750	386
22	San Jacinto College, Pasadena, Tex. 77505, Thomas M. Spencer, president	4,512	26
19	South Plains College, Levelland, Tex. 79336, Marvin L. Baker, president	41,282	2010
5	Southern Methodist Univ., Dallas, Tex. 75222, Willis M. Tate, president	22,750	112
21	Southwest Texas Jr. Col., Uvalde, Tex. 78801, Wayne Matthews, president	$31,303	195
10	Southwest Texas State Univ., San Marcos, Tex 78666 Dr. Billy Jones, president	29,315	139
4	Southwestern Christian College, Terrell, Tex. 75160, Jack Evans, president	30,076	163
199	Southwestern Union Col., Keene, Tex. 76059, E. C. Wines, president	13,646	67
6	Southwestern Assemb. God Col , Waxahachie, Tex 75165, Blake L. Farmer, president	9,749	52
10	St. Edwards University, Austin, Tex. 78704, Edgar L. Roy, Jr., president	7,174	43
21	St. Marys University, San Antonio, Tex. 78228, Very Rev. Louis J. Blume, president	118,968	702
17	Stenograph Institute of Texas, Abilene, Tex. 79604, H. Don Rodgers, president	1,262	8
2	Stephen F. Austin Univ., Nacogdoches, Tex. 75961, R. W. Steen, president	48,413	288
16	Sul Ross State Univ., Alpine, Tex. 79830, Norman L. McNeil, president	64,531	347
17	Tarleton State College, Stephenville, Tex. 76401, W. O. Trogdon, president	24,433	142
6	Tarrant Co. Jr. Col., Fort Worth, Tex. 76102, Joe Bob Rushing, chancellor	85,218	468
11	Temple Jr. College, Temple, Tex. 76501, Hubert M. Dawson, president	19,827	117
1	Texarkana College, Texarkana, Tex. 75501, J. W. Cady, president	13,426	83
6	Texas A & M University, College Station, Tex. 77843, Jack K. Williams, president	27,339	152
15	Texas A and I Univ., Kingsville, Tex. 78363, James C. Jernigan, president	66,756	370
6	Texas Christian Univ., Fort Worth, Tex. 76129, James M. Moudy, chancellor	9,208	58
4	Texas College, Tyler, Tex. 75701, Allen C. Hancock, president	102,362	522
23	Texas Lutheran College, Seguin, Tex. 78155, Joe K. Menn, President	9,475	52
22	Texas Southern Univ., Houston, Tex. 77004, Granville Sawyer, President	147,808	659
15	Texas Southmost College, Brownsville. Tex. 78520, William H. Walton, President	32,729	163
11	Texas St. Tech. Inst., Connally Campus, Waco, Tex. 76705, Roy W. Dugger, Director	53,350	319
19	Texas Tech. Univ., Lubbock, Tex. 79409, Grover E. Murray, President	49,780	290
13	Texas Woman's University, Denton, Tex. 76204, John A. Guinn, President	40,034	217
20	Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex. 78212, Dr. Gordon D. Wimpress, Jr., President	18,466	103
15	Tex. St. Tech Inst., Rio Grande Campus, Harlingen, Tex. 78550, Dr. Roy W. Dugger, President	37,401	217
14	Univ. of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Tex. 78411, Kenneth A. Maroney, President	18,562	111
3	Univ. of Dallas, Irving, Tex. 75060, Donald A. Cowan, President	11,895	53
12	Univ. of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Tex. 76010, Frank Harrison, President	70,978	386
10	Univ. of Texas at Austin, Austin, Tex. 78712, Stephen H. Spurr, President	192,671	1,047
16	Univ. of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Tex. 79902, Joseph R. Smiley, President	167,891	892
5	Univ. of Tex. at Dallas, Dallas, Tex. 75230, Francis S. Johnson, President	2,025	10
22	University of Houston, Houston, Tex. 77004, Robert Morris, President	235,206	1,416
7	University of St. Thomas, Houston, Tex. 77006, Rev. Patrick O. Braden, President	12,631	66
19	Wayland Baptist College, Plainview, Tex. 79072, Roy C. McClung, president	40,906	224
11	Weatherford College, Weatherford, Tex. 76086, J. C. Nichols, president	5,263	31
18	West Texas State Univ., Canyon, Tex. 79015, James P. Cornette, president	78,497	347
19	Western Tex. College, Snyder, Tex. 79549, Robert L. Clinton, president	8,784	79
10	Wharton County Jr. Col., Wharton, Tex. 77488, Theodore Nicksick, Jr., president	25,603	141
1	Wiley College, Marshall, Tex. 75670, T. W. Cole, Sr., president	78,245	399
	UTAH (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 12)		
	Total	335,293	2,381
1	Col. of Eastern Utah, Price, Utah 84501, M. McDonald, president	1,685	16
1	Dixie College, St. George, Utah 84770, Ferron C. Losee, President	8,416	89
1	Sevier Valley Tech., Richfield, Utah 84701, Dewain C. Washburn, president	2,155	13
1	Snow Col., Ephraim, Utah 84627, Floyd S. Holm, Director	10,513	97
2	Southern Utah State Coll., Cedar City, Utah 84720, Royden C. Braithwaite, president	32,362	197
2	Stevens Henager Col., Main Campus, Salt Lake City, Ut. 84102, Leroy R. Stevens, president	13,310	82
2	University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112, James C. Fletcher, president	188,250	1,286
1	Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84321, Glen L. Taggart, president	34,878	283
2	Utah Tech. College at Salt Lake City, Salt Lake City, Ut. 84107, Jay L. Nelson, president	5,211	32

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	UTAH (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 12)—Con.		
1	Utah Technical Col. at Provo, Provo, Utah 84601, Wilson W. Sorensen, president	$4,500	20
1	Weber State College, Ogden, Utah 84403, William P. Miller, president	33,122	259
2	Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah 84105, Manford A. Shaw, president	891	7
	VERMONT (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 16)		
	Total	199,674	1,089
1 1	Bennington College, Bennington, Vt. 05201, Edward J. Bloustein, president	2,808	18
1 1	Castleton State College, Castleton, Vt. 05735, Harold Abel, acting president	4,174	27
1 1	Col. of St. Joseph the Provider, Rutland, Vt. 05701, Sr. Mary Imelda Welch, president	572	5
1 1	Goddard College, Plainfield, Vt. 05667, Gerald S. Witherspoon, president	18,690	106
1 1	Johnson State College, Johnson, Vt. 05656, William G. Craig, acting president	22,597	130
1 1	Lyndon State College, Lyndon Center, Vt. 05850, A. John Holden, Jr., acting president	24,972	106
1 1	Marlboro College, Marlboro, Vt. 05344, Thomas Ragle, acting president	1,809	9
1 1	Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 05753, James I. Armstrong, president	6,523	33
1 1	Norwich University, Northfield, Vt. 05663, Barksdale Hamlett, president	2,288	16
1	St. Joseph College, Old Bennington, Vt. 05201, Father Charles C. Matusik, president	3,652	29
1 1	St. Michaels College, Winooski, Vt. 05404, Bernard L. Boutin, president	14,274	92
1 1	Trinity College, Burlington Vt. 05401, Sister Elizabeth Candon, R.S.M., president	5,026	31
1	Univ. of Vt. St. Agric. Col., Burlington, Vt. 05401, Edward C. Andrews, Jr., president	55,432	303
1 1	Vermont College, Montpelier, Vt. 05602, William L. Irvine, president	3,900	23
1 1	Vermont Tech. College, Randolph Center, Vt. 05061 Pierre V. Kieffer, Jr., President	10,920	50
1 1	Windham College, Putney, Vt. 05346, Eugene C. Winslow, President	22,037	111
	VIRGINIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 60)		
	Total	2,418,774	10,032
5	Averett College, Danville, Va. 24514, Conwell A. Anderson, President	19,997	80
7	Blue Ridge Cmty. Col., Weyers Cave, Va. 24486, James A. Armstrong, President	17,773	102
7	Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Va. 22812, Wayne Geisert, President	31,358	109
6	Central Va. Cmty. Col., Lynchburg, Va. 24504, S. A. Burnette, President	14,998	46
1	Christopher Newport College, Newport News, Va. 23601, James C. Windson, Acting President	3,600	16
99	Cmptr. Lrng. Ctr. of Falls Church, Va., Falls Church, Va. 22044, Thomas E. Stone, President	32,398	141
1	College of Hampton Roads, Newport News, Va. 23602, Richard G. Parise, President	9,854	43
1	College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 23185, Davis Y. Paschall, President	10,998	67
6	Dabney S. Lancaster Cmty. Col., Clifton Forge, Va. 24422, John F. Backels, President	12,283	52
5	Danville Cmty. Col. V.P.I., Danville, Va. 24541, J. M. Taylor, President	15,859	59
7	Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Va. 22801, Myron S. Augsburger, President	119,795	449
9	Emory & Henry College, Emory, Va. 24327, William C. Finch, President	13,807	61
5	Ferrum Jr. College, Ferrum, Va. 24088, Fred O. Wygal, President	44,999	196
7	Front Royal-Winchester Ar. Cmty. Col., Middletown, Va. 22645, Dr. William H. McCoy, President	94,998	283
8	Germanna Community College, Fredericksburg, Va. 22401, Dr. Arnold E. Wirther, President	7,999	49
4	Hampden Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va. 23943, W. Taylor Reveley, President	8,240	34
1	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va. 23868, Roy D. Hudson, President	59,596	324
6	Hollins College, Hollins College, Va. 24020, John A. Logan, Jr., President	20,597	67
3	John Tyler Cmty. Col., Chester, Va. 23831, James R. Walpole, President	20,999	91
2	Kees Coastal Business College, Norfolk, Va. 23510, Richard G. Parise, President	9,164	40
4	Longwood College, Farmville, Va. 23901, Henry I. Willett, Jr., President	42,800	164
6	Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va. 24504, Carey Brewer, President	80,253	317
7	Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va. 22801, Ronald Carrier, President	24,959	115
7	Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va. 24401, William w. Kelly, President	2,500	11
9	New River Cmty. College, Dublin, Va. 24084, Dr. F. L. Wellman, Acting President	15,678	97
2	Norfolk State Col., Norfolk, Va. 23504, Lyman B. Brooks, President	182,398	833
10	Northern Va. Community College, Annandale 22003, Richard J. Ernst, President	$16,913	74
2	Old Dominion Univ., Norfolk, Va. 23508, James L. Bugg, President	78,649	311
4	Paul D. Camp Cmty. Col., Franklin, Va. 23851, Perry R. Adams, President	13,421	58
6	Phillips Business Col., Lynchburg, Va. 24505, Harry G. Green, President	5,000	22
3	Presbyterian Sch Chris Ed., Richmond, Va., 23227, Charles E. S. Kramer, president	5,913	26
6	Radford College, Radford, Va., 24141, Charles K. Martin Jr., president	121,334	597
8	Randolph Macon College, Ashland, Va., 23005, Luther W. White, III, president	4,800	21
6	Randolph Macon Womans Col., Lynchburg, Va., 24503, William F. Quillian Jr., president	20,697	52
8	Rappahannock Cmty College, Warsaw, Va., 22572, John H. Upton, president	10,047	44
6	Roanoke College, Salem, Va., 24153, Perry F. Kendig, president	21,764	93
7	Shenandoah Col & Cons Mus., Winchester, Va., 22601, Robert P. Parker, president	29,997	130
5	Southside Virginia Cmty College, Alberta, 23831, Dr. Kenneth Dawson, president	9,999	52
9	Southwest Va Cmty Col., Richlands, Va., 24641, Charles R. King, president	88,176	284
5	St. Pauls College, Lawrenceville, Va., 23868, James Alvin Russell Jr., president	46,998	204
5	Stratford College, Danville, Va., 24540, W. Hugh Moomaw, president	6,400	35
99	The College of the Potomac, McLean, Va., 22101, Dr. James E. Russell, president	5,396	26
1	Thomas Nelson Cmty Col., Hampton, Va., 23369, Thomas V. Jenkins, president	11,998	64
2	Tidewater Comm College, Portsmouth, Va., 23703, Douglas M. Montgomery, president	26,695	152
9	U. of Va. Clinch Valley Col., Wise, Va., 24293, J. C. Smiddy, chancellor	59,999	196
10	U. of Va. George Mason Col., Fairfax, Va., 22030, Lorin A. Thompson, chancellor	5,905	30
8	Univ. of Va., Mary Wash. Col., Fredericksburg, Va. 22401, Grellet C. Simpson, chancellor	7,647	27
3	University of Richmond, Richmond, Va. 23173, George M. Modlin, president	34,597	167
7	University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 22903, Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., president	207,499	89
9	Virginia Intermont College, Bristol, Va. 24201, Floyd V. Turner, president	8,398	37
3	Virginia Commonwealth Univ., Richmond, Va. 23220, Warren W. Brandt, president	38,117	171
9	Virginia Highlands Cmty. College, Abingdon, Va. 24210, Donald E. Puyear, president	35,000	157
6	Virginia Polytechnic Inst., Blacksburg, Va. 24061, T. Marshall Hahn, Jr., president	129,998	598
4	Virginia State College, Petersburg, Va. 23803, Walker H. Quarles, acting president	179,997	696
3	Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va. 23220, Allix B. James, president	129,997	557
2	Virginia Wesleyan Col., Norfolk, Va. 23502, Lambuth M. Clarke, president	15,998	75
6	Virginia Western Cmty. Col., Roanoke, Va. 24015, Harold H. Hopper, president	14,564	80
7	Washington & Lee Univ., Lexington, Va. 24450, Robert E. R. Huntley, president	14,498	72
10	Washington Bus. Sch., Arlington, Va. 22205, Albert P. Coppola, president	19,999	65
9	Wytheville Cmty. Col., Wytheville, Va. 24382, J. Wade Gilley, president	74,464	324
	WASHINGTON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 43)		
	Totals	1,291,295	6,638
1	Bellevue Cmty. Col., Bellevue, Wash. 98004, Merle E. Landerholm, president	13,444	89
4	Big Bend Community Col., Moses Lake, Wash 98837, Don A. Morgan, president	11,099	66
4	Central Washington St. Col., Ellensburg, Wash. 98926, James E. Brooks, president	11,537	74
3	Centralia College, Centralia Wash. 98531, Nels Hanson, president	16,801	67
3	Chase Bus. College, Vancouver, Wash. 98660, Harold Wosepka, president	5,915	38
3	Clark College, Vancouver, Wash. 98663, Dwight C. Baird, president	5,813	34
4	Columbia Basin College, Pasco, Wash. 99301, Fred L. Esvelt, president	17,844	122
5	Eastern Washington St. Col., Cheney, Wash. 99004, Emerson C. Schuck, president	38,335	183
2	Edmonds Cmty. Col., Lynnwood, 98036, James R. Warren, president	13,973	69
2	Everett Cmty. Col., Everett, Wash. 98201, Jeanette Poore, president	21,903	117
3	Evergreen State Col., Olympia, Wash. 98501, Charles J. McCann, president	9,897	69
6	Fort Steiliacoom Cmty. Col., Tacoma, Wash. 98499, Marion O. Oppelt, president-elect	14,615	63
5	Ft. Wright Col. Holy Names, Spokane, Wash. 99204, Monica Schmidt, president	4,018	23
5	Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash. 99202, Richard E. Twohy, president	50,529	231

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	WASHINGTON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 43)—Con.		
3	Grays Harbor College, Aberdeen, Wash. 98520, Edward P. Smith, president	$10,707	65
7	Green River Cmty. Col., Auburn, Wash. 98002, Melvin Lindbloom, president	26,984	135
7	Highline Community Col., Midway, Wash. 98031, M.A. Allan, president	12,018	81
4	J.M. Perry Institute, Yakima, Wash. 98902, John M. Wilson, director	3,557	18
3	Lower Columbia College, Longview, WA. 98632, David B. Story, president	19,019	100
1	N. Seattle Cmty. Coll., Seattle, WA. 98103, Cecil Baxter, president	10,589	75
1	Northwest Col. Assemblies of God, Kirkland, WA. 98033, D. V. Hurst, president	7,462	44
6	Olympic College, Bremerton, WA. 98310, Norman Richardson, president	46,865	218
6	Pacific Lutheran Univ., Tacoma, WA. 98447, Eugene Wiegman, president	7,538	50
2	Peninsula College, Port Angeles, WA. 98362, E. John, Maier, president	9,229	45
1	Seattle Community College, Seattle, WA. 98109, William Moore Jr., president	89,870	626
1	Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, WA. 98119, David L. McKenna, president	37,454	198
7	Seattle University, Seattle, WA. 98122, Kenneth Baker, president	21,903	116
1	Shoreline Community Col., Seattle, WA. 98133, Richard S. White, president	27,706	138
2	Skagit Valley College, Mt. Vernon, WA. 98273, Norwood M. Cole, president	4,169	26
5	Spokane Community College, Spokane, WA. 99202, Hobart G. Jenkins, president	26,204	160
5	Spokane Falls Cmty. College, Spokane, WA. 99204, Max M. Synder, president	26,241	160
3	St. Martins College, Olympia, WA. 98501, Very Rev. Michael Feeney, president	9,235	53
6	Tacoma Community Col., Tacoma, WA. 98465, Thornton M. Ford, president	25,891	139
6	Univ. of Puget Sound, Tacoma, WA. 98416, R. Franklin Thompson, president	12,953	80
1	University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 98105, Charles E. Odegaard, president	354,450	1,592
4	Walla Walla College, College Place, Wash. 99324, R. L. Reynolds, president	9,488	66
4	Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, Wash. 99362, Eldon Dietrich, president	15,036	89
4	Washington State Univ., Pullman, Wash. 99163, Glenn Terrell, president	96,488	411
5	Wenatchee Valley Col., Wenatchee, Wash. 98801, William E. Steward, president	14,539	81
2	Western Washington St. Col., Bellingham, Wash. 98225, Charles J. Flora, president	75,529	328
4	Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 99362, Donald Sheehan, president	10,727	59
5	Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash. 99218, Edward B. Lindaman, president	26,907	144
4	Yakima Valley College, Yakima, Wash. 98902, Thomas E. Deem, president	16,814	96
	WEST VIRGINIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 22)		
	Total	1,071,189	5,456
2	Alderson Broaddus College, Philippi, W. Va. 26416, Richard E. Shearer, president	15,206	103
1	Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va. 26032, Perry E. Gresham, president	19,502	109
5	Bluefield State College, Bluefield, W. Va. 24701, Wendell G. Hardway, president	41,560	221
3	Center College Inc., Charleston, W. Va. 25301, William D. Swearingen, president	8,543	44
5	Concord College, Athens, W. Va. 24712, Joseph F. Marsh, Jr., president	79,396	368
2	Davis & Elkins College, Elkins, W. Va. 26241, Gordon E. Hermanson, pres dent	32,312	176
1	Fairmont State College, Fairmont, W. Va. 26554, Eston K. Feaster, president	96,460	440
1	Glenville State College, Glenville W. Va. 26351, D. Banks Wilburn, president	38,577	176
4	Huntington, College of Business, Huntington, W. Va. 25701 Chester A. Riley, president	8,184	43
4	Marshall University, Huntington, W. Va., 25701, John G. Barker, president	174,876	878
4	Mountain State College, Parkersburg W. Va. 26101, William H. Hazlett, president	7,680	33
4	Ohio Valley College Inc., Parkersburg, W. Va. 26104, Justin B. Roberts, acting president	5,475	31
9	Parkersburg Center, W. Va. University, Parkersburg, W. Va. 26101, James G. Harlow, president	28,411	170
2	Potomac St. Col. of W. Va. U. Keyser, W. Va. 26726, Harold C. Doster, president	28,885	99
1	Salem College, Salem, W. Va. 26426, K. Duane Hurley, president	38,822	196
2	Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, W. Va. 25443, James A. Butcher, president	41,089	219
5	W. Virginia Inst. of Tech., Montgomery, W. Va. 25136, Leonard C. Nelson, president	115,084	565
2	W. Virginia Wesleyan Col., Buckhannon, W. Va. 26201, Stanely H. Martin, president	8,000	63
1	West Liberty State Col., West Liberty W. Va. 26074, James L. Chapman, president	$38,841	273
3	West Virginia State Col., Institute, W. Va. 25112, William J. L. Wallace, president	73,186	373
2	West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. 26506, James G. Harlow, president	159,500	815
1	Wheeling College, Wheeling W. Va. 26003 Very Rev. Frank R. Haig, president	11,600	61
	WISCONSIN (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 46)		
	Totals	1,458,792	8,516
4	Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53215, Joel Read, president	3,807	25
8	Bellin Mem. Hospital Sch. of Nursing, Green Bay, Wis. 54301, Daniel Smith, administrator	3,760	18
1	Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 53511, Miller Upton, president	11,190	70
99	Bryant & Stratton Business College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53203, Richard J. O'Neil, president	2,820	15
9	Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53217, Sister Mary Aquin O. S. F., president	587	4
9	Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis. 53186, Morris Spencer, chief admin. officer	2,996	24
1	Carthage College, Kenosha, Wis. 53140, Dr. Harold H. Lentz, president	7,050	44
5	Concordia College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53208, Dr. Walter W. Stuenkel, president	1,607	12
2	Dodge County Teachers Col., Mayville, Wis. 53050, Dr. Arthur K. Mehren, president	805	5
1	Dominican College, Racine, Wis. 53402, Thomas C. Stevens, president	4,140	23
10	Eau Claire Tech. Instit. Dist 1, Eau Claire, Wis. 54701, Cecil W. Beede, dist. director	7,002	48
2	Edgewood College, Madison, Wis. 53711, Sister Mary Cecillia Cary, president	7,285	37
1	Kenosha Tech. Inst., Kenosha Wis., 53140, Keith W. Stoehr, director	7,050	37
6	Lakeland College, Sheboygan, Wis. 53081, Dr. John B. Morland, president	6,580	40
6	Lakeshore Tech. Schools-Vtae Dist. 11, Sheboygan, Wis., 53081, Frederick J. Nierode, district director	4,447	26
8	Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis. 54911, Thomas S. Smith, president	12,408	53
2	Madison Technical College, Dist. No. 4, Madison, Wis. 53703, Norman P. Mitby, director	17,860	117
6	Marian Col. of Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac, Wis. 54935, Sister Mary Sheila CSA, president	2,350	18
5	Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis. 53233, John P. Raynor, president	23,500	165
7	Mid-State Tech. Institute, Wisconsin Rapids, Wis. 54494, Earl F. Jaeger, dist. director	1,927	15
1	Milton College, Milton, Wis. 53563, Kenneth E. Smith, president	3,792	22
5	Milwaukee Area Tech. College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53203, William L. Ramsey, dist. director	41,773	224
4	Milwaukee School of Engrg., Milwaukee, Wis. 53201, Karl O. Werwath, president	3,525	23
9	Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53222, Mary Huberta, president	2,775	18
10	Mount Senario Col., Ladysmith, Wis. 54848, Robert E. Lovett, president	4,572	43
10	Nicolet Col. and Technist., Rhinelander, Wis. 54501, Dr. Richard J. Brown, director	9,318	48
7	North Central Tech. Inst., Wausau, Wis. 54401, Lawrence B. Hoyt, director	12,220	84
8	Northeast Wisc. Tech. Inst., Green Bay, Wis. 54303, K. W. Haubenschild, area director	1,936	12
10	Northland College, Ashland, Wis. 54806, Robert V. Cramer, president	11,280	65
1	Racine Tech. Institution, Racine, Wis. 53403, Howard M. Heigl, director	1,927	9
6	Ripon College, Ripon, Wis. 54971, Bernard S. Adams, president	12,050	67
3	Southwest Wisc. Voc.-Tech. Schools, Fennimore, Wis. 53809, Ronald H. Anderson, acting director	10,481	60
8	St. Norbert College, West de Pere, Wis. 54178, Robert E. Christin, president	8,335	45
2	U. of Wis. Madison, Madison, Wis. 53706, John C. Weaver, president	115,023	694
5	U. of Wis., Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis. 53201, J. Martin Klotsche, chancellor	135,911	755
99	University Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha, Wis. 53140, Irvin G. Wyllie, chancellor	17,053	94
3	Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wis. 54601, J. T. Finucan, president	7,520	51
6	VTAE Area No. 10, Fond Du Lac, Wis. 54935, H. S. Van Valkenburg, dist. director	3,642	18
10	VTAE Dist. No. 17, Superior, Wis. 54880, Sam L. Lavine, dist director	7,050	44
10	VTAE Dist. No. 18, New Richmond, Wis. 54017, Arthur Cothran, director	1,410	12
1	VTAE Dist. No. 5, Janesville, Wis 53545, O. L. Johnson, dist. director	1,069	7
6	VTAE Dist. No. 12, Fox Valley Tech. Schls., Oshkosh, Wis. 54901, William M. Sirek, director	12,032	73
9	Waukesha Co. Technical Inst., Waukesha, Wis. 53186, A. J. Natalizio, dist. dir	2,068	11
3	Western Wis. Tech. Inst., La Crosse, Wis. 54601, Charles G. Richardson, director	7,585	49

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	WISCONSIN (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 46)—Continued		
2	Wis. State Universities System, Madison, Wis. 53701, Eugene R. McPhee, director	$894,113	5,185
5	Wisconsin College Conservatory, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202, Dr. Vincent McDermott, dean of facilities	1,161	7
	WYOMING (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 8)		
	Total	136,707	1,035
[1] 1	Casper College, Casper, Wyo. 82601, Tilghman H. Alley, president	14,747	119
[1] 1	Central Wyoming College, Riverton, Wyo. 82501, Walter H. Palmberg, president	3,852	30
1	Eastern Wyoming College, Torrington, Wyo. 82240, Charles Rogers, dean	2,445	21
99	Laramie County Comm. College, Cheyenne, Wyo. 82001, Charles E. Carpenter, president	5,237	45
1	Northwest Community Col., Powell, Wyo. 82435, Sinclair Crendorff, president	3,322	27
1	Sheridan College, Sheridan, Wyo. 82801, Dana Peitersen, president	5,548	36
[1] 1	University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo. 82070, William D. Carlson, president	98,686	737
2	Western Wyoming College Rock Springs, 82901, Charles C. Crandall, president	2,870	20
	GUAM (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 1)		
	Total	$69,999	304
	University of Guam, Box Ex, Agana, Guam 96910, Pedro Sanchez, president	69,999	304
	PUERTO RICO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 5)		
	Total	820,910	3,605
	Catholic Univ. of P.R., Ponce, P.R. 00731, Francisco J. Carreras, president	57,151	252
	Col. of the Sacred Heart, Santurce, P.R. 00914, Rafael Enrique Garcia Bottari, president	28,808	125
	Inter American Univ. of Puerto Rico, San German, P.R. 00753 Sol Luis Descartes, president	239,952	1,043
	Puerto Rico Jr. College, Rio Piedras, P.R. 00928, Ana G. Mendez, Chancellor	20,000	87
	Univ. of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R. 00931, Jamie Benitez, president	474,999	2,098
	VIRGIN ISLANDS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 1)		
	Total	12,499	54
	College of the Virgin Is., St. Thomas, V.I. 00801, Lawrence C. Wanlass, president	12,499	54
	U.S. Totals (2,459)	80,506,704	424,704

[1] Congressional District at Large.

EOG REPORT NO. 1–71

(Report of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, May 7, 1971, notification to Members of Congress regarding P.L. 89–329, the Higher Education Act of 1965)

Grants to institutions listed on the following pages have been approved for the Educational Opportunity Grants Program, authorized under Title IV, Part A, of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, *for the academic year 1971–72*. The format used in this notification schedule identifies the: (1) State and Congressional District in which the institution is located; (2) name and location of the institution; (3) name of the institution's president; (4) amount of the grant; (5) estimated number of student awards.

Educational Opportunity Grants ranging from $200 to $1000 for each academic year of study, up to a maximum duration of four years, are awarded by participating institutions of higher education to students of exceptional financial need who are eligible for the program.

Each grant requires provision of an equal amount of financial assistance to a student from one or more of the following sources:

(1) institutional, State or privately financed grant aid;

(2) compensation from employment provided by the institution, including employment under the Federal College Work-Study Program, and

(3) institutionally provided loans, including the National Defense Student Loan Program.

Further information about the program may be obtained from Hubert S. Shaw, Chief, Educational Opportunity Grants Branch, Division of Student Financial Aid, Office of Education, Telephone: Area Code 202 962-4110 or 962–2635. (Government Code 13-24110 or 13–22635.)

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	ALABAMA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 46)		
	Total	$3,145,077	5,422
8	Alabama A. & M. College, Normal, Ala. 35762, R. D. Morrison, President	124,630	215
2	Alabama Christian College, Montgomery, Ala. 36109, Rex A. Turner, President	10,035	17
2	Alabama State Univ., Montgomery, Ala. 36101 Levi Watkins, President	57,314	99
7	Albert P. Brewer St. Junior College, Fayette, Ala. 35555, Dr. Charles W. Davis, President	5,638	10
3	Alexander City State Jr. Col., Alexander City, Ala. 35010, W. Byron Causey, President	12,035	21
8	Athens College, Athens, Ala. 35611, Sidney E. Sandridge, President	14,360	25
2	Auburn Univ at Montgomery, Montgomery, Ala. 36104 H. H. Funderburk, Jr., President	2,174	4
3	Auburn University, Auburn, Ala. 36830, Harry M. Philpott, President	94,960	164
6	Birmingham Southern Col., Birmingham, Ala. 35204, Charles D. Hounshell, President	38,407	66
7	Cullman College, Cullman, Ala. 35055, Sr. Mary Lourdes Michel, President	8,323	14
6	Daniel Payne College, Birmingham, Ala. 35212, Daniel T. Grant, President	8,152	14
3	Enterprise State J. C., Enterprise, Ala. 36330, B. A. Forrester, President	8,400	14
8	Florence State Univ., Florence, Ala. 35630, E. B. Norton, President	108,720	187
1	Gadsden State Jr. College, Gadsden, Ala. 35903, Allan D. Naylor, President	40,801	70
2	Huntingdon College, Montgomery, Ala. 36106, Allen K. Jackson, President	42,720	74
4	Jacksonville State Univ., Jacksonville, Ala. 36265, Houston Cole, President	88,587	153
2	James H. Faulker State Jr. College, Bay Minette, Ala. 36507, Lathem N. Sibert, President	6,242	11
6	Jefferson State Jr. College, Birmingham, Ala. 35215, Leroy Brown, President	24,350	42
8	John C. Calhoun State Tech. Jr. Col., Decatur, Ala. 36501, Carlton Kelley, President	8,145	14
5	Judson College, Marion, Ala. 36756, N. H. McCrummen, Acting President	$11,796	20
5	Livingston State Univ., Livingston, Ala. 35470, John E. Deloney, President	88,546	153
2	Lurleen B. Wallace St. Jr. College, Andalusia, Ala. 36420, Dr. William H. McWhorter, President	12,953	22
6	Miles College, Birmingham, Ala. 35208, L. H. Pitts, President	343,383	592
1	Mobile College, Mobile, Ala. 36613, William K. Weaver, Jr., President	18,480	32
1	Mobile State Jr. Col., Mobile, Ala. 36603, Sandford Bishop, President	18,444	32
8	Northeast St. Jr. Col., Rainsville, Ala. 35986, E. R. Knox, President	13,865	24
7	Northwest Alabama St. Jr. Col., Phil Campbell, Ala. 35581, James A. Glasgow, President	8,956	15
8	Oakwood College, Huntsville, Ala. 35806, Frank W. Hale, Jr., President	84,176	145
1	Patrick Henry State Jr. College, Monroeville, Ala. 36460, B. E. Lee, President	4,718	8
6	Samford University, Birmingham, Ala. 35209, Leslie S. Wright, President	43,850	76
4	Selma Univ., Selma, Ala. 36701, M. C. Cleveland, Jr., President	84,925	146
7	Snead State Jr. College, Boaz, Ala. 35957, Virgil M. McCain, President	6,590	11
4	Southern Union State Jr. College, Wadley, Ala. 36276, Harold N. Stinson, president	6,733	12
1	Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala. 36608, Very Rev. William J. Rimes, president	30,000	52
7	St. Bernard College, St. Bernard, Ala. 35138, Rt. Reverend Gregory Roettger, president	28,566	49
5	Stillman College, Tuscaloosa, Ala., 35401, Harold N. Stinson, president	207,221	357
6	T. A. Lawson State Jr. College, Birmingham, Ala., 35211, T. A. Lawson, president	20,880	3
4	Talladega College, Talladega, Ala., 35160, Herman H. Long president	194,218	335
5	The Marion Inst., Marion, Ala. 36756, Dr. Paul B. Robinson president	6,793	12
2	Troy State Univ., Troy, Ala. 36081, Ralph W. Adams, president	142,734	246

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	ALABAMA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 46)—Con.		
3	Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Ala., 36088, L. H. Foster, president	$414,101	714
6	Univ. of Alabama in Birmingham, Birmingham, Ala., 35233, Joseph Volker, president	43,748	75
8	Univ. of Alabama in Huntsville, Huntsville, Ala., 35807, Benjamin B. Graves, president	16,776	29
5	Univ. of Montevallo, Montevallo, Ala., 35115, Kermit Johnson, president	38,715	67
1	Univ. of South Alabama, Mobile, Ala. 36608, Frederick Palmer Whiddon III, president	110,604	191
5	University of Alabama, University, Ala. 35486, F. David Mathews, president	439,113	757
	ALASKA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 3)		
	Total	76,197	132
1 1	Alaska Methodist Univ., Anchorage, Alas. 99504, Frederick P. McGinnis, president	61,255	106
1 1	Sheldon Jackson Jr. Col., Sitka, Alas. 99835, Orin R. Stratton, president	7,350	13
1	University of Alaska, College Alas. 99701, William R. Wood, president	7,592	13
	ARIZONA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 16)		
	Total	1,633,944	2,818
1	Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz. 85281, John W. Schwada, President	354,160	611
2	Arizona Western College, Yuma, Ariz. 85364, George L. Hall, President	52,080	90
2	Central Arizona Col., Coolidge, Ariz. 85228, Don P. Pence, President	46,292	80
2	Cochise College, Douglas, Ariz. 85607, John R. Edwards, Jr., President	26,640	46
3	Eastern Arizona Col., Thatcher, Ariz. 85552, Dean A. Curtis, President	50,167	86
3	Glendale Cmty. Col., Glendale, Ariz. 85301, Matt D. Hanila, Exec. Dean	28,400	49
3	Grand Canyon College, Phoenix, Ariz. 85017, Arthur K. Tyson, President	32,253	56
3	Maricopa Tech Col., Phoenix, Ariz. 85004, Nobert I. Bruemmer, Exec. Dean	17,057	29
1	Mesa Community College, Mesa, Ariz. 85201, John D. Riggs, Exec. Dean	39,588	68
3	Navaho Cmty. Col., Many Farms, Ariz. 86503, Ned Hatathli, President	83,390	144
3	Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Ariz. 86001, J. Lawrence Walkup, President	356,644	615
1	Phoenix College, Phoenix, Ariz. 85013, J. Lee Thompson, Exec. Dean	204,459	353
2	Pima College, Tucson, Ariz. 85711, Dr. Kenneth Harper, President	46,417	80
3	Prescott College, Prescott, Ariz. 86301, Ronald C. Nairn, President	10,800	19
2	University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz. 85721, Richard A. Harvill, President	273,200	471
3	Yavapai College, Prescott, Ariz. 86301, John W. Barnes, president	12,397	21
	ARKANSAS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 21)		
	Total	1,517,504	2,616
4	Agric Mech. & Normal Col., Pine Bluff, Ark. 71601, Lawrence A. Davis, president	321,096	554
4	Arkansas A & M College, College Hghts., Ark. 71633, Claude Hunter Babin, president	107,543	185
2	Arkansas Bapt. College, Little Rock, Ark. 72202, J. C. Oliver, president	17,452	30
2	Arkansas College, Batesville, Ark. 72501, R. William Wygle, president	57,880	100
3	Arkansas Polytechnic Col., Russellville, Ark. 72801, George L. B. Pratt, president	52,313	90
1	Arkansas State Univ., State University 72467, Carl R. Reng, president	149,252	257
3	College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark. 72830, Don E. Davis, president	19,477	34
1	Crowleys Ridge College, Paragould, Ark. 72450, Emmett Smith, president	22,681	39
2	Harding College, Searcy, Ark. 72143, Clifton L. Ganus, Jr., president	56,960	98
4	Henderson St. College, Arkadelphia, Ark. 71923, Dr. Martin B. Garrison, president	82,524	142
2	Hendrix College, Conway, Ark. 72032, Rox B. Shilling, Jr., president	28,183	49
3	John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark. 72761, John E. Brown, Jr., president	20,530	35
4	Ouachita Baptist Univ., Arkadelphia, Ark. 71923, Daniel R. Grant, president	78,681	136
2	Philander Smith College, Little Rock, Ark. 72203, Walter Hazzard, president	81,817	141
1	Phillips Co. Cmty. Col., Helena, Ark. 72342, John W. Easley, president	10,200	18
1	Southern Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, Ark. 72 H. F. Williams, President	31,862	55
4	Southern State College, Magnolia, Ark. 71753, Imon B. Bruce, President	146,892	253
2	State Col. of Arkansas, Conway, Ark. 72032, Silas D. Shuk, President	85,745	148
2	Univ. of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, Ark. 72204, Carey V. Stabler, President	$33,302	57
3	University of Arkansas, Fayatteville, Ark. 72701, David W. Mullins, President	57,792	159
3	Westark Junior Col., Fort Smith, Ark. 72901, Ben Whitfield, Acting President	15,322	25
	CALIFORNIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 172)		
	Total	16,590,046	28,608
13	Allan Hancock College, Santa Maria, Cal. 93454, Walter E. Conrad, President	12,804	22
3	American River College, Sacramento, Cal. 95841, Douglas Burris, Acting President	55,144	95
27	Antelope Valley College, Lancaster, Cal. 93534, William N. Kepley, Jr., Supt. President	2,400	4
24	Azusa Pacific College, Azusa, Cal. 91702, Cornelius P. Haggard, President	80,821	139
18	Bakersfield College, Bakersfield, Cal. 93305, Burns Finlinson, President	28,864	50
33	Barstow College, Barstow, Cal. 92311, Donald L. White, President	38,808	67
12	Bethany Bible College, Santa Cruz, Cal. 95060, C. C. Burnett, President	46,800	81
19	Biola College, La Mirada, Cal. 90638, J. Richard Chase, President	116,240	204
2	Butte College, Durham, Cal. 95938, Albert A. Schlueter, President	27,472	47
18	Cal State College, Bakersfield, Bakersfield, Cal. 93309, Dr. Paul F. Romberg, President	39,774	69
12	Cabrillo College, Aptos, Cal. 95003, Robert E. Swenson, president	67,476	116
24	Cal. St. Poly. Col. Kellog Voorhis, Pomona, Cal. 91766, Robert C. Kramer, president	386,846	667
17	Cal. State Col. Dominguez Hills, Dominguez Hills, Cal. 90247, Leo F. Cain, president	257,530	444
33	Cal. State Col. San Bernardino, San Bernardino, Cal. 92407, John M. Pfau, president	64,607	111
12	Cal. State Poly. Col., San Luis Obispo, Cal. 93401, Robert E. Kennedy, president	120,555	208
7	Calif. Col. of Arts and Crafts, Oakland, Cal. 94618, Harry X. Ford, president	44,804	77
30	Calif. Inst. of the Arts, Valencia Cal. 91335, Robert Corrigan, director	28,480	49
25	Calif. State Col. Fullerton, Fullerton, Cal. 92631, L. Donald Shields, acting president	95,314	164
32	Calif. State Col. Long Beach, Long Beach, Cal. 90801, Stephen Horn, president	285,757	493
29	Calif. State Col. Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Cal. 90032, John A. Greenlee, president	623,760	1,075
7	California Concordia Col., Oakland, Cal. 94605, William A. Poehler, president	3,500	6
24	California Inst. of Tech., Pasadena, Cal. 91109, Harold Brown, president	23,040	40
13	California Lutheran Col., Thousand Oaks, Cal. 91360, Raymond M. Olson, president	52,480	90
9	California St. Col. Hayward, Hayward, Cal. 94542, Ellis E. McCune, president	147,484	254
11	Canada College, Redwood, Cal. 94061, William M. Goss, president	69,386	120
19	Cerritos College, Norwalk, Cal. 90650, Siegfried Ringwald, president	44,545	77
8	Chabot College, Hayward, Cal. 94545, Reed L. Buffington, president	81,000	140
33	Chaffey College, Alta Loma Cal. 91701, T. Stanley Warburton, president	24,937	43
35	Chapman College, Orange, Cal. 92666, John L. Davis, president	49,520	85
2	Chico State College, Chico, Cal. 95926, Lew D. Oliver, president	294,427	508
6	City Col. San Fran., SF. Un. Sch. Dist., San Francisco, Cal. 94112, Louis Batmall, president	128,562	222
24	Claremont Mens Coll., Claremont, CA. 91711, Jack L. Stark, president	10,670	18
38	Col. of the Desert, Cuachella Val. Jcd., Palm Desert, Cal. 92260, Roy C. McCall, president	37,471	65
7	Col. of the Holy Names, Oakland, Cal. 94619, Sister Mary Ambrose Devereux, president	23,180	40
8	College of Alameda, Alameda, Cal. 94501, Dr. Ernest H. Berg, president	46,583	80
1	College of Marin, Kentfield, Cal. 94904, John A. Grasham, president	37,840	65
11	College of Notre Dame, Belmont, Cal. 94002, Sister Catharine Julie Cunning, president	15,279	26
11	College of San Mateo, San Mateo, Cal. 94402, Robert Ewigleben, president	149,124	257
27	College of the Canyons, Valencia, Cal. 91355, Dr. Robert C. Rockwel., superintendent-president	2,000	3
1	College of the Redwoods, Eureka, Cal. 95501, Eugene J. Portugal, president	15,560	27
18	College of the Sequoias, Visalia, Cal. 93277, Ivan C. Crookshanks, president	27,326	47
6	College of the Siskiyous, Weed, Cal. 96094, E. Schumacher, president	17,450	30
2	Columbia Jr. Col., Columbia, Calif. 95310, Harvey Rhodes, dean	25,126	43
23	Compton College, Compton, Calif. 90221, Abel Sykes, Jr., president	20,160	35
14	Contra Costa College, San Pablo, Calif. 94806, Dr. Robert L. Wynne, president	190,221	328

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	CALIFORNIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 172)—Con.		
3	Cosumnes River College, Sacramento, Calif. 95825, Oliver J. Durand, president	$14,672	25
34	Cypress College, Cypress, Calif. 90630, Omar Scheidt, president	44,880	77
10	De Anza College, Cupertino, Calif. 95014, A. Robert Dehart, president	87,240	150
14	Diablo Valley College, Concord, Calif. 94523, William P. Niland, president	44,008	76
6	Dominican Col., San Rafael, San Rafael, Calif. 94901, Sister Mary Samuel Conlan, president	5,000	9
27	Don Bosco Technical Institute, Rosemead, Calif. 91770, Rev. Thomas Prendiville, SDB, president	12,880	22
29	East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90022, John K. Wells, president	34,132	59
17	El Camino College, El Camino Col., Calif. 90506, Stuart E. Marsee, president	145,747	251
2	Feather River Col., Quincy, Calif. 95971, Dale Wren, president	7,000	12
10	Foothill College, Los Altos Hls., Calif. 94022, Hubert H. Semans, president	36,365	63
16	Fresno City College, Fresno, Calif. 93704, Clyde McCully, president	157,841	272
16	Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif. 93726, Norman Baxter, president	396,895	684
34	Fullerton Jr. College, Fullerton, Calif. 92631, John W. Casey, president	34,560	60
10	Gavilan College, Gilroy, Calif. 95020, Ralph Schroeder, president	39,778	69
20	Glendale College, Glendale Calif. 91208, John T. McCuen, president	8,536	15
5	Golden Gate College, San Francisco, Calif. 94105, Otto Butz, president	65,324	113
32	Golden West College, Huntington Beach, Calif. 92647, R. Dudley Boyce, president	22,554	39
36	Grossmont College, El Cajon, Calif. 92020, Ervin F. Metzgar, president	55,524	96
12	Hartnell College, Salinas, Calif. 93901, Gibb R. Madsen, super-president	62,143	107
24	Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, Joseph B. Platt, president	14,800	26
1	Humboldt State College, Arcata Calif. 95521, C. H. Siemens, president	100,804	174
15	Humphreys College, Stockton, Calif. 95207, J. R. Humphreys, president	13,920	24
20	Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, Calif, 90027, Helen Kelley, president	50,400	87
38	Imperial Valley Col , Imperial, Calif. 92251, Terrel Spencer, president	31,494	54
14	John F Kennedy Univ , Martinez, Calif. 94553, Harry L. Morrison, president	15,390	27
24	La Verne College, La Verne, Calif. 91750, Leland Newcomer, president	46,242	80
7	Laney College, Oakland, Calif. 94606, Herbert M. Stein, president	139,045	240
2	Lassen College, Susanville, Calif. 96130, Robert Theiler, president	3,502	6
33	Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, Calif. 92354, David J. Bieber, president	91,315	157
6	Lone Mountain College, San Francisco, Calif. 94118, Mother Gertrude Patch, president	45,631	79
32	Long Beach City College, Long Beach, Calif. 90808, Wiley D. Garner, president	6,488	11
27	Los Angeles Baptist Col. & Sem., Newhall, Calif. 91321, John R. Dunkin, president	26,960	48
29	Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90029, Louis Kaufman, president	110,428	190
17	Los Angeles Harbor Col., Wilmington, Calif. 90744, Wendell C. Black, president	13,066	23
22	Los Angeles Pierce Col., Woodland Hills, Calif. 91364, John A. Nicklin, president	6,400	11
31	Los Angeles Southwest Col., Los Angeles, Calif. 90047, Leadie Clark, acting president	43,066	74
21	Los Angeles Tr. Tech. Col., Los Angeles, Calif. 90015, Fred J. Brinkman, president	18,720	32
22	Los Angeles Valley Col., Van Nuys, Calif. 91401, Dr. Robert Horton, president	36,340	63
28	Loyola U. of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. 90045, Very Rev. Donald Paul Merrifiel, president	90,277	156
28	Marymount College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90045, Sister M. Raymund McKay, president	44,400	77
11	Menlo College, Menlo Park, Calif. 94025, Richard O'Brien, president	6,114	11
16	Merced Col., Merced, Calif. 95340, Lowell F. Barker, president	69,601	120
7	Merritt College, Oakland, Calif. 94609, Noruel Smith, president	114,720	198
7	Mills College, Oakland, Calif. 94613, Robert J. Wert, president	40,658	70
35	Mira Coast Col., Oceanside, Calif. 92054, John MacDonald, president	39,538	68
15	Modesto Jr. College, Modesto, Calif. 95350, Roy G. Mikalson, President	48,251	83
12	Monterey Inst. of Foreign Studies, Monterey, Calif. 93940, Fulton Freeman, President	15,600	27
12	Monterey Peninsula Col. Monterey, Calif. 93940, George F. Faul, President	58,640	101
13	Moorpark College, Moorpark, Calif. 93021, John J. Collins, President	94,855	164
24	Mount San Antonio College, Walnut, Calif. 91789, Marie Mills, President	88,773	153
28	Mount St. Marys College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90049, Sister Cecilia Louise, President	$25,920	45
99	Nairobi College, East Palo Alto, Calif. 94303, Donald R. Smothers, President	283,442	489
1	Napa College, Napa, Calif. 94558, George Clark, President	33,200	57
31	Northrop Inst. of Tech., Inglewood, Calif. 90306, Homer H. Grant, Jr., President	12,800	22
24	Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90041, Richard C. Gilman, President	45,821	79
9	Ohlone College, Fremont, Calif. 94537, Stephen E. Epler, President	9,120	15
35	Orange Coast Col., Costa Mesa, Calif. 92626, Robert B. Moore, President	15,804	27
30	Otis Art Inst. of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif. 90057, Andreas S. Andersen, President	11,950	21
32	Pacific Christian College, Long Beach, Calif. 90804, Medford Jones, President	8,000	14
16	Pacific College of Fresno, Fresno, Calif. 93702, Arthur J. Wiebe, President	45,200	78
24	Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena, Calif. 91105, E. Robert La Crosse, Jr., President	18,243	31
1	Pacific Union College, Angwin, Calif. 94508, F. O. Rittenhouse, president	64,720	112
38	Palo Verde College, Blythe, Calif. 92225, David L. Brown, acting president	9,867	17
35	Palomar College, San Marcos, Calif. 92069, Frederick R. Huber, president	83,807	144
20	Pasadena City College, Pasadena, Calif. 91106, Armen Sarafian, president	297,920	514
20	Pasadena College, Pasadena, Calif. 91104, W. Shelburne Brown, president	85,858	148
31	Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90044, M. Norvel Young, president	69,679	120
24	Pitzer College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, Robert H. Atwell, president	74,719	129
24	Pomona College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, David Alexander, president	74,921	129
18	Porterville College, Porterville, Calif. 93258, Orlin H. Shires, president	21,385	37
16	Reedley College, Reedley, Calif. 93654, Clifford M. Boyer, president	24,926	43
19	Rio Hondo College, Whittier, Calif. 90608, Walter M. Garcia, president	194,005	334
38	Riverside City College, Riverside, Calif. 92506, R. H. Bradshaw, president	30,960	53
3	Sacramento City College, Sacramento, Calif. 95822, Sam Kipp, president	160,139	276
3	Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Calif. 95819, Bernard Hyink, president	351,762	606
33	San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino, Calif. 92403, Arthur M. Jensen, president	31,306	54
37	San Diego City College, San Diego, Calif. 92101, Rex Gorton, president	9,627	17
36	San Diego Mesa College, San Diego, Calif. 92111, Ellis Benson, President	7,713	13
36	San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif. 92115, Malcolm A. Love, President	475,901	821
27	San Fernando Vly. St. Col., Northridge, Calif. 91316, James W. Cleary, President	824,119	1,421
5	San Francisco Art Inst., San Francisco, Calif. 94133, Theodore L. Eliot, Exec. Director	6,414	11
6	San Francisco Cons. Music, San Francisco, Calif. 94122, Milton Salkind, Director	11,200	19
6	San Francisco State Col., San Francisco, Calif. 94132, S. J. Hayakawa, President	679,647	1,172
15	San Joaquin Delta Jr. College, Stockton, Calif. 95204, Joseph Blanchard, President	78,501	135
9	San Jose Bible College, San Jose, Calif. 95108, Woodrow Phillips, President	2,895	5
10	San Jose City College, San Jose, Calif. 95114, Otto Roemnich, President	87,380	151
9	San Jose Hospitals School of Nrsg., San Jose, Calif. 95114. David E. Olsson, President	5,575	10
10	San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif. 95114, John Bunzel, President	1,151,198	1,985
35	Santa Ana College, Santa Ana, Calif. 92706, John E. Johnson, President	59,574	103
13	Santa Barbara City Col., Santa Barbara, Calif. 93105, Glenn Gooder, Supt. President	40,144	69
28	Santa Monica College, Santa Monica, Calif. 90406, Wade F. Thomas, Jr., President	18,622	32
6	Santa Rosa Jr. College, Santa Rosa, Calif. 95401, Brook Tauzer, Acting President	30,511	53
24	Scripps College, Claremont, Calif. 91711, Mark H. Curtis, President	31,414	54
2	Shasta College, Redding, Calif. 96001, Gilbert A. Collyer, president	40,084	69
2	Sierra College, Rocklin, Calif. 95677, Harold H. Weaver, president	36,169	62
6	Simpson Bible College, San Francisco, Calif. 94134, Mark W. Lee, president	14,614	25
11	Skyline College, San Bruno, Calif. 94406, Phillip Garlington, president	36,340	63
4	Solano College, Vallejo, Calif. 94590, N. Dallas Evans, president	30,154	52
1	Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, Calif. 94928, Thomas H. McGrath, president	147,751	255
35	Southern California Col., Costa Mesa, Calif. 92626, Emil A. Balliet, president	70,619	122
37	Southwestern College, Chula Vista, Calif. 92010, Chester S. Devore, president	22,926	40

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	CALIFORNIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 172)—Con.		
14	St. Marys Col. of California, St. Marys Col., Calif. 94575, Brother Mel Anderson, president	$38,000	66
10	Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. 94305, Richard Lyman, acting pres	156,529	270
15	Stanislaus State College, Turlock, Calif. 95380, Carl Gatlin, president	67,040	116
7	U. of Cal. Berkeley, Berkeley, Calif. 94720, Roger Heyns, chancellor	791,361	1,364
35	U. of Cal. San Diego, La Jolla, Calif. 92038, Herbert F. York, acting chancellor	146,912	253
36	U. S. Internal Univ., San Diego, Calif. 92106, William C. Rust, president	102,979	178
36	U. San Diego Col. for Men, San Diego, Calif. 92110, Very Rev. John L. Baer, president	55,280	95
28	Univ. of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024, Charles E. Young, Chancellor	567,360	978
38	Univ. of California Riverside, Riverside, Calif. 92502, Ivan Hindlraker, Chancellor	217,007	374
13	Univ. of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93106, Vernon I. Cheadle, Chancellor	464,841	801
12	Univ. of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, Calif. 95060, Dean E. McHenry, Chancellor	81,595	141
6	Univ. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif. 94117, Rev. Albert R. Jonsen, President	51,040	00
21	Univ. of Sthrn. California, Los Angeles, Calif. 90007, John R. Hubbard, President	211,568	365
4	University of California Davis, Davis, Calif. 95616, James Meyer, Chancellor	197,213	340
35	University of California Irvine, Irvine, Calif. 92664, Charles J. Hitch, Chancellor	97,719	165
33	University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif. 92373, Eugene Dawson, President	79,510	137
10	University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, Calif. 95053, Very Rev. Thomas D. Terry, President	108,822	168
15	University of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif. 95204, Robert E Burns, President	61,920	107
13	Ventura College, Ventura, Calif. 93003, Ray C. Lochr, President	33,383	58
33	Victor Valley College, Victorville, Calif. 92392, Burt Wadsworth, President	32,829	57
16	West Hills Col., Coalinga, Calif. 93210, Robert A. Annand, President & Superintendent	9,928	17
26	West Los Angeles Col., Culver City, Calif. 90230, Morris J. Heldman, President	19,629	34
10	West Valley Col., Campbell, Calif 95008, James P. Hardy, President	63,602	110
13	Westmont College, Santa Barbara, Cal. 93103, John William Snyder, President	22,979	40
19	Whittier College, Whittier, Cal. 90608, Frederick M. Binder, President	90,296	156
4	Yuba College, Marysville, Cal. 95901, Daniel Walker, Supt. and President	52,894	91
	COLORADO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 26)		
	Total	2,105,130	3,631
4	Adams State College, Alamosa, Colo. 81101, John A. Marvel, President	69,916	121
4	Alms College, Greeley, Colo. 80631, Ed Beaty, President	26,488	46
2	Arapahoe Cmty. Col., Littleton, Co. 80120, Dr. Allan P. Crawford, President	19,712	34
1	Cmty. Col. of Denver, Denver, Colo. 80216, Leland B. Luchsinger, President	110,957	191
3	Colorado College, Colorado Spgs., Colo. 80903, Lloyd E. Worner, President	48,654	84
4	Colorado Mountain College, Glenwood Springs, Colo. 81601, Elbie Gann, President	17,017	29
2	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo. 80401, Guy T. McBride, Jr., President	20,636	36
4	Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo. 80521, Dr. A. Ray Chamberlain, President	427,124	736
3	El Paso Community College, Colorado Springs, Co. 80903, Dr. Robert O. Hatton, President	12,635	22
4	Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colo. 81301, Rexer Berndt, President	73,065	126
3	Lamar Community College, Lamar, Colo. 81052, Dr. Donald L. Keith, President	10,288	18
1	Loretto Heights College, Denver, Colo. 80236, Patricia Jean Manion, President	11,216	19
4	Mesa College, Grand Junction, Col. 81501, Theodore E. Albers, President	19,096	33
1	Metropolitan State College, Denver Colo 80204, Kenneth Phillips, president	105,411	182
4	Northeastern Jr College, Sterling, Colo 80751, E S French president	30,569	53
3	Otero Jr College, La Junta, Colo 81050, William L Mc-Divitt, president	9,473	16
4	Rangely College, Rangely, Colo 81648, John E Roberts, president	11,396	20
1	Regis College, Denver, Colo 80221, Very Rev Louis Mattione, president	30,669	53
3	Southern Colorado St Col, Pueblo, Colo 81005, J Victor Hopper, president	49,921	80
1	Temple Buell College, Denver, Colo 80220, Dumont F Kenny, president	24,735	43
3	Trinidad State Jr College, Trinidad, Colo 81082 Guy C Davis, president	163,743	282
2	University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo 80302, Dr Frederick P Thieme, president	499,758	861
1	University of Denver, Denver, Colo 80210, Maurice B Mitchell, chancellor	$49,049	85
4	University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo 80631, Darrell Holmes, president	246,380	42
4	US International Univ-Colo Alpine, Steamboat Springs, Colo, 80477 William C Rust, president	3,927	7
4	Western State Col of Colo, Gunnison, Colo 81230, Harlan Bryant, president	13,475	23
	CONNECTICUT (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 36)		
	Totals	1,963,899	3,422
3	Albertus Magnus College, New Haven Conn 06511, Sr Marie Louise Hubert, president	26,160	45
2	Annhurst College, S Woodstock, Conn 06281, Sr Cecill Comtois, president	4,300	7
6	Central Conn State Col, New Britain Conn 06050, F Don James, president	144,782	250
2	Connecticut College, New London, Conn. 06320, Charles E. Shain, president	49,077	85
2	Eastern Conn. State College, Willimantic, Conn. 06226, Charles Webb, president	64,871	112
4	Fairfield University, Fairfield, Conn. 06430, Very Rev. William C. McInnes, president	88,320	152
1	Greater Hartford Cmty. Col., Hartford, Conn. 06106, Arthur C. Banks, president	39,496	68
1	Hartford Col. for Women, Hartford, Conn. 06105, Laura A. Johnson, president	11,840	20
1	Hartford State Tech. Col., Hartford, Conn. 06106, Thomas Raimondi, president	10,573	18
3	Housatonic Cmty. Col., Stratford, Conn. 06497, Edward Liston, president	25,600	44
1	Manchester Community Col., Manchester, Conn. 06040, Frederick W. Lowe, Jr., president	14,261	25
3	Mattatuck Cmty. Col., Waterbury, Conn. 06702, Charles B. Kinney, president	16,145	28
2	Middlesex Cmty College, Middletown, Conn. 06458, Philip D. Wheaton, president	23,564	41
2	Mitchell College, New London, Conn. 06320, Robert C. Weller, president	13,360	23
2	Mohegan Comm. College, Norwich, Conn. 06360, Robert N. Rue, president	3,729	6
3	New Haven College, West Haven, Conn. 06505, Marvin K. Peterson, president	115,689	199
6	Northwestern Conn. Cmty. College, Winsted, Conn. 06098, Regina M. Duffy, president	3,800	7
4	Norwalk Community Col., Norwalk, Conn. 06854, Everett I. L. Baker, dean	15,920	27
4	Norwalk State Tech. Col., S. Norwalk, Conn. 06854, Frank L. Juszli, president	6,693	12
5	Post Jr. College, Waterbury, Conn., 06702, F. Burton Cook, president	14,008	24
3	Quinnipiac College, Hamden, Conn., 06518, John H. Herder, president	66,106	114
4	Scared Heart Univ., Bridgeport, Conn., 06604, William H. Conley, president	26,473	46
4	Silvermine College of Art, New Canaan, Conn., 06840, Stephen Jay, president	3,463	6
3	South Central Cmty. Col., New Haven, Conn., 06511, Albert Hendricks, acting president	10,880	19
3	Southern Conn. State Col., New Haven, Conn., 06515, Hilton C. Buley, president	108,878	188
1	St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn., 06117, Sr. Mary Consolata, president	15,081	26
2	Thames Vly. St. Tech. Inst., Norwich, Conn., 06360, Donald Ralph Welter, president	10,835	19
1	Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 06106, Dr. Theodore C. Lockwood, president	63,606	110
5	Tunxis Cmty. College, Farmington, Ct., 06032, Dr. Benjamin G. Davis	13,089	23
4	University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn., 06602, Thurston E. Manning, president	89,678	155
2	University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn., 06268, Homer D. Babbidge Jr., president	499,506	861
1	University of Hartford, W. Hartford, Conn., 06117, Archibald M. Woodruff, chancellor	103,440	178
5	Waterbury State Tech Col., Waterbury, Conn., 06708, Kenneth W. Fogg, president	2,769	5
2	Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., 06457, Colin G. Campbell, president	103,184	178
5	Western Conn. State Col., Danbury, Conn., 06810, Ruth A. Haas, president	38,924	67
3	Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 05620, Kingman Brewster, Jr., president	135,797	234
	DELAWARE (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 6)		
	Total	416,993	720
1 1	Brandywine Junior College, Wilmington, Del. 19800, Sidney Peters, president	35,920	62
1 1	Del. Tec and Cmty Col., Dover, 19947, Paul K. Weatherly, president	35,192	61
1 1	Delaware State College, Dover, Del. 19901, Luna I. Mishol, president	259,639	448
99	Goldy Beacon Jr. College, Wilmington, Del. 19899, Clarence A. Fulmer, president	18,000	31
1 1	University of Delaware, Newark, Del. 19711, Edward A. Trabant, acting president	59,602	103
99	Wilmington College, Wilmington, Del. 19720, Donald E. Ross, president	8,640	15

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 10)		
	Total	$1,261,630	2,176
	American University, Washington, D.C. 20016, George H. Williams, president	108,320	187
	Catholic Univ. of America, Washington, D.C. 20017, Clarence Walton, president	82,640	142
	D.C. Teachers College, Washington, D.C. 20009, Paul Cooke, president	40,233	69
	Dunbarton Col. Holy Cross, Washington, D.C. 20008, Paul Buchanan, president	4,500	8
	Federal City College, Washington, D.C. 20001, Harland Randolph, president	555,929	958
	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. 20006, Lloyd H. Elliott, president	84,993	147
	Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007, Rev. Robert J. Henle, S.J., president	55,680	96
	Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20001, James E. Cheek, president	160,400	277
	Trinity College, Washington, D.C. 20017, Sister Margaret Claydon, president	25,840	45
	Washington Tech. Inst., Washington, D.C. 20005, Cleveland L. Dennard, president	143,095	247
	FLORIDA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 52)		
	Total	4,032,840	6,955
11	Barry College, Miami, Fla. 33136, Sister M. Dorothy Browne, president	45,018	78
4	Bethune Cookman College, Daytona Beach, Fla. 32015, Richard V. Moore, president	253,100	436
10	Biscayne College, Miami, Fla. 33054, John H. McDonnel Osa, president	29,456	51
5	Brevard Jr. College, Cocoa, Fla. 32922, Maxwell G. King, president	59,675	103
10	Broward Cmty. College, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla. 33314, Hugh Adams, president	53,198	92
4	Central Florida Jr. Col., Ocala, Fla. 32670, Henry Goodlett, president	36,089	62
1	Chipola Jr. College, Marianna, Fla. 32446, Raymond M. Deming, president	41,662	72
4	Daytona Beach Jr. College, Daytona Beach, Fla. 32015, Roy F. Bergengren, Jr., president	45,770	79
7	Edison Junior College, Fort Meyers, Fla. 33901, David G. Robinson, president	8,085	14
3	Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, Fla. 32209, William B. Stewart, president	86,297	149
4	Embry-Riddle Aero Inst., Dayton, Beach Fla. 32015, Jack R. Hunt, president	23,887	41
2	Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Fla. 32307, Benjamin Perry, president	356,025	614
9	Florida Atlantic Univ., Boca Raton, Fla, 33432, Kenneth R. Williams, president	124,373	214
5	Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Fla. 32901, Jerome P. Keuper, president	38,668	67
3	Florida Jr. Col. at Jacksonville, Jacksonville, Fla. 32207, Benjamin R. Wygal, president	63,200	109
12	Florida Keys Jr. College, Key West, Fla. 33040, John S. Smith, president	31,673	55
11	Florida Memorial College, Miami, Fla. 33165, R. W. Puryear, president	182,182	314
8	Florida Presbyterian Col., St. Petersburg, Fla. 33733, Billy O. Wireman, president	74,330	128
7	Florida Southern College, Lakeland, Fla. 33802, Charles T. Thrift, Jr., president	84,842	146
2	Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla. 323, J. Stanley Marshall, president	229,427	396
5	Florida Technological Univ., Orlando, Fla. 32801, Dr. Charles Millican, president	134,022	231
10	Fort Lauderdale University, Fort Lauderdale, Fla. 33301, Dr. Stanley J. Drake, president	6,483	11
1	Gulf Coast Jr. College, Panama City, Fla. 32401, Richard E. Morley, president	10,843	19
6	Hilisborough Jr. Col., Tampa, Fla. 33606, Morton S. Shanberg, president	29,518	51
9	Indian River Jr. College, Fort Pierce, Fla. 33450, Herman Heise, president	4,504	8
3	Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Fla. 32211, Robert H. Spiro, president	82,854	143
3	Jones College, Jacksonville, Fla. 32211, Jack H. Jones, president	74,666	129
2	Lake City J. C. & Forest Ranger Sch., Lake City, Fla. 32055, H. E. Phillips, president	58,572	101
4	Lake-Sumter Jr. College, Leesburg, Fla. 32748, Paul P. Williams, president	3,000	5
7	Manatee Jr. College, Bradenton, Fla. 33505, Samuel R. Neel, president	28,058	48
9	Marymount College, Boca Raton, Fla. 33432, Gerard Fagan, president	13,629	23
11	Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Fl. 33156, Peter Masiko, Jr., president	200,354	345
7	New College, Sarasota, Fl. 33578, John Elmendorf, president	20,568	35
2	North Florida Jr. College, Madison, Fl. 32340, Stephen H. McMahon, president	37,191	64
1	Okaloosa Walton Jr. Col., Valparaiso, Fl. 32580, J. E. McCracken, president	3,974	7
9	Palm Beach Atlantic College, W. Palm Beach, Fl. 33401, Dr. Jess Moody, president	16,886	29
1	Pensacola Jr. College, Pensacola, Fl. 32504, T. Felton Harrison, president	17,813	31
5	Rollins College, Winter Park, Fl. 32789, Jack B. Critchfield, president	$34,518	60
2	Santa Fe Jr. Col., Gainesville, Fl. 32601, Joseph Fordyce, president	36,371	63
4	Seminole Jr. Col., Sanford, Fl. 32771, Earl S. Weldon, president	8,622	13
7	South-Eastern Bible Col., Lakeland, Fl. 33801, Cyril E. Homer, president	110,803	191
2	St. Johns River Jr. College, Palatka, Fl. 32077, Charles La Pradd, president	27,032	47
9	St. Joseph College of Fla., Jensen Beach, Fl. 33457, Sister M. Martha, SSJ., president	16,247	28
8	St. Leo College, St. Leo Fl. 33574, Marion Bowman, acting president	8,837	15
8	St. Petersburg Jr. College, St. Petersburg, Fl. 33733, Michael M. Bennett, president	100,414	173
4	Stetson University, De Land, Fl. 32720, John E. Johns, chief exec. officer	77,539	134
2	Tallahassee Cmty. College, Tallahassee, Fl. 32303, Fred W. Turner, president	15,972	28
6	Univ. of South Florida, Tampa, Fla. 33620, Harris W. Dean, Acting President	216,494	373
1	Univ. of West Florida, Pensacola, Fla. 32504, Harold B. Crosby, President	108,939	188
2	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla. 32601, Stephen C. O'Connell, President	377,503	651
12	University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla. 33124, Henry King Standord, President	251,067	433
5	Valencia Jr. College, Orlando, Fla. 32802, James Gollattscheck, President	33,374	58
	GEORGIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS 53)		
	Total	3,076,796	5,306
2	Abraham Baldwin Agric. Col., Tifton, Ga. 31794, J. Clyde Driggers, President	34,717	60
2	Albany Jr. College, Albany, Georgia 31705, B. R. Tilley, President	28,105	48
2	Albany State College, Albany, Ga. 31705, Charles Hayes, President	104,713	181
2	Andrew College, Cuthbert, Ga. 31740, George W. Gambill, President	10,633	16
1	Armstrong State College, Savannah, Ga. 31406, Henry L. Ashmore, President	21,160	36
5	Atlanta Baptist Col., Atlanta, Ga. 30341, Monroe F. Swilley, Director	19,866	34
10	Augusta College, Augusta, Ga. 30904, George A. Christenberry, President	16,924	29
7	Berry College, Mount Berry, Ga. 30149, John R. Bertrand, President	103,759	179
1	Brewton Parker College, Mount Vernon, Ga. 30445, J. Theodore Phillips, President	24,523	42
8	Brunswick Jr. College, Brunswick, Ga. 31520, John W. Teel, President	32,316	56
5	Clark College, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, Vivian W. Henderson, President	246,015	424
5	Clayton Jr. Col., Forest Park, Ga. 30050, Harry S. Downs, president	8,547	15
3	Columbus College, Columbus, Ga. 31907, Thomas Y. Whitley, president	15,281	26
7	Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, Tenn. 37350, Marion D. Barnes, president	37,274	64
7	Dalton Junior College, Dalton, Ga. 30720, Derrell C. Roberts, president	18,326	32
4	Dekalb Col., Clarkston, Ga. 30021, James Hinson, president	18,634	32
9	Emmanuel College, Franklin Springs, Ga. 30639, Culbreth Melton, president	8,416	15
4	Emory University, Atlanta, Ga. 30322, Sanford S. Atwood, president	34,590	60
7	Floyd Jr. College, Rome, Ga. 30161, David B. McCorkle, president	3,006	5
3	Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Ga. 31030, Waldo W. E. Blanchet, president	165,275	285
9	Gainesville Jr. College, Gainesville, Ga. 30501, Hugh M. Mills, Jr., president	3,274	6
10	Georgia College at Milledgeville, Milledgeville, Ga. 31061, J. Whitney Bunting, acting president	19,802	34
5	Georgia Institute of Tech., Atlanta, Ga. 30332, Arthur G. Hansen, president	78,078	135
1	Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Ga. 30458, John O. Eidson, president	112,714	194
3	Georgia Southwestern Col., Americus, Ga. 31709, William B. King, president	27,501	47
5	Georgia State Univ., Atlanta, Ga. 30303, Noah Langdale, Jr., president	47,127	81
6	Gordon Military College, Barnesville, Ga. 30204, Joseph Bray, president	13,244	23
7	Kennesaw Jr. College, Marietta, Georgia 30060, Horace W. Sturgis, president	3,973	7
6	La Grange College, La Grange, Georgia 30240, Waights G. Henry, Jr., president	14,861	26
6	Macon Jr. College, Macon, Ga, 31206, Jack Carlton, president	3,927	7
10	Medical Col. of Georgia, Augusta, Ga. 30902, Harry B. Orear, president	4,754	8
6	Mercer University, Macon, Ga. 31207, Rufus C. Harris, president	96,175	166
8	Middle Georgia College, Cochran, Ga. 31014, Louis C. Alderman, president	14,169	24
5	Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, Hugh M. Gloster, president	237,073	409

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	GEORGIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 53)—Continued		
5	Morris Brown College, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, John A. Middleton, president	$165,103	285
2	Norman College, Norman Park, Ga. 31771, Thomas G. Renfroe, president	11,858	20
9	North Georgia College, Dahlonega, Ga. 30533, John H. Owen, president	37,801	65
4	Oglethorpe College, Atlanta, Ga. 30319, Paul Kenneth Vonk, president	9,471	16
10	Paine College, Augusta, Ga. 30901, E. Clayton Calhoun, president	240,548	415
9	Piedmont College, Demorest, Ga. 30535, James E. Walter, president	27,489	47
9	Reinhardt College, Waleska, Ga. 30183, J. R. Burgess Jr., president	9,637	17
1	Savannah State College, Savannah, Ga. 31404, Howard Jordan, Jr., president	31,361	54
7	Shorter College, Rome, Ga. 30161, Randall H. Minor, president	16,625	29
8	South Georgia College, Douglas, Ga. 31533, Denton R. Coker, president	42,762	74
5	Spelman College, Atlanta, Ga. 30314, A. E. Manley, president	303,080	523
6	Tift College, Forsyth, Ga. 31029, Robert W. Jackson, president	16,710	29
9	Toccoa Falls Inst. Inc., Toccoa Falls, Ga. 30577, Julian A. Sandy, president	22,296	38
9	Truett McConnell Col., Cleveland, Ga. 30528, Warner Earle Fusselle, president	5,739	10
10	University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 30601, Fred C. Davison, president	393,686	679
8	Valdosta State College, Valdosta, Ga. 31601, S. Walter Martin, president	31,707	55
6	Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga. 31201, W. Earl Strickland, president	4,396	8
6	West Georgia College, Carrollton, Ga. 30117, James E. Boyd, president	73,253	126
9	Young Harris College, Young Harris, Ga. 30582, Douglas R. Sasser, president	4,522	6
	HAWAII (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 11)		
	Total	435,106	749
12	Chaminade Col. of Honolulu, Honolulu, Hawaii 96816, Bro. Robert Magiure, president	19,158	33
12	Hawaii Cmty College, Hilo, Hawaii 96720, Mitsugu Sumada, principal	11,112	19
99	Hawaii Pacific College, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, Dr. George A. Warmer, president	4,698	8
12	Honolulu Community College, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817 James W. Thornton, Jr., provost	25,038	43
12	Kapiolani Community College, Honolulu, Hawaii 96814, Raymond Y. C. Won, provost	26,781	46
12	Kauai Community College, Lihue Kauai, Hawaii 96766, Philip Ige, provost	12,156	21
12	Leeward Oahu Cmty Col, Pearl City, Hawaii 96782, Leonard D Tuthill, provost	33,029	57
12	Maui Community College, Kahului, Hawaii 96732, Harold Luntey, provost	19,367	33
12	Mauna Olu College, Paia Maui, Hawaii 96779, Cummins E. Speakman Jr., president	54,898	95
12	Univ of Hawaii Hilo Campus, Hilo, Hawaii 96720, Dr. Charles Neff, provost	46,619	80
12	University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, Harlan Cleveland, president	182,250	314
	IDAHO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 8)		
	Total	625,597	1,079
1	Boise State College, Boise, Idaho 83701, John B. Barnes, president	44,223	76
2	Col of Southern Idaho, Twin Falls, Idaho 83301, James L. Taylor, president	50,371	87
1	College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho 83605, Warren B. Knox, president	92,640	160
2	Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho 83201, William E. Davis, president	159,095	274
1	Lewis-Clark Normal School, Lewiston, Idaho 83501, Jerold Dugger, president	45,290	78
1	North Idaho, Jr. College, Coeur D. Alene, Idaho 83814, Garry G Schuler, president	11,574	20
1	Northwest Nazarene Col., Nampa, Idaho 83651 John E. Riley, president	121,632	210
1	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83843, Ernest W. Hartung, president	100,772	174
	ILLINOIS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 100)		
	Total	7,815,257	13,475
11	Amundsen-Mayfair Col Chicago, Ill 60630, Theodore G. Phillips, president	15,412	27
19	Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill. 61201, Dr. C. W. Sorensen, president	86,000	148
15	Aurora College, Aurora, Ill. 60507, Dr. James E. Crimi, president	43,360	75
12	Barat College, Lake Forest, Ill. 60045, Mother Margaret Burke, president	75,280	130
19	Black Hawk College, Moline, Ill. 61265, Alban E. Reid, Jr., president	14,033	24
23	Blackburn College, Carlinville, Ill. 62626, Glenn L. McConagha, president	$27,598	48
18	Bradley University, Peoria, Ill. 61606, T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr., president	232,028	400
19	Carl Sandburg Col., Galesburg, Ill. 61401, Eltis Henson, president	5,647	10
7	Central YMCA Cmty. College, Chicago, Ill. 60606, Donald A. Canar, president	299,840	517
7	Chicago Conservatory College, Chicago, Ill. 60605, Dr. Francis Dalbert, president	2,440	4
3	Chicago State College, Chicago, Ill. 60621, Milton B. Byrd, president	170,263	294
11	City College of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60634, Ernest V. Clements, president	6,320	11
14	College of Dupage, Glen Ellyn, Ill. 60137, Rodney Berg, president	20,621	36
12	College of Lake County, Grayslake, Ill. 60030, Richard G. Erzen, president	34,400	59
9	Columbia College, Chicago, Ill. 60611, Dr. Mirron Alexandroff, president	5,000	9
10	Concordia Teachers Col., River Forest, Ill. 60305, M. L. Koehneke, president	24,800	43
17	Danville Jr. College, Danville, Ill. 61832, Mary Miller, president	42,817	74
7	DePaul University, Chicago, Ill. 60604, Very Rev. John R. Cortelyou, president	127,200	219
22	Eastern Illinois Univ., Charleston, Ill. 61920, Dr. Quincy Doudna, president	205,920	355
15	Elgin Community College, Elgin, Ill. 60120, G. I. Renner, President	12,613	22
14	Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill. 60126, Dr. Donald C. Kleckner, President	36,499	63
18	Eureka College, Eureka, Ill. 61530, Dr. Ira W. Langston, President	52,080	90
2	Fenger-Southeast Col., Chicago, Ill. 60617, Doyle Bonjour, Acting President	61,452	106
14	George Williams College, Downers Grove, Ill. 60515, Dr. Richard E. Hamlin, President	39,920	69
4	Governors St. Univ., Park Forest South, Ill. 60466, William Engbretson, President	34,629	60
23	Greenville College, Greenville, Ill. 62246, Orley R. Herron, Jr., President	54,206	93
13	Hebrew Theol. College, Skokie, Ill. 60076, Harold P. Smith, Administrator Vice President	24,080	42
16	Highland Cmty. Col., Freeport, Ill. 61032, Kenneth E. Borland, President	12,160	21
23	Ill. Central Col., East Peoria, Ill. 61611, Kenneth L. Edwards, President	65,581	113
17	Ill. State University, Normal, Ill. 61761, Francis R. Geigle, Acting President	409,014	705
20	Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill. 62650, Dr. L. Vernon Caine, President	29,760	51
1	Illinois Inst. of Tech., Chicago, Ill. 60616, John T. Rettaliata, President	68,320	118
15	Illinois Valley Cmty. Col., Oglesby, Ill. 61301, R. Earl Trobaugh, Director	3,274	6
17	Illinois Wesleyan Univ., Bloomington, Ill. 61701, Robert S. Eckley, President	58,196	100
14	Joliet Jr. College, Joliet, Ill 60436, Douglas Graham, Acting President	4,560	8
15	Judson College, Elgin, Ill. 60120, Harn A. Weber, president	15,840	27
17	Kankakee Community College, Kankakee, Ill. 60901, John R. Samlin, president	4,880	8
13	Kendall College, Evanston, Ill. 60204, Dr. Wesley H. Westerberg, president	63,840	110
3	Kennedy-King Col., Chicago, Ill. 60621, Maceo T. Bowie, president	262,800	453
16	Kishwaukee College, Malta, Ill. 60150, W. Lamar Fly, president	6,354	11
19	Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. 61401, Sharvy G. Umbeck, president	32,840	57
12	Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill. 60045, Eugene Hotchliss, president	70,320	121
22	Lake Land College, Mattoon, Ill. 61938, Virgil H. Judge, president	20,232	35
14	Lewis St. Francis of Illinois, Lockport 60441, Paul French, president	29,344	51
22	Lincoln Christian College, Lincoln, Ill. 62656, Earl C. Hargrove, president	13,347	23
22	Lincoln College, Lincoln, Ill. 62656, Dr. Raymond N. Dooley, president	8,052	14
20	Lincoln Land Cmty. Col., Springfield, Ill. 62703, Robert L. Poorman, president	9,280	16
7	Loop College, Chicago, Ill. 60601, David H. Heller, president	164,397	283
9	Loyola University, Chicago, Ill. 60626, Raymond C. Baumhart, president	310,175	535
7	MacCormac College, Chicago, Ill. 60604, Gordon C. Borchardt, president	8,180	14
20	MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Ill. 62650, Dr. John J. Wittich, president	111,403	192
7	Malcolm X Col., Chicago, Ill. 60612, Charles G. Hurst, President	486,872	839
12	McHenry Co. Jr. Col. Dist. 528, Crystal Lake, Ill. 60014, John Garrett, President	7,324	13
24	McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill. 62254, Dr. Eric N. Rackham, President	27,760	48
22	Millikin University, Decatur, Ill. 62522, J. Roger Miller, President	67,600	117
19	Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill. 61462, Richard C. Stine, President	41,360	71

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	ILLINOIS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 100)—Continued		
4	Moraine Valley Cmty. Col., Oak Lawn, Ill. 60465, Robert E. Turner, President	$12,958	22
9	Mundelein College, Chicago, Ill. 60626, Sister Mary Ann Ida Gannon, President	73,761	127
13	National College of Educ., Evanston, Ill. 60201, Dr. K. Richard Johnson, President	50,573	87
11	Niles College, Loyola Univ., Chicago, Ill. 60631, Eugene F. Lyons, President	15,520	27
14	North Central College, Naperville, Ill. 60540, Dr. Arlo Schilling, President	48,640	84
11	North Park College, Chicago, Ill 60625, Lloyd Ahlem, President	44,880	77
11	Northeastern Ill. State Col., Chicago, Ill. 60625, J. M. Sachs, President	95,279	164
15	Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb, Ill. 60115, Rhoten Smith, President	511,760	882
13	Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 60201, Dr. J. Roscoe Miller, Chancellor	122,420	211
17	Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Ill. 60901, Dr. H. W. Reed, President	97,520	168
23	Olney Central College, Olney, Ill. 62450, Gail L. Lathrop, Dean	25,941	45
22	Parkland College, Champaign, Ill. 61820, William W. Staerkel, president	35,997	62
4	Prairie State Col., Chicago Hghts., Ill. 60411, Ashley Johnson, president	25,600	44
20	Quincy College, Quincy, Ill. 62301, Titus Ludes, president	89,530	154
20	Robert Morris College, Carthage, IL. 62321, Dean C. Nichols, dean of academic affairs	14,116	24
16	Rock Valley College, Rockford, Illinois 61111, Karl J. Jacobs, president	24,885	43
7	Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill. 60605, Dr. Rolf A. Weil, president	164,074	263
10	Rosary College, River Forest, Ill. 60305, Candida Lund, president	43,680	75
20	Sangamon State University, Springfield, IL. 62701, Robert C. Spencer, president	18,588	32
16	Sauk Valley College, Dixon, Ill. 61021, Edward J. Sabol, president	28,825	50
7	Schools of the Art Inst. of Chgo., Chicago, Ill. 60603, Donald J. Irving, president	32,042	55
21	Shawnee City College, Ullin, IL. 62992, Dr. Loren E. Klaus, president	32,366	56
16	Shimer College, Mount Carroll, Ill. 61053, Robert S. Long, president	10,188	18
21	Southeastern Illinois Jr. Col., Harrisburg, Ill. 62946, Joseph C. Deaton, dean	3,050	5
24	Southern Ill. U. Edwardsville Camp, Edwardsville, Ill. 62025, John S. Rendleman, chancellor	75,673	130
21	Southern Ill. Univ. Carbondale, Carbondale, Ill. 62901, Robert Layer, chancellor	133,932	231
3	Southwest College, Chicago, Ill. 60652, Stephen Nicholson, president	10,567	18
19	Spoon River College, Canton, Ill. 61520, Hearl C. Bishop, president	6,312	11
14	St. Procopius College, Lisle, Ill. 60532, Rev. Roman Galiardi, OSB, president	41,012	71
3	St. Xavier College, Chicago, Ill. 60655, Harry A. Marmion, president	42,472	73
4	Thornton Cmty. College, Harvey, Ill. 60426, J. O. Dalby, president	31,033	54
4	Tolentine College, Olympia Fields, Ill. 60461, Very Rev. Robert E. Burns, OSA, president	3,000	5
4	Trinity Christian Col., Palos Heights, Ill. 60463, Gordon R. Werkema, president	10,960	19
12	Trinity College, Deerfield, Ill. 60615, Rev. Harry L. Evans, president	78,640	136
10	Triton College, River Grove, 60164, Herbert Zeitlin, president	10,706	18
7	Univ. of Ill. at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Ill. 60680, Norman A. Parker, chancellor	495,783	855
7	Univ. of Ill. at Med. Center, Chicago, Ill. 60612, Joseph S. Begandu, chancellor	4,000	7
2	University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60637, Edward H. Levi, president	136,305	235
22	University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 61801, Jack W. Peltason, president	792,754	1,367
21	Wabash Valley College, Mt. Carmel, Ill. 62863, James S. Spencer, chancellor	19,699	34
15	Waubonsee Cmty. Col., Sugar Grove, Ill. 60554, Forest Etheredge, president	2,000	3
20	Western Illinois Univ., Macomb, Ill. 61455, John T. Bernhard, president	53,468	92
14	Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill. 60187, Dr. Hudson T. Armerding, president	59,360	102
13	William Rainey Harper Col., Palatine, Ill. 60067, Robert E. Lahti, president	17,865	31
	INDIANA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 38)		
	Total	4,320,710	7,451
10	Anderson College, Anderson, Ind. 46011, Robert H. Reardon, president	108,817	188
10	Ball State University, Muncie, Ind. 47306, John J. Pruis, president	407,693	703
3	Bethel College Inc., Hishawaka, Ind. 46544, Ray P. Pannabecker, president	22,574	39
7	Depauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 46135, William E. Kerstetter, president	62,574	108
10	Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. 47374, Landrum R. Bolling, president	$76,796	132
4	Fort Wayne Art Inst., Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804, Russell L. Dettel, director	8,258	14
4	Fort Wayne Bible College, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46807, Jared F. Gerig, president	5,568	10
6	Franklin College, Franklin, Ind. 46131, Wesley N. Haines, president	68,276	118
3	Goshen Col., Goshen, Ind. 46526, Carl Kreider, acting president	124,118	214
3	Grace Theol Sem. & Col., Winona Lake, Ind. 46590, Herman A. Hoyt, president	33,231	57
3	Holy Cross Jr. Col., Notre Dame, Ind. 46556, Brother John Driscoll, president	3,511	3
4	Huntington College, Huntington, Ind. 46750, E. Dewitt Baker, president	69,327	120
6	Indiana Central College, Indianapolis, Ind. 46227, Gene A. Sease, president	34,537	60
4	Indiana Institute of Tech., Fort Wayne, Ind. 46803, Edward A. Dugan, Jr., president	22,923	40
8	Indiana St. U. Evansville Campus, Evansville, Ind. 47712, David L. Rice, dean	50,692	67
7	Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Ind. 47809, Alan C. Rankin, president	301,838	520
7	Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. 47401, John W. Ryan, president	1,169,174	2,016
5	Manchester College, No. Manchester, Ind. 46962, A. Blair Helman, president	68,329	118
6	Marian Col. Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Ind. 46222, D. J. Guzzetta, president	105,550	182
5	Marion College Marion, Marion, Ind. 46952, Woodrow Goodman, president	94,388	163
8	Oakland City College, Oakland City, Ind. 47560, Laurence Barrett, president	31,016	53
4	Purdue Univ. Fort Wayne Center, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46805, L. D. Nelson, acting dean	23,827	41
3	Purdue Univ. Nth. Cen. Campus, Westville, Ind. 46391, Robert F. Schwarz, dean and director	18,082	31
2	Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind. 47907, F. L. Hovde, president	431,902	745
99	Purdue University Calumet Campus, Hammond, Ind. 46323, Dr. Carl Elliott, director	20,918	36
7	Rose Polytechnic Inst., Terre Haute, Ind. 47803, John A. Logan, president	38,760	67
4	St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46808, Sister M. Rosanna, president	21,222	37
1	St. Josephs Col. Calumet Campus, East Chicago, Ind. 46312, Dr. John M. Lefko Cpps, president	43,412	75
2	St. Joseph College, Rensselaer, Ind. 47978, Rev. Charles Banet, president	47,518	82
7	St. Mary of the Woods Col., St. Mary of Wds., Ind. 47876 Jeanne Knoerle, president	20,023	35
3	St Marys College, Notre Dame, Ind. 46556, M. Aima Peter, acting president	44,044	76
8	St. Meinrad Col., St. Meinrad, Ind. 47577 Hilary Ottensmeyer, President	10,032	17
5	Taylor University, Upland, Ind. 46989, Milo Rediger, President	103,925	179
4	Tri-State College, Angola, Ind. 46703, R. M. Bateman, President	46,361	60
8	Univ. of Evansville, Evanville, Ind. 47704, Wallace B. Graves, President	167,304	288
3	University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind. 46556, Rev. T. M. Hesburgh, President	150,440	259
2	Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind. 46383, A. G. Huegli, President	178,117	307
8	Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind. 47591, Issac K. Beckes, President	85,635	146
	IOWA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS 49)		
	Total	3,007,961	5,185
5	American Inst. of Business, Des Moines, Iowa 50307, Keith Fenton, President	9,038	16
6	Briar Cliff College, Sioux City, Iowa 51104, Sister Jordan Dahm, President	25,640	44
6	Buena Vista College, Storm Lake, Iowa 50588, Wendell Q. Halverson, President	64,288	111
4	Central College, Pella Iowa 50219, Kenneth J. Weller, President	90,572	156
2	Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa 52001, Robert J. Giroux, President	21,130	36
2	Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402, Leo Nussbaum, President	36,510	63
2	Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314. Samuel E. Stumph, President	38,986	67
5	Des Moines Area Cnty. Col., Ankeny, Iowa 50021, Paul Lowery, Superintendent	29,786	51
6	Divine Word College, Epworth, Iowa 52045, Harold W. Rigney, President	18,398	32
6	Dordt College, Sioux Center, Iowa 51250, B. J. Haan, President	90,265	156
5	Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa 50311, Paul F. Sharp, President	124,553	215
3	Ellsworth Cmty. College, Iowa Falls, Iowa 50126, Donald W. Skinner, Superintendent	51,618	89
4	Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa 50140, William T. Higdon, President	45,624	79
5	Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa 50316, Ernest D. Nielsen, President	28,066	48

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	IOWA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 49)—Continued		
4	Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa 50112, Glenn Leggett, President	$50,452	87
4	Indian Hills Cmty. College, Ottumwa, Iowa 52502, Mel Everingham, Superintendent	20,964	36
3&5	Iowa Central Cmty. Col. Area V, Ft. Dodge, Iowa 50501, Edwin Barbour, Superintendent	9,702	17
6	Iowa Lake Cmty. Col., Estherville, Iowa 51334, H. Edwin Cramer, Superintendent	25,514	44
5	Iowa St. U. of Sci. & Tech., Ames, Iowa 50010, W. Robert Parks, President	535,557	923
1	Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa 52641, Dr. Louis Haselmayer, President	43,144	74
7	Iowa Western Cmty. Col. Area XIII, Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501, Robert Looft, Superintendent	6,723	12
7	Jennie Edmundson Hosp. Sch. Nursing, Council Bluffs, Ia. 51501, Edward R. Lynn, Administrator	2,000	3
2	Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404, Selby A. Ballantyne, Superintendent	34,139	59
2	Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, 52003, Burton R. McQuillan, Acting President	101,674	175
2	Luther College, Decorah, Iowa 52101, E. D. Farwell, President	159,174	274
4	Marshalltown Cmty. Col. Marshalltown, Iowa 50158, Donald W. Skinner, Supt	14,155	24
1	Marycrest College, Davenport, Iowa 52804, Louis C. Vaccaro, President	28,105	48
6	Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa 51106, Dr. Thomas S. Thompson, President	96,682	167
2	Mount Mercy College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 52402 Sister Mary Agnes, President	37,996	66
2	Mount St. Clare, Clinton, Iowa 52732, Sister Cecile Devereux, President	5,248	9
3	North Iowa Area Cmty. Col. Area II, Mason City, Iowa 50401, David Pierce, Pres.-Superintendent	23,381	40
6	Northwestern College, Orange City, Iowa 51041, Lars I. Granberg, President	58,276	100
4	Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Iowa 52501, John R. Alberti, President	9,742	17
1	Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa 52556, Carl Kreisler, President	32,264	56
4	Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa 50125, Ralph C. John, President	64,958	112
1	Southeastern Iowa Area Cmty. Col., Burlington, Iowa 52601, C. W. Callison, Superintendent	10,761	19
4	Southwestern Community Col., Area XIV, Creston, Iowa 50801, William R. Pierce, Jr., Superintendent	11,230	19
1	St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa 52803, Rt. Rev. Sebastian Menke, President	32,605	56
6	St. Joseph Mercy Sch. of Nursing, Sioux City, Iowa 51104, Sister M. Maurice, Pres	6,545	11
6	St. Vincent Hosp. School of Nursing, Sioux City, Iowa 51105, Richard J. Zunker, Administrator	8,075	14
2	University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa 52001, Walter F. Peterson, President	56,590	98
1	University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240, Willard L. Boyd, President	219,727	379
3	University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613, John J. Kamerick, President	302,709	522
2	Upper Iowa College, Fayette, Iowa 52142, Aldrich K. Paul, President	81,718	141
4	Vennard College, University Park, Iowa 52595, Merne A. Harrix, President	24,096	42
3	Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa 50436, Gerrish Severson, Acting President	39,368	68
3	Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa 50677, John W. Bachman, President	81,920	141
6	Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa 51031, Laurence C. Smith, President	67,418	116
4	William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa 52577, Duane Moon, President	30,875	53
	KANSAS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 51)		
	Total	2,550,711	4,401
5	Allen County Community Jr., College Iola, Kans. 66749, Bill Spencer, President	2,425	4
3	Baker University, Baldwin City, Kans. 66006, James E. Doty, President	21,275	37
1	Barton Co. Community Jr. College, Great Bend, Kans. 67530, C. O. Robinson, President	25,597	44
4	Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans. 67456, Arvin W. Hahn, President	26,651	46
4	Bethel College, North Newton, Kans. 67117, Orville Voth, President	37,600	65
5	Butler County Cmty. Jr. Col., El Dorado, Kans. 67042, Edwin J. Walbourn, President	20,551	35
4	Central College, McPherson, Kans. 67460, Bruce L. Kline, president	28,233	49
1	Cloud Co. Cmty. Jr. Col., Concordia, Kans. 66901, Arley A. Bryant, president	13,307	23
5	Coffeyville Cmty. Jr. Col., Coffeyville, Kans. 67337, Russell H. Graham, president	13,075	23
1	Colby Community Jr. Col., Colby, Kans 67701, Richard H. Mosier, president	9,255	16
5	College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans. 66801, Ronald Ebberts, president	21,831	38
5	Cowley County Community Jr. College, Arkansas City Kans. 67005, Given Nelson, president	3,600	6
1	Dodge City Community Jr. College, Dodge City, Kans. 67801, Charles H. Barnes, president	9,538	16
3	Donnelly College, Kansas City, Kans. 66102, Sister M. Richard Pendegast, president	$13,884	24
1	Fort Hays Kans. State Col., Hays, Kans. 67602, John W. Gustad, president	160,775	277
5	Fort Scott Community Jr. College, Fort Scott, Kans. 66701, Leon Foster, president	17,382	30
1	Friends Bible Coll., Haviland, Kans. 67059, Wanda Mitchell, administrator	2,000	3
4	Friends University, Wichita, Kans. 67213, Roy F. Ray, president	37,100	64
4	Hesston College, Hesston, Kans. 67062, Laban Peachey, president	32,890	57
2	Highland Cmty Jr. Col., Highland, Kans. 66035, Tony E. Woodrum, president	3,106	5
4	Hutchinson Community Jr. College, Hutchinson, Kans. 67501, A. H. Elland, president	38,252	66
5	Independence Cmty. Jr. Col., Independence, Kans. 67301, Neil Edds, president	8,590	15
3	Johnson County Cmty Jr. Col., Shawnee Mission, Kans. 66202, Robert Harris, President.	12,616	22
5	Kans. St. Col. of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Kans. 66762, George F. Budd, President.	187,748	324
3	Kansas City Kansas Cmty Jr. Col., Kansas City, Kans. 66101, Jack M. Flint, President.	6,306	11
2	Kansas St. U. Ag. & App. Sci., Manhattan, Kans. 66502, James A. McCain, President.	362,987	626
5	Kansas State Teachers Col., Emporia, Kans. 66801, John E. Visser, President.	250,593	432
1	Kansas Tech. Inst., Salina, Kansas 67401, Henry M. Neely, President.	7,015	12
1	Kansas Wesleyan Univ., Salina, Kans. 67401, Paul W. Renich, President.	33,026	57
5	Labette Community Jr. College, Parsons, Kans. 67357, Charles E. Thiebaud, President.	4,662	8
2	Manhattan Bible College, Manhattan, Kans. 66502, Wilford F. Lown, President.	6,800	12
1	Marymount College, Salina, Kans. 67401, Emerald V. Dechant, President.	61,722	106
4	McPherson College, McPherson, Kans. 67460, J. Jack Melhorn, President.	26,774	46
3	Mid American Nazarene Col., Olathe, Kans. 66061, R. Curtis Smith, President.	24,612	42
1	Miltonvale Wesleyan Col., Miltonvale, Kans. 67466, Leo G. Cox, President.	9,147	16
2	Mount St. Scholastica Col., Atchison, Kans. 66002, Sister Mary Noel Walter, Acting President.	50,320	87
5	Neosho Co. Cmty Jr. Col., Chanute, Kans. 66720, J. C. Sanders, President.	10,191	18
3	Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans. 66067, Peter G. Armacost, President.	86,802	150
1	Pratt Community, Jr. College, Pratt, Kans. 67124, Raymond E. Cleveland, President	7,844	14
4	Sacred Heart College, Wichita, Kans. 67213, Sister M. Sylvia Gorges, President	48,744	84
1	Sehard County Cmty. Jr. Col., Liberal, Kans. 67901, Dale J. Gibson, President	11,640	20
5	Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans. 67156, C. Orville Strohl, President	30,118	52
2	St. Benedicts College, Atchison, Kans. 66002, Rev. Alcuin Hemmen, President	46,120	80
5	St. Johns College, Winfield, Kans. 67156, R. C. Beisel, President	5,000	9
2	St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans. 66098, Sister Mary Janet McGilley, President	38,626	67
1	St. Mary of the Plains Col., Dodge City, Kans. 67801, Sr. M. Cecilia Bush, President	32,633	56
4	Sterling College, Sterling, Kans. 67579, William M. McCreery, President	35,084	60
4	Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kans. 67063, Roy Just, President	32,264	56
3	University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans. 66044, E. L. Chalmers, Jr., Chancellor	340,936	588
2	Washburn Univ. of Topeka, Topeka, Kans. 66621, John W. Henderson, President	66,108	114
4	Wichita State University, Wichita, Kans. 67208, Clark Ahlberg, President	167,354	289
	KENTUCKY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 29)		
	Total	2,532,693	4,368
7	Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Ky. 41844, William S. Hayes, President	101,000	174
6	Asbury College, Wilmore, Ky. 40390, Dennis F. Kinlaw, PHD, President	38,850	67
3	Bellarmine Ursuline College, Louisville, Ky. 40205, Raymond J. Treece, Executive Vice President	49,275	85
6	Berea College, Berea, Ky. 40403, Willis D. Weathford, president	61,230	106
2	Brescia College, Owensboro, Ky. 42301, Sister Joan Marie, Lechner, president	28,500	49
5	Campbellsville College, Campbellsville, Ky. 42718, William, R. Davenport, president	72,386	125
6	Centre Col. of Kentucky, Danville, Ky. 40422, Thomas A. Spragans, president	31,431	54
5	Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Ky. 40769, James M. Boswell, president	145,514	251
6	Eastern Kentucky Univ., Richmond, Ky. 40475, Robert R. Martin, president	288,590	498
6	Georgetown College, Georgetown, Ky. 40324, Robert L. Mills, president	55,050	95
6	Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Ky. 40601, Carl M. Hill, president	83,909	145

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	KENTUCKY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 29)—Con.		
2	Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro, Ky. 42301, Howard L. Ramsey, vica president	$12,600	22
7	Lees Jr. College, Jackson, Ky. 41339, Troy R. Eslinger, president	106,093	183
6	Midway Jr. College, Midway, Ky. 40347, Albert N. Cox, president	38,049	66
7	Morehead State Univ., Morehead, Ky. 40351, Adron Doran, president	369,385	637
1	Murray State Univ, Murray, Ky. 42071, Harry M. Sparks, president	139,000	240
4	Northern Kentucky State College, Covington, Ky. 41011, W. Frank Steely, president	9,335	16
7	Pikeville College, Pikeville, Ky. 41501, Robert S. Cope, president	19,125	33
4	Sem. of St. Pius X, Erlanger, Ky. 41018, Rev. Elmer J. Grosser, president	2,977	5
6	Southeastn. Christian Col., Winchester, Ky. 40391, Victor Broaddus, president	4,000	7
3	Spalding College, Louisville, Ky. 40203, Sister Eileen M. Egan, president	44,250	76
2	St. Catharine Jr. College, St. Catharine, Ky. 40061, Sister Margaret Marie Hofstett, president	6,600	11
5	Sue Bennett College, London, Ky. 40741, Earl F. Hays, president	11,178	19
4	Thomas More Col., Covington, Ky. 41017, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy, president	35,025	60
6	Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky. 40508, Irvin E. Lunger, president	22,650	39
5	Union College, Barbourville, Ky. 40906, Mahlon A. Miller, president	50,250	87
6	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. 40506, Otis A. Singletary, president	289,926	500
3	University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky. 40208, Woodrow M. Strickler, president	92,665	160
2	Western Kentucky Univ., Bowling Green, Ky. 42101, Dero A. Downing, president	323,850	558
	LOUISIANA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 22)		
	Total	2,905,750	5,010
4	Centenary College, Shreveport, La. 71104, John H. Allen, president	30,939	53
1	Delgado College, New Orleans, La. 70119, Marvin Thames, president	48,047	83
1	Dillard University, New Orleans, La. 70122, Broadus N. Butler, president	328,663	567
5	Grambling College, Grambling, La. 71245, R. W. E. Jones, president	214,497	370
6	La. State Univ. & A. & M. Col. Baton Rouge, La. 70803, Cecil G. Taylor, chancellor	154,305	266
8	La. State Univ., Alexandria, Alexandria, La. 71301, Morris Abrams, dean	10,987	19
7	La. State Univ. Eunice, Eunice, La. 70535, John A. Hunter, president	16,200	28
4	La. State Univ. Shreveport, Shreveport, La. 71105, John A. Hunter, president	9,920	17
8	Louisiana College, Pinesville, La. 71360, G. Earl Guinn, president	50,306	87
1	Louisiana St. Univ. in New Orleans, New Orleans, La. 70122, Homer L. Hitt, Chancellor	110,878	191
5	Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, La. 71270, F. Jay Taylor, president	228,127	393
2	Loyola University, New Orleans, La. 70118, Michael F. Kennelly, SJ., president	89,396	154
7	McNfese State University, Lake Charles, La. 70601, Thomas S. Leary, president	118,790	205
5	Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe, La, 71201, George Thomas Walker, president	236,989	409
8	Northwestern State Univ., Natchitoches, La. 71457, Arnold R. Kilpatrick, president	97,120	167
6	Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, La. 70401, Clea E. Parker, president	52,783	91
6	Southern Univ. & A & M Col., Baton Rouge, La. 70813, G. Leon Netterville, Jr. president	470,287	811
6	St. Joseph Seminary College, Saint Benedict La. 70457, Very Rev. Marian Larmann, OSB, Rector-president	6,200	11
2	St. Marys Dominican Col., New Orleans, La. 70118, Sister Mary Ursula Cooper, president	17,481	30
2	Tulane Univ. of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. 70118, Herbert E. Longenecker, president	102,959	178
3	Univ. Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, La. 70501, Clyde L. Rougeou, president	97,660	168
2	Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. 70125, Norman C. Francis, president	413,216	712
	MAINE (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 20)		
	Total	702,229	1,211
2	Bates College, Lewiston, Maine 04240, Thomas Hedley Reynolds, President	39,803	59
1	Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine 04011, Roger Howell, Jr., President	54,403	94
1	Colby College, Waterville, Maine 04901, Robert E. L. II, President	39,002	67
2	Husson College, Bangor, Maine 04401, Bareu Kibarian, President	36,103	62
2	Maine Maritime Academy, Castine, Maine 04421, Rear Admiral E. A. Rodgers, superintendent	7,500	13
1	Nasson College, Springvale, Maine 04083, John Stephen Bailey, President	$21,175	37
2	Northern Cons of Music, Bangor, Maine 04401, William R. Mague, Director	11,000	19
2	Ricker College, Houlton, Maine 04730, Robert Matson, President	14,250	25
1	St. Francis College, Biddeford, Maine 04005, Richard J. Spath, President	20,430	35
1	St. Joseph's College, North Windham, Maine 04062, Bernard Paul Currier, President	15,937	27
1	Thomas College, Waterville, Maine 04901, John L. Thomas, Jr., President	38,322	66
1	Unity College, Unity, Maine 04988, Lawrence M. Reichel, President	18,961	33
1	Univ. of Maine at Augusta, Augusta, Maine 04330, Lloyd J. Jewett, Provost	6,061	10
1	Univ. of Maine at Portland Gorham, Portland, 04103, William J. Macleod, President	78,158	135
2	University of Maine, Portland 04102, Winthrop C. Libby, President	155,412	208
2	University of Maine at Farmington, Farmington, Maine 04938, Einar A. Olsen, president	36,603	63
2	University of Maine at Fort Kent, Fort Kent, Maine 04743, Joseph M. Fox, president	11,001	19
2	University of Maine at Machias, Machias Maine 04654, Lincoln A. Sennett, president	24,401	42
2	University of Maine at Presque Isle, Presque Isle, Maine 04769, Stanley F. Salwak, president	50,701	87
1	Westbrook Jr. College, Portland, Maine 04103, James F. Dickinson, president	22,986	40
	MARYLAND (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 40)		
	Total	2,239,594	3,862
6	Allegany Community Col., Cumberland, Md. 21502, W. Ardell Haines, president	7,649	13
1	Anne Arundel Cmty. College, Arnold 21012, Robert P. Ludlum, president	13,998	24
3	Balt. Col. of Commerce, Baltimore, Md. 21201, D. Deane Wyatt, president	7,779	13
5	Bowie State College, Bowie, Md. 20715, Samuel Lloyd Myers, president	136,137	235
8	Capitol Inst. of Tech., Kensington 20795, Martin A. Mason, act. president	6,333	11
6	Catonsville Cmty. College, Catonsville, Md. 21228, B. A. Barringer, president	11,081	19
1	Cecil Community College, Elkton, Md. 21921, Dr. Robert L. Nash, president	11,811	20
1	Chesapeake College, Wye Mills, Md. 21679, George Silver, president	11,582	20
7	Cmty. Col. of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md. 21215, Harry Bard, president	50,163	86
4	Col. of Notre Dame of Md., Baltimore, Md. 21210, Sister Mary E. McGuire SSND, acting president	12,625	22
8	Columbia Union College, Takoma Park, Md. 20012, George H. Akers, president	39,648	68
7	Coppin State College, Baltimore, Md. 21216, Calvin Burnett, president	34,647	60
2	Essex Community College, Essex, Md. 21221, Vernon Wanty, president	16,493	28
6	Frostburg State College, Frostburg, Md. 21532, Nelson P. Guild, president	87,647	117
2	Goucher College, Towson, Md. 21204, Harvin S. Perry, president	31,264	54
6	Hagerstown Jr. College, Hagerstown, Md. 21740, Atlee C. Kepler, president	29,280	50
2	Hartford Junior College, Bel Air, Md. 21014, Joseph N. Hankin, president	36,345	63
6	Hood College, Frederick, Md. 21701, A. Randle Elliott, president	22,033	38
6	Howard Cmty. College, Columbia, Md. 21043, Dr. Alfred Smith, president	6,398	11
4	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 21218, Lincoln Gordon, president	116,195	200
4	Loyola College, Baltimore, Md. 21210, Very Rev. Joseph A. Sellinger, president	70,662	122
4	Maryland Inst. Col. of Art, Baltimore, Md. 21217, Eugene W. Leake, Jr., president	57,330	99
8	Montgomery Comm. College, Rockville, Md. 20850, William C. Strasser, president	31,698	55
4	Morgan State College, Baltimore, Md. 21212, Thomas P. Fraser, interim president	386,693	667
7	Mount Providence Jr. Col., Baltimore, Md. 21227, Sister Mary Alice Osp, president	49,030	85
6	Mount St. Marys College, Emmitsburg, Md. 21727, Eugene Lacroce, comptroller	19,215	33
7	Ner Israel Rabbinical Col., Baltimore, Md. 21215, Rabbi Jacob I. Ruderman, president	24,466	42
5	Prince Georges Cmty. Col., Largo, Md. 20027, Watson F. Pindell, president	28,975	50
1	Salisbury State College, Salisbury, Md. 21801, Norman C. Crawford, president	18,355	32
1	St. Johns College, Annapolis, Md. 21404, Richard D. Weigle, president	9,600	17
6	St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg, Md. 21727, Sister Margaret Dougherty, president	26,632	46
1	St. Marys College of Md., St. Marys City, Md. 20686, J. Renwick Jackson, Jr., president	8,500	15
2	Towson State College, Baltimore, Md. 21204, James Fisher, president	75,635	130

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MARYLAND (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 40)—Con.		
1	Univ of Maryland St. Col., Pricess Anne, Md. 21853 Howard E. Wright, acting chancellor	$92,084	159
7	Univ of Md., Baltimore Co. Campus, Baltimore, Md. 21228, Albin O. Kuhn, vice president	48,328	83
4	University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md. 21201, H. Mebane Turner, president	9,471	34
5	University of Md., College Park, College Park, Md. 20740, Wilson H. Elkins, president	508,719	877
7	Villa Julie College, Inc., Stevenson, Md. 21153, Sister Mary Stephen, president	30,329	52
1	Washington College, Chestertown, Md. 21620, Charles J. Merdinger, president	21,833	38
6	Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md. 21157, Lowell S. Ensor, president	42,931	74
	MASSACHUSETTS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 97)		
	Total	5,954,817	10,271
2	American Internatl. Col., Springfield, Mass. 01109, Harry J. Courniotes, president	86,198	149
1	Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 01002 John William Ward, president	53,286	92
4	Anna Maria Col. for Women, Paxton, Mass. 10612, Sr. Irene Socquet SSA president	27,600	46
3	Aquinas Jr. Col. of Bus., Newton, Mass. 02158, M. Philomene, dean	7,208	12
4	Assumption College, Worchester, Mass. 01609, Rev. Georges Bissonnette, president	44,465	77
3	Atlantic Union College, So. Lancaster, Mass. 01561, William G. Nelson, Actg. president	123,120	212
9	Babson College, Babson Park, Mass. 02157, Henry A. Kriegel, president	21,019	36
2	Bay Path Junior College, Longmeadow, Mass. 01108, Douglas D. Perkins, president	26,080	45
9	Bay State Jr. Col. of Bus., Boston, Mass. 02116, Louis F. Musco, president	8,187	14
4	Becker Jr. College, Worchester, Mass. 01609, Donald H. Huges, chancellor	3,280	6
9	Bentley College Acc. & Fin., Waltham, Mass. 02154, Gregory Adamian, pres. pro-tem	47,869	83
9	Berklee College of Music, Boston, Mass. 02215, Lawrence Berk, president	34,522	60
1	Berkshire Christian Col., Lenox, Mass. 01240, Ernest Palmer, president	5,425	9
1	Berkshire Cmty. College, Pittsfield, Mass. 01201, Thomas E. O'Connell, president	12,752	22
8	Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. 02167, Rev. W. Seavey Joyce S. J., president	553,539	954
9	Boston State College, Boston, Mass. 02115, Robert J. Bond, president	110,591	191
8	Boston University, Boston, Mass. 02215, Calvin Lee, acting pres	416,037	717
3	Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. 02154, Dr. Charles I. Schottland, acting president	56,767	98
12	Bridgewater State College, Bridgewater, Mass. 02324, Adrian Rondileau, president	34,244	59
10	Bristol Community College, Fall River, Mass. 02720, Jack P. Hudnall, president	32,795	57
5	Bryant McIntosh Business School, Lawrence, Mass. 01840, Howard, Reith president	35,094	61
8	Cambridge Jr. College, Cambridge, Mass. 02140, Harold D. Talbot, president	4,000	7
12	Cape Cod Community Col., Hyannis, Mass. 02601, E. Carleton Nickerson, president	22,097	38
8	Cardinal Cushing College, Brookline, Mass. 02146, Sr. M. Madonna Murphy CSC, president	4,379	8
9	Carnegie Institute, Boston, Mass., 02114. William R. Keany, president	4,466	8
4	Clark University, Worcester, Mass. 01610, Glenn Ferguson, president	87,097	150
2	Col of Our Lady of Elms, Chicopee, Mass. 01013, Very Rev. Thomas F. Devine, president	35,600	61
4	Col of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. 01610, John E. Brooks, SJ, president	63,752	110
11	Curry College, Milton, Mass. 02186, John S. Hafer, president	24,540	42
3	Dean Jr. College, Franklin, Mass. 02038, Donald Deyo, president	12,697	22
11	Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy, Mass. 02170, Leslie Parrott, president	91,241	157
9	Emerson College, Boston, Mass. 02116, Richard Chapin president	66,817	115
9	Emmanuel College, Boston, Mass. 02115, Sister Marie Barry, president	138,273	238
9	Fisher Junior College, Boston, Mass. 02116, Scott A. Fisher, president	5,250	9
3	Fitchburg State College, Fitchburg, Mass. 01420, James J. Hammond, president	29,936	52
7	Framingham State College, Framingham, Mass. 01701, D. Justin McCarthy, president	33,200	37
9	Garland Jr. College, Boston, Mass. 02215, Canon G. Gardner, Acting president	8,000	14
6	Gordon Col. & Gordon Divinity Sch., Wenham, Mass 01984, Harold J. Sokenga, president	48,512	84
9	Grahm Jr. Col., Boston, Mass. 02215, Milton L. Grahm, president	56,048	97
1	Greenfield Cmty. Col., Greenfield, Mass. 01301, Lewis O. Turner, president	12,363	21
99	Hampshire College, Amherst, Mass. 01002, Franklin Patterson, president	38,222	49
8	Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, Nathan M. Pusey, President	$222,689	384
8	Hebrew Tchrs. College, Brookline, Mass. 02146, Eli Grad, president	4,400	7
8	Hellenic Col, Brookline, Mass. 02146, Leonidas C. Contos, president	23,520	41
1	Holyoke Community College, Holyoke, Mass. 01040, George E. Frost, President	13,233	23
10	Laselli Jr. College, Auburndale, Mass. 02166, Kenneth Greene, president	6,541	11
2	Leicester Junior College, Leicester, Mass. 01524, Henry C. Borger, president	8,740	15
8	Lesley College, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, Don A. Orton, president	18,111	31
5	Lowell State College, Lowell, Mass. 01850, Daniel H. Oleary, president	41,819	72
5	Lowell Technological Inst., Lowell, Mass, 01854, Martin J. Lydon, president	92,134	159
10	Mass Bay Community Col., Watertown, Mass. 02172, John F. McKenzie, president	15,200	26
8	Mass. Inst. of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. 02139, Howard W. Johnson, president	130,885	226
9	Massachusetts Col. of Art, Boston, Mass. 02215, John F. Nolen, acting president	29,026	50
12	Massasoit Community College, North Abington, Mass. 02351, John Musselman, president	13,241	23
6	Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass. 01845, Rev. John R. Aherne, president	47,200	81
2	Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 01075, David B. Truman, president	37,248	64
10	Mount Ida Jr. College, Newton Ctr., Mass. 02159, F. Roy Carlson, president	2,800	5
3	Mount Wachusett Cmty Col., Gardner, Mass. 01440, Arthur F. Haley, president	13,402	23
9	New England Cons. of Music, Boston, Mass. 02115, Gunther Schuller, president	12,541	22
9	Newbury Sch. of Business, Boston, Mass. 02116, Edward J. Tassinari, president	16,688	29
3	Newton Col. Sacred Heart, Newton, Mass. 02159, James J. Whelan, president	38,480	66
2	Nichols Col. of Business Adm., Dudley, Mass. 01572, Gordon B. Cross, president	20,925	36
1	North Adams State College, North Adams, Mass. 01247, James T. Amsler, president	9,483	16
6	North Shore Cmty Col., Beverly, Mass. 01915, Harold E. Shively, president	37,650	65
1	Northampton Junior Col., Northampton, Mass. 01060, Richard D. Pickett, president	6,957	12
9	Northeastern University, Boston, Mass. 02115, Asa S. Knowles, president	595,748	1,027
6	Northern Essex Cmty Col., Haverhill, Mass. 01832, Harold Bently, president	25,590	44
9	Perry Normal School, Boston, Mass. 02116, Frederick G. Perry, president	11,558	20
8	Pine Manor Jr. College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. 02167, Frederick C. Perry, Jr., president	6,400	11
4	Quinsigamond Cmty. College, Worcester, Mass. 01605, Paul G. Preus, president	10,455	18
8	Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, Mary I. Bunting, president	37,136	64
3	Regis College, Weston, Mass. 02193, Sister M. Jeanne D. Arc, president	60,073	104
6	Salem State College, Salem, Mass. 01970, Frederick A. Meier, president	67,733	117
9	Sch. of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 02115, William A. Bagnall, dean	21,312	37
9	Simmons College, Boston, Mass. 02115, William Holmes, Jr., president	78,342	135
1	Simons Rock, Inc., Great Barrington, Mass. 01230, Elizabeth B. Hall, president	2,000	3
1	Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 01060, Thomas C. Mendenhall, president	45,874	79
12	Southeastern Mass. Univ., N. Dartmouth, Mass. 02747, Dr. Joseph L. Driscoll, president	57,845	100
2	Springfield College, Springfield, Mass. 01109, Wilbert E. Locklin, president	104,124	180
2	Springfield Tech. Cmty. Col., Springfield, Mass. 01105, Edmund T. Garvey, president	32,748	56
9	St. Johns Seminary, Brighton, Mass. 02135, Rev. Msgr. John A. Broderick, president	3,785	7
3	Stevens College, Hubbardston, Mass. 01452, Ernest D. Robinson, acting president	7,040	12
10	Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass. 02356, Rev. John T. Corr, president	77,280	133
9	Suffolk University, Boston, Mass. 02114, Thomas Fulham, President	54,943	95
12	Swain School of Design, New Bedford, Mass. 02740, George Perkins, President	8,226	14
7	Tufts University, Medford, Mass. 02155, Burton C. Hallowell, President	191,747	331
1	Univ. of Mass., all campuses, Amherst, Mass. 01002, Robert Wood, President	692,860	1,195
10	Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 02181, Ruth M. Adams, President	56,149	97
9	Wentworth Coll. of Technology, Boston, Mass. 02115, H. Russell, President	7,415	13
9	Wentworth Institute, Boston, Mass. 02115, H. Russell Beatty, President	64,169	111
2	Western New England Col., Springfield, Mass. 01119, Beaumont A. Herman, President	25,068	43
1	Westfield State College, Westfield, Mass. 01085, Leonard J. Savignano, President	73,626	127

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MASSACHUSETTS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 97)—Continued		
10	Wheaton College, Norton, Mass. 02766, W. C. H Prentice, President	$31,193	54
9	Wheelock College, Boston, Mass. 02215, Mrs. Margaret H. Merry, President	19,708	34
1	Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 01267, John E. Sawyer, President	32,707	56
4	Worcester Poly Institute, Worcester, Mass. 01609, George W. Hazzard, President	59,680	103
4	Worcester State College, Worcester, Mass. 01602, Robert Leestamper, President	12,800	22
	MICHIGAN (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 77)		
	Total	7,350,707	12,672
2	Adrian College, Adrian, Mich. 49221, John H. Dawson, President	38,240	66
3	Albion College, Albion, Mich. 49224, Bernard T. Lomas, President	43,790	76
10	Alma College, Alma, Mich. 48801, Robert D. Swanson, President	90,689	156
11	Alpena Community College, Alpena, Mich. 49707, Steward Olmstead, Acting President	21,272	37
4	Andrews University, Berrien Spgs., Mich. 49104, Richard Hammill, President	48,640	84
5	Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49506, Richard Hammill, President	62,560	142
3	Argubright Business College, Battle Creek, Mich. 49014, Robert W. Sneden, President	2,000	3
11	Bay De Noc Community Col., Escanaba, Mich. 49829, Richard L. Rinehart, President	14,720	25
5	Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49506, William Spoelhof, President	101,600	175
12	Center Campus, Macomb Cmty. College, Mt. Clemens, Mich. 48043, John Dimitry, President	8,062	14
10	Central Michigan Univ., Mt. Pleasant, Mich. 48858 William B. Boyd, President	250,006	431
5	Davenport Col. of Business, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502, Robert W. Sneden, President	83,200	143
10	Delta College, University Center, Mich. 48710, Donald J. Carlyon, President	57,600	99
16	Detroit College of Business, Dearborn, Mich. 48126, Robert W. Sneden, President	20,444	35
99	Detroit Engineering Institute, Detroit, Mich. 48226, F. Edgar Lamb, President	5,567	10
13	Detroit Institute of Tech., Detroit, Mich. 48201, Dewey F. Barich, President	51,002	66
18	Duns Scotus College, Southfield, Mich. 48076, Corman Mullen, President	4,700	9
2	Eastern Michigan Univ., Ypsilanti, Mich. 48197, Harold E. Sponberg, President	228,216	393
10	Ferris State College, Big Rapids, Mich. 49307, Victor F. Spathelf, President	137,537	237
7	Genessee Cmty. College, Flint, Mich. 48503, Charles Pappas, President	72,265	125
4	Glen Oaks Cmty. Col, Centerville, Mich. 49032, Harold V. Sheffer, President	22,080	38
11	Gogebic Community College, Ironwood, Mich, 49938, James L. Perry, President	36,733	63
5	Grand Rapids Bapt. Col. & Sem., Grand Rapids, Mich. 49505, W. Wilbert Welch, President	12,990	22
5	Grand Rapids Jr. College, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502, C. Robert Muth, Superintendent	65,520	113
9	Grand Valley State Col., Allendale, Mich. 49401, Arend D. Lubbers, President	230,445	397
16	Henry Ford Community Col., Dearborn, Mich. 48128, James O. McCann, President	9,630	17
1	Highland Park Cmty. College, Highland Park, Mich. 48203, Paul H. Jones, Dean	132,445	228
4	Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich. 49242, J. Donald Phillips, President	30,560	53
9	Hope College, Holland, Mich. 49423, Clarence Handlogton, President	127,348	220
6	Jackson Cmty. College, Jackson, Mich. 49201, Harold D. McAnich, President	25,679	44
3	Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001, Weimer K. Hicks, President	87,048	150
3	Kalamazoo Valley Cmty. Col., Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001, Dale B. Lake, President	21,162	36
3	Kellogg Community College, Battle Creek, Mich. 49017, Richard F. Whitmore, Director	21,440	37
10	Kirtland Cmty. Col., Roscommon, Mich. 48653. Robert A. Stenger, President	5,281	9
4	Lake Michigan College, Benton Harbor, Mich. 49022, James H. Lehman, president	32,320	56
11	Lake Superior St. Col., Sault Ste Marie, Mich. 49783 Kenneth J. Shouldice, chancellor	44,620	77
6	Lansing Business University, Lansing, Mich. 48933, Martin Wynaldi, director	11,200	15
6	Lansing Community College, Lansing, Mich. 48914, Philip J. Gannon, president	18,400	32
18	Lawrence Inst. Technology, Southfield, Mich. 48075, Wayne Buell, president	23,686	41
13	Lewis Business Coll., Detroit, Mich. 48202, Marjorie Harris, president	14,933	26
12	Macomb County Cmty. col., Warren, Mich. 48093, John Dimitry, president	99,152	171
19	Madonna College, Livonia, Mich. 48150, Sister Mary Danatha, president	14,435	25
17	Marygrove College, Detroit, Mich. 48221, Arthur W. Brown, president	76,289	132
17	Mercy College of Detroit, President 48219, Sister Karl George, actg. president	$67,286	116
13	Merrill Palmer Institute, Detroit, Mich. 48202, J. William Rioux, president	1,500	3
11	Mich. Technological Univ., Houghton, Mich. 49931, Raymond L. Smith, president	94,053	162
18	Michigan Christian Jr. Col., Rochester, Mich. 48063, E. Lucien Palmer, president	11,520	20
6	Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich. 48823, Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., president	1,270,151	2,190
2	Monroe County Cmty. Col., Monroe, Michigan 48161, Ronald Campbell, president	21,831	38
10	Montcalm Cmty. Col., Sidney, Mich. 48885, Donald Fink, president	7,340	13
9	Muskegon Co. Cmty. College, Muskegon, Mich. 49440, Charles Green, president	20,144	35
3	Nazareth College, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49074, Mary Bader, president	23,373	40
11	No. Central Michigan Col., Petoskey, Mich 49770, A. D. Shankland, dean	7,673	13
11	Northern Michigan Univ., Marquette, Mich. 49855, John X. Jamrich, president	132,500	228
9	Northwestern Michigan Col., Traverse City, Mich. 49684, James M. Davis, director	21,760	38
10	Northwood Institute, Midland, Mich. 48640, Arthur E. Turner, president	27,166	47
18	Oakland Cmty. College, Bloomfield Hills, Mich. 48013, Joseph Hill, president	157,558	272
18	Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan 48063, Donald D. Dowo, president	167,654	289
3	Olivet College, Olivet, Mich. 49076, Ray B. Loeschner, president	70,724	122
6	Owosso College, Owosso, Mich. 48867, Russell V. DeLong, president	23,459	40
3	Parsons Business School, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49006, Robert Sneden, president	2,720	5
8	Saginaw Business Inst., Saginaw, Mich. 48607, Angelo Guerriero, director	14,172	24
8	Saginaw Valley Col. Univ. Center, Mich. 48710, Samuel D. Marble, president	33,909	58
19	Schoolcraft College, Livonia, Mich. 48151, Eric J. Bradner president	21,405	37
1	Shaw College at Detroit, Detroit, Mich. 48202, Romallus O. Murphy, president	106,541	184
2	Siena Heights College, Adrian, Mich. 49221, Richard Reaume, acting president	8,823	15
4	Southwestern Michigan Col., Dowagiac, Mich. 49047, Stanley W. Bergenroeder, president	11,360	20
6	Spring Arbor College, Spring Arbor, Mich. 49283, Dr. Ellwood Voller, president	78,157	135
8	St. Clair Co. Cmty. Col., Port Huron, Mich. 48060, Richard L. Morris, acting president	24,058	41
11	Suomi College, Hancock, Mich. 49930, Ralph J. Jalkanen, president	29,760	51
1	University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich. 48221, Rev. Malcolm Carron, president	353,855	610
2	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104, R. W. Fleming, president	371,380	640
2	Washtenaw Cmty. College, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48107, David H. Ponitz, president	70,436	121
99	Wayne Cty. Community College, Detroit, Mich. 48201, Murray Jackson, acting president	371,945	641
13	Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich. 48202, William R. Keast, president	700,340	1,207
6	West Shore Cmty. Col., Scottsville, Mich. 49454, John M. Eaton, president	11,680	20
3	Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001, James W. Miller, president	488,968	843
	MINNESOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 50)		
	Total	4,223,979	7,284
3	Anoka Ramsey St. Jr. Col., Coon Rapids, Minn. 55433, Dr. Ronald H. Denison, president	15,160	26
5	Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn. 55404, Oscar A. Anderson, president	139,003	240
1	Austin State Jr. College, Austin, Minn. 55912, Curtis MacDonald, president	21,739	37
7	Bemidji State College, Bemidji, Minn. 56601, Robert Decker, president	446,989	771
2	Bethany Lutheran Col. & Sem., Inc., Mankato, Minn. 56001, Raymond H. Branstad, president	8,098	14
4	Bethel College, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, Carl H. Lundquist, President	60,080	104
6	Brainerd State Junior College, Brainerd, Minn. 56401, J. E. Chalberg, President	9,046	16
1	Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 55057, Howard Swearer, President	53,863	93
6	College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minn. 56374, Stanley J. Idzerda, President	96,896	167
4	College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minn. 55116, Sister Fides Huber, President	63,674	110
8	College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minn. 55811. Sr. Mary Richard Boo, President	43,520	75
1	College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn. 55987, Sister M. Joyce Rowland, President	81,840	141
4	College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, Msgr. Terrence J. Murphy, President	115,234	199
7	Concordia Col. Moorhead, Moorhead, Minn. 56560, Joseph L. Knutson, President	149,370	258
4	Concordia Col. St. Paul, Acting President 55104, H. W. Otte, President	42,480	73

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MINNESOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 50)—Con.		
7	Corbett College, Crookston, Minn. 56716, Mother Mary John Flynn, President	$2,285	4
6	Crosier Seminary, Onamia, Minn. 56359, Very Rev. John Neville, President & Rector	4,640	8
7	Fergus Falls State Junior College, Fergus Falls, Minn. 56537, Wesley A. Waage, President	7,377	13
3	Golden Valley Lutheran College, Minneapolis, Minn. 55422, Bernt C. Opsal, President	14,364	25
2	Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn. 56082, Frank R. Barth, President	76,847	132
4	Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, Richard Bailey, President	45,683	79
8	Hibbing State Jr. College, Hibbing, Minn. 55746, H. C. Kelley, President	13,727	24
1	Inver Hills State Junior College, Inver Grove Heights, Minn. 55075, Dr. Arthur Gessner, President	13,882	24
8	Itasca State Jr. College, Grand Rapids, Minn. 55744, Harold E. Wilson, Dean	12,804	22
4	Lakewood State Jr. Col., White Bear Lake, Minn. 55110, Carl Gerber, President	16,208	28
1	Lea College, Albert Lea, Minn. 56007, Quentin Hartwig, Dean of the College	28,509	49
4	Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn. 55101, Arthur S. Fleming, President	152,535	263
2	Mankato State College, Mankato, Minn. 56001, James Nickerson, President	339,289	585
8	Mesabi State Jr. Col., Virginia, Minn. 55792, Gilbert M. Staupe, Dean	13,938	24
5	Metropolitan St. J. C., Minneapolis, Minn. 55409, Robert Jensen, President	24,713	43
5	Minneapolis College of Art & Design, Minneapolis, Minn. 55404, Arnold Herstand, Director	23,631	41
7	Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minn. 56560, Roland Dille, President	263,852	455
3	Normandale St. Jr. Col., Bloomington, Minn. 55431, Dale A. Lorenz, President	14,187	24
3	North Hennepin State Jr. Col., Minneapolis Minn. 55428, John F. Helling, President	18,614	32
7	Northland State Jr. Col., Thief River Falls, Minn. 56701, Victor Charles, President	10,039	17
8	Rainy River State Jr. College, International Falls, Minn. 56649, Wallace A. Simpson, President	9,680	17
1	Rochester State Junior College, Rochester, Minn. 55901, Charles E. Hill, President	41,448	71
6	Southwest Minn. State Col., Marshall, Minn 56258, Howard A. Bellows, president	226,154	390
6	St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minn. 56301, Robert H. Wick, president	150,800	260
6	St. Johns University, Collegeville, Minn. 56321, Colman Barry, president	244,335	421
1	St. Marys College, Winona, Minn. 55987, George Pahl, president	38,138	66
5	St. Marys Jr. Col., Minneapolis, Minn. 55406, Sister Anne Joachim Moore, president	16,947	29
1	St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn .55057, Sidney A. Rand, president	31,523	54
5	U. of Minn. Mpls.-St. Paul-Crookston, Minneapolis, Minn. 55455, Malcolm Moos, president	666,477	1,149
8	University of Minnesota—Duluth, Duluth, Minn. 55812, R. W. Darland, provost	104,409	180
6	University of Minnesota—Morris, Morris, Minn. 56267, John Q. Imholte, acting provost	116,796	201
8	Vermilion State Jr. Col., Ely, Minn. 55731, C. Don Miller, president	8,132	14
6	Willmar State Junior College, Willmar, Minn. 56201, John Torgelson, president	19,058	33
1	Winona State College, Winona, Minn. 55987, Robert Dufresne, president	95,656	165
2	Worthington State Jr. Col., Worthington, Minn. 56187, W. Donald Olsen, president	10,508	18
	MISSISSIPPI (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 34)		
	Totals	2,303,476	3,973
3	Alcorn A. & M. College, Lorman, Miss. 39096, Walter Washington, president	150,640	260
3	Belhaven College, Jackson, Miss. 39202, Howard J. Cleland, president	43,434	75
2	Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain, Miss. 38610, E. Harold Fisher, president	15,912	27
4	Clarke Memorial College, Newton, Miss. 39345, W. Lowrey Compere, President	6,786	12
2	Coahoma Jr. College, Clarksdale, Miss. 38614, James E. Miller, President	75,250	130
3	Copiah Lincoln Jr. Col., Wesson, Miss. 39191, Billy B. Thames, President	2,652	5
1	Delta State College, Cleveland, Miss. 38732, James E. Ewing, President	111,774	193
4	East Central Jr. College, Decatur, Miss. 39327, Charles V. Wright, President	8,265	14
4	East Mississippi Jr. Col., Scooba, Miss. 39358, Earl A. Stennis, President	14,040	24
3	Hinds Jr. College, Raymond, Miss. 39154, Robert M. Mayo, President	16,068	26
4	Holmes Jr. College, Goodman, Miss. 39079, Frank B. Branch, President	7,223	12
3	Jackson State College, Jackson, Miss. 39217, John A. Peoples, Jr., President	300,188	518
5	Jones County Jr. College, Ellisville, Miss. 39437, Terrell Tisdale, President	9,282	16
1	Mary Holmes Jr. College, West Point, Miss. 39773, John W. Walton, President	$127,608	220
4	Meridian Municipal Junior College, Meridian, Miss. 39301, William F. Scaggs, Dean	36,582	63
3	Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss. 39210, Edward M. Collins, President	80,418	139
5	Miss. Gulf Coast J. C. Dist., Perkinston, Miss. 39573, J. J. Hayden, Jr., President	18,252	31
1	Miss. State Col. for Women, Columbus, Miss. 39701, Charles P. Hogarth, President	41,340	71
1	Miss. Valley State College, Itta Bena, Miss. 38941, Dr. J. H. White, President	178,370	308
3	Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss. 39056, W. Lewis Nobles, President	25,110	43
2	Mississippi Indus. College, Holly Springs, Miss. 38635, E. E. Rankin, President	8,497	15
1	Mississippi State Univ., State College, Miss. 39762, William L. Giles, President	270,995	467
2	Northeast Mississippi Jr. Col., Boonesville, Miss. 38829, Harold T. White, President	25,275	44
2	Northwest Mississippi Jr. Col., Senatobia, Miss. 38668, R. D. McLendon, President	13,330	23
5	Pearl River Jr. College, Poplarville, Miss. 39470, Marvin R. White, President	5,161	9
5	Prentiss Norm. and Indus. Inst., Prentiss, Miss. 39474, Mrs. J. E. Johnson, President	38,880	67
2	Rust College, Holly Springs, Miss. 38635, William A. McMillan, President	195,259	337
4	Saints Junior College, Lexington, Miss. 39095, Dr. Arenia C. Mallory, President	5,000	9
3	Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Miss. 39174, George A. Owens, President	99,535	172
5	Univ. of Southern Miss., Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401, William D. McCain, President	102,804	177
2	University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 38677, Porter L. Fortune Jr., Chancellor	212,940	367
3	Utica Jr. College, Utica, Miss. 39175, J. L. Stokes, President	26,719	46
5	William Carey College, Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401, J. Ralph Noonkester, President	25,114	43
1	Wood Jr. College, Mathiston, Miss. 39752, Dr. Felix Sutphin, President	4,770	8
	MISSOURI (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 50)		
	Total	3,708,551	6,395
5	Avila College, Kansas City, Mo. 64145, Sr. Olive Louise Dallavis, President	54,161	93
7	Central Bible College, Springfield, Mo. 65802, Philip Crouch, President	47,642	82
8	Central Methodist College, Fayette, Mo. 65248, Harold Hamilton, President	27,962	48
4	Central Missouri St. Col., Warrensburg, Mo. 64093, Warren C. Lovinger, President	372,762	643
8	Columbia College, Columbia, Mo. 65201, W. Merle Hill, President	8,441	15
4	Cottey College, Nevada, Mo. 64772, Jon O. Hondrum, President	5,620	10
7	Crowder College, Neosho, Mo. 64850, Dell Reed, President	4,580	8
9	Culver Stockton College, Canton, Mo. 63435, Fred Helsabeck, President	54,402	94
7	Drury College, Springfield, Mo. 65802, Carl Stillwell, Acting President	55,340	95
9	East Central Junior College, Union, Mo. 63084, Donald D. Shook, President	3,379	6
7	Evangel College, Springfield, Mo. 65802, J. Robert Ashcroft, President	48,843	84
2	Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo. 63105, Sister Roberta Schmidt, President	57,933	100
3	Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, Mo. 63103, Richard Stumpe, President	26,479	46
8	Jefferson Col., Hillsboro, Mo. 63050, B. Ray Henry, President	11,721	20
	Jr. College Dist. of Metro Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo. 64111, Dr. Leslie Koltai, Chancellor	24,167	42
2	Jr. College Dist. of St. Louis Co., Clayton, Mo. 63103, Joseph P. Cosand, President	145,546	251
5	Kansas City Art Institute, Kansas City, Mo. 64111, John W. Lottes, President	42,204	73
8	Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo. 65101, Walter C. Daniel, president	150,321	259
9	Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo. 63301, John Anthony Brown, Jr., president	46,863	81
2	Maryville Col. Sacred Heart, St. Louis, Mo. 63141, Harriet Switzer, president	20,261	35
10	Mineral Area College, Flat River, Mo. 63601, Richard B. Caster, president	5,960	10
9	Missouri Bapt. College Campus, Hannibal, Mo. 63401, Frank B. Kellogg, president	37,558	65
7	Missouri Southern College, Joplin, Mo. 64801, Leon C. Billingsly, president	8,500	15
4	Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Mo. 65340, W. L. Tomkins, president	46,483	80
6	Missouri Western Junior College, St. Joseph, Mo. 64501, M. O. Looney, president	22,867	39
9	Moberly Jr. College, Moberly, Mo. 65270, William Clark, president	3,384	6
9	Northeast Missouri S. T. C., Kirksville, Mo. 63501, Charles McClain, president	115,314	199
6	Northwest Missouri St. Col., Maryville, Mo. 64468, Robert P. Foster, president	219,000	378

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	MISSOURI (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 50)—Con.		
6	Park College, Parkville, Mo. 64152, Donald M. MacKenzie, president	$55,361	95
5	Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Mo. 64110, Maurice E. Van Ackeren, president	63,007	109
10	Southeast Missouri St. Col., Cape Girardeau, Mo. 63701, Mark F. Scully, president	37,284	64
7	Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar, Mo. 65613, James L. Sells, president	132,270	228
7	Southwest Missouri St. Col., Springfield, Mo. 65802, Arthur L. Mallory, president	169,311	292
3	St. Louis Col. of Pharmacy, St. Louis, Mo. 63110, Charles C. Rabe, President	15,040	26
3	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. 63103, Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, President	152,902	264
4	St. Pauls College, Concordia, Mo. 64020, Lambert J. Mehl, President	8,961	15
4	State Fair Cmty. Col., Sedalia, Mo. 65301, Fred Davis, President	15,079	26
8	Stephens College, Columbia, Mo. 65201, Seymour Smith, President	18,421	32
6	Tarkio College, Tarkio, Mo. 64491, Eldon Breazier, Acting Pres	80,242	138
10	Three Rivers Junior College, Poplar Bluff, Mo. 63901, H. Tudor Westover, President	38,188	60
9	Trenton Jr. College, Trenton, Mo. 64683, William K. Ray, President	8,604	15
5	U. of Missouri at Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo. 64110, James C. Olson, Chancellor	255,497	441
8	U. of Missouri at Rolla, Rolla, Mo. 65401, Merl Baker, Chancellor	93,009	160
1	U. of Missouri at St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo. 63121, Glen R. Driscoll, Chancellor	26,364	45
8	University of Missouri at Columbia, Columbia, Mo. 65201, John Schwada, Chancellor	560,366	966
2	Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 63130, Thomas Hopkinson Eliot, Chancellor	144,871	250
2	Webster College, St. Louis, Mo. 63119, Leigh Gerdine, President	89,310	154
9	Westminster College, Fulton, Mo. 65251, Robert L. D. Davidson, President	22,762	39
6	William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. 64068, Thomas Field, President	27,741	48
9	William Woods College, Fulton, Mo. 65251, R. B. Cutlip, President	26,266	45
	MONTANA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 12)		
	Total	813,762	1,403
1	Carroll College, Helena, Mont. 59601, Rev. Joseph D. Harrington, President	95,873	165
2	College of Great Falls, Great Falls, Mont. 59401, E. Milton Brassell, President	38,960	67
2	Dawson College, Glendive, Mont. 59330, James Hoffman, President	7,760	13
2	Eastern Montana Col., Billings, Mont. 59101, Stanley J. Heywood, President	104,256	130
1	Flathead Cmty. College, Kalispell, Mont. 59901, Larry Blake, President	40,263	69
2	Miles Community College, Miles City, Mont. 59301, Vernon Kailey, President	7,058	12
1	Montana Col. of Mineral Sci. & Tech., Butte, Mont. 59701, Edwin G. Koch, President	24,111	42
1	Montana State Univ., Bozeman, Mont. 59715, Carl McIntosh, President	159,268	275
2	Northern Montana College, Havre, Mont. 59501, Joseph R. Crowley, President	24,124	42
2	Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Mont. 59102, Lawrence F. Small, President	35,632	61
1	Univ. of Montana, Missoula, Mont. 59801, Robert Pantzer, President	233,618	403
1	Western Montana Col., Dillon, Mont. 59725, James E. Short, President	42,839	74
	NEBRASKA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 25)		
	Total	1,460,116	2,519
2	Bellevue College, Bellevue, Nebr. 68005, Richard D. Winchell, President	2,930	5
3	Chadron State College, Chadron, Nebr. 69337, Edwin C. Nelson, President	74,601	129
2	College of St. Mary, Omaha, Nebr. 68124, Mary Costello, President	30,581	53
1	Concordia Teachers Col., Seward, Nebr. 68434, W. Theo Janzow, president	30,210	52
2	Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr. 68131, Joseph J. Labaj, president	71,495	123
2	Dana College, Blair, Nebr. 68008, C. C. Madsen, president	34,872	60
1	Doane College, Crete, Nebr. 68333, Philip R. Heckman, president	28,632	49
1	Fairbury Junior College, Fairbury, Nebr. 68352, Ivan R. Simpson, president	4,826	8
3	Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr. 68901, Theron B. Maxson, president	32,733	56
3	Hiram Scott College, Scottsbluff, Nebr. 69361, Walter E. Weese, acting president	41,951	72
2	Immanuel Hosp. Sch. of Radiologic Tec., Omaha, Nebr. 68111, Spencer E. Brader, exec. director	1,000	2
1	John F. Kennedy College, Wahoo, Nebr. 68066, Ted Dillon, president	44,624	77
3	Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebr. 68847, Milton J. Hassel, president	$147,809	255
1	Midland Lutheran Col., Fremont, Nebr. 68025, Dale Lund, president	74,546	129
1	Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., Lincoln, Nebr. 68504, Vance D. Rogers, president	115,304	199
3	Nebraska Western Col., Scotts Bluff, Nebr. 69361, William Ptacek, president	11,919	21
3	North Platte Col., North Platte, Nebr. 69101, William Hasemeyer, president	5,794	12
1	Northeastern Nebraska, Norfolk, Nebr. 68701, ichall E. Paradise, president	11,479	20
1	Peru State College, Peru, Nebr. 68421, Neal S. Gomon, president	70,261	121
1	Platte Jr. Col., Columbus, Nebr. 68601, Donald L. Newport, President	10,475	18
1	Union College, Lincoln, Nebr. 68506, Robert H. Brown, President	27,300	47
1	Univ. of Nebr. at Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebr. 68508, Joseph Soshnik, President	428,010	738
2	Univ of Nebr. at Omaha, Omaha, Nebr. 68101, Kirk Naylor, President	31,051	54
1	Wayne State College, Wayne, Nebr. 68787, W. A. Brandenburg, President	89,653	155
1	York College, York, Nebr. 68467, Dale R. Larsen, President	37,060	64
	NEVADA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 4)		
	Total	195,824	337
11	Elko Cmty. College, Elko, Nev. 89801, Elmer L. Kuntz, President	10,709	18
1	Sierra Nevada College, Incline Village, Nev. 89450, Benjamin Solomon, President	4,768	8
11	Univ. of Nevada—Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nev. 89100, Roman J. Zorn, President	74,009	128
11	Univ. of Nevada—Reno, Reno, Nev. 89507, N. Edd Miller, President	106,338	183
	NEW HAMPSHIRE (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 18)		
	Total	730,446	1,258
1	Belknap College, Center Harbor, N.H. 03226, William K. Widger, Jr., President	17,316	30
2	Colby, Jr., Col., New London, N.H. 03257, Everett M. Woodman, President	4,162	7
2	Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H. 03755, John G. Kemeny, President	115,977	200
2	Franconia College, Franconia, N.H. 03580, Leon Botstein, President	9,581	17
2	Franklin Pierce, Col., Rindge, N.H. 03461, Frank S. Dipietro, President	9,505	16
2	Keene State College, Keene, N.H. 03431, Leo F. Redfern, President	65,521	113
1	Mount St. Mary College, Hooksett, N.H. 03106, Sister Mary Vianney Fulham, president	15,325	26
2	N.H. Tech. Institute, Concord, N.H. 03301, George M. Strout, director	7,410	13
2	Nathaniel Hawthorne College, Antrim, New Hampshire 03440, Kenneth F. McLaughlin, president	26,286	45
2	New England Aero Inst., Nashua, N.H. 03060, Brig. Gen. Harrison R. Thyng, director	16,506	28
2	New England College, Henniker, N.H. 03242, Jere Chase, president	25,270	44
1	New Hampshire Col. Acc. and Commerce, Manchester, N.H. 03101, Gertrude Shapiro, president	45,701	79
1	Notre Dame College, Manchester, N.H. 03104, Sister Jeannette Vezeau, president	14,742	25
2	Plymouth State Col., Plymouth, N.H. 03264, Harold E. Hyde, president	42,270	73
2	Rivier College, Nashua, N.H. 03060, Sister Gloria Lemieux, president	18,597	32
1	St. Anselms College, Manchester, N.H. 03102, Rev. Placidus H. Riley, president	57,482	99
1	Univ. of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H. 03824, John W. McConnell, president	236,795	408
1	White Pines College, Chester, N.H. 03036, Faith Preston, president	2,000	3
	NEW JERSEY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 44)		
	Total	3,399,060	5,859
7	Alphonsus College, Woodcliff Lake, N.J. 07680, Sister Veronica, C.S.J., president	7,360	13
2	Atlantic Cmty. Col., May Landing 08330, William Young, president	19,858	34
7	Bergen Community College, Paramus, N.J. 07652, Sidney Silverman, president	13,020	22
3	Beth Medrash Govoha of America, 150 5th Ave., New York, N.Y. 10011, Martin Klein, dean	67,695	117
10	Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, N.J. 07003, Kenneth B. Obrien, President	50,227	87
3	Brookdale Cmty. Col., Lincroft, N.J. 07738, Ervin L. Harlacher, President	18,246	31
6	Burlington County Col., Pemberton, N.J. 08068, N. Dean Evans, President	13,520	23
12	Caldwell Col. for Women, Caldwell, N.J. 07006, Sister Anne John, President	34,078	59
1	Camden County Cmty. Col., Blackwood, N.J. 08012, Otto R. Mauke, President	43,520	75

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NEW JERSEY (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 44)—Continued		
5	College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station, N.J. 07961, Sister Hildegarde Marie Mahone, President	$32,560	56
5	County Col. of Morris, Dover, N.J. 07801, Sherman H. Masten, President	30,857	53
2	Cumberland Co. Col., Vineland, N.J. 08360, William J. Sample, President	13,920	24
5	Drew University, Madison, N.J. 07940, Robert Fisher Oxnam, President	36,595	63
9	Fairleigh Dickinson Univ., Rutherford, N.J. 07070, J. Osburn Fuller, President	85,040	147
5	Felician College, Lodi, N.J. 07644, Sister Mary Justitia President	5,274	9
3	Georgian Court College, Lakewood, N.J. 08701, Mary Stephanie Slogan, President	21,840	38
1	Glassboro State College, Glassboro, N.J. 08028, Dr. Mark Chamberlain, President	120,909	208
1	Gloucester County College, Sewell, N.J. 08080, William L. Apelz, President	19,120	33
13	Jersey City State College, Jersey City, N.J. 07305, James H. Mullen, President	150,265	259
9	Luther Col. of Bible & Liberal Arts, Teaneck, N.J. 07666 The Rev. J. Phillip Worthington, President	8,348	14
4	Mercer Co. Community College, Trenton, N.J. 08608, Richard K. Greenfield, President.	45,490	78
15	Middlesex County Col., Edison, N.J. 08817, Frank M. Chambers, President.	14,320	25
13	Monmouth College, W. Long Branch, N.J. 07764, William G. Van Note, President.	85,680	148
10	Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, N.J. 07043, Thomas Richardson, President.	88,918	153
10	Newark Col. of Engineering, Newark, N.J. 07102, William Hazell, President.	31,597	54
12	Newark State College, Union, N.J. 07083, Nathan Weiss, President.	61,910	107
12	Nthestrn. Coll. Bible Inst., Essex Falls, N.J. 07021, Charles W. Anderson, President.	13,258	23
6	Ocean County Col., Toms River, N.J. 08753, Andrew S. Moreland, President.	26,994	47
8	Paterson State College, Wayne, N.J. 07470, James Karge Olsen, President.	125,680	217
4	Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. 08540, Robert F. Goheen, Prasident.	92,959	160
7	Ramapo College of N.J., Mahwah, N.J. 07430, George T. Potter, President.	10,563	13
4	Rider College, Trenton, N.J. 08602, Frank N. Elliott, President.	36,129	62
15	Rutgers The State Univ., New Brunswick, N.J. 08903, Mason W. Gross, President.	1,410,813	2,432
11	Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. 07079, Thomas Fahy, President.	76,786	132
5	Somerset Co. Col., Somerville 08876, Henry C. J. Evans, President.	12,160	21
14	St. Peters College, Jersey City, N.J. 07306, Victor R. Yanitelli, President.	208,640	360
14	Stevens Institute of Tech., Hoboken, N.J. 07030, Jess H. Davis, president	32,880	57
2	Stockton State Coll., Pleasantville, N.J. 08240, Richard Bjork, president	28,744	50
8	Tombrock College, West Paterson 07424, Rose Claire Gonzalez, exec. vice president	21,040	36
4	Trenton State College, Trenton, N.J. 08625, Robert Heussler, president	65,760	113
12	Union College, Cranford, N.J. 07016, Kenneth W. Iverson, president	26,796	46
11	Upsala College, East Orange, N.J. 07019, Carl G. Fjellman, president	73,994	128
5	Walsh College, Morristown, N.J. 07960, Sr. Margherita Marchione, president	8,017	14
4	Westminster Choir College, Princeton, N.J. 08540, Ray E. Robinson, president	7,700	13
	NEW MEXICO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 13)		
	Total	973,611	1,679
2	College of Artesia, Artesia, N. Mex. 88210, James E. Gibson, president	19,070	33
1	College of Santa Fe, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87501, Brother Cyprian Luke, president	72,726	125
2	Eastern N. Mex. U. Roswell Campus, Roswell, N. Mex. 88201, Dale E. Traylor, director	15,203	26
2	Eastern New Mexico Univ., Portales, N. Mex. 88130, Charles W. Meister, president	132,386	228
2	N. Mex. Inst. Mining & Tech., Socorro, N. Mex. 87801, S. A. Colgate, president	26,520	46
1	New Mexico Highlands Univ., Las Vegas, N. Mex. 87701, R. C. Smith, president	127,357	220
2	New Mexico Jr. Col., Hobbs, N. Mex. 88240, Jodie Smith, president	13,872	24
2	New Mexico Military Inst., Roswell, N. Mex. 88201, Sam W. Agee, superintendent	9,700	17
2	New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces, N. Mex. 88001, Gerald W. Thomas, president	112,575	194
1	St. Johns College in Santa Fe, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87501, Richard D. Weigih, president	7,805	13
1	University of Albuquerque, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 87105, Frank A. Kleinhenz, acting president	115,219	199
1	University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 87106, Ferrell Heady, president	283,166	488
2	Western New Mexico Univ., Silver ity, N. Mex. 88061, John H. Snedeker, president	$38,006	66
	NEW YORK (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 164)		
	Total	15,357,750	26,478
4	Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y. 11530, Charles Viever, actg. president	45,873	79
30	Adirondack Community Col., Glens Falls, N.Y. 12801, Charles R. Eisenhart, president	8,000	14
38	Alfred University, Alfred, N.Y. 14802, Leland Miles, president	91,967	159
35	Auburn Community College, Auburn, N.Y. 13021, Albert T. Skinner, president	9,040	16
28	Bard College, Annandl. on Hdsn., N.Y. 12504, Reamer Kline, president	17,775	31
20	Barnard Col.-Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. 10027, Martha E. Peterson, president	47,980	83
12	Be Er Shmuel Talmudical Acad., 1363 50th, New York, N.Y. 11219, Rabbi Moshe Horovitz, exec. vice president	18,527	32
28	Bennett College, Millbrook, N.Y. 12545, Donald A. Eldridge, president	3,600	6
19	Beth Jacob Hebrew Teachers Col., New York, N.Y. 10002, Israel Garber, executive vice president	32,953	57
25	Briarcliff College, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y. 10510, Thomas E. Baker, president	6,220	11
33	Broome Tech. Community Col., Binghamton, N.Y. 13902, Cecil C. Tyrrell, president	33,164	57
41	Canisius College, Buffalo N.Y. 14208, Very Rev. James M. Demske, president	100,664	174
99	Cath Col of the Immac Conception, Douglaston, N.Y. 11362, Thomas J. Gradilone, president	8,889	15
32	Cazenovia College, Cazenovia, N.Y. 13035, Rhea M. Eckel, president	6,320	11
12	Central Yeshiva Tomchei, T L., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11230, Rabbi Israel Jacobson, chairman exec comm	38,077	66
99	City University of New York, New York, N.Y. 10021, Albert H. Bowker, chancellor	6,254,781	10,784
31	Clarkson Col of Tech, Potsdam, N.Y. 13676, John W. Graham, Jr., president	85,680	148
30	Clinton County Cmty Col, Plattsburg, N.Y. 12901, James D. Pletcher, acting president	22,855	39
35	Cmty Col of Finger Lakes, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424, Roy I. Satre Jr., president	6,713	12
23	Col of Mount St Vincent, Riverdale, N.Y. 10471, Sister Mary David, president	30,320	52
19	Col of Pharm Sciences Columbia U, New York, N.Y. 10023 Joseph L. Kanig, dean	12,250	21
32	Colgate University, Hamilton N.Y. 13346, Thomas A. Bartlett, president	73,044	126
26	College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801, Dorthy Anne Kelly, acting president	26,275	45
29	College of St Rose, Albany, N.Y. 12203, Alfonse R. Miele, president	27,708	48
20	Columbia University, New York, N.Y. 10027, William McGill, president	247,084	426
28	Columbia-Greene Community College, Athens, N.Y. 12015, Edward J. Owen, president	14,761	25
17	Cooper Union, New York, N.Y. 10003, John F. White, president	20,394	35
33	Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850, Dr. Dale R. Corson, president	89,164	154
38	Corning Community College Corning, N.Y. 14830, Robert W. Frederick, Jr., president	25,204	43
27	Dominican Col. of Blauvelt, Blauvelt, N.Y. 10913, Sister M. Natalie, president	13,320	23
1	Dowling College, Oakdale, N.Y. 11769, Allyn P. Robinson, dean	46,000	79
28	Dutchess Cmty. College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601, James F. Hall, president	32,332	56
41	Dyouville College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14201, Sister Mary Charlotte Barton, president	30,391	52
36	Eastman Sch. of Music, Rochester, N.Y. 14604, Walter Hendle, director	8,476	15
25	Elizabeth Seaton College, Yonkers, N.Y. 10701, Sister Delores Mary Kelly, president	5,760	10
33	Elmira College, Elmira, N.Y. 14901, J. Ralph Murray, president	23,760	41
39	Erie Community College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14221, James E. Shenton, president	47,705	82
19	Fashion Institute of Tech., New York, N.Y. 10001, Lawrence L. Jarvie, president	24,880	43
17	Finch College, New York, N.Y. 10021, Rodney O. Felder, president	2,063	4
24	Fordham University, Bronx 10458, Rev. Michael P. Walsh, president	169,117	292
3	Friends World College, Westbury, N.Y. 11590, Sidney Harman, president	25,254	44
30	Fulton-Montgomery Cmty. College, Johnstown, N.Y. 12095, William L. Gragg, president	26,400	46
37	Genessee Cmty. Col., Batavia, N.Y. 14020, Cornelius V. Robbins, president	19,086	33
26	Good Counsel College, White Plains, N.Y. 10603, Charles E. Ford, President	8,326	14
32	Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y. 13323, John Chandler, President	15,440	27
27	Harriman College, Harriman, N.Y. 10926, Sister M. Agnes Csac, President	5,089	9
35	Hartwick College, Oneonta, N.Y. 13820, Adolph G. Anderson President	59,120	120

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NEW YORK (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 164)—Con.		
32	Herkimer Co. Cmty. College, Ilion, N.Y. 13357, Robert McClaughlin, President	$8,640	15
39	Hilbert College, Hamburg, N.Y. 14075, Sister Mary Edwina Bogel, President	10,080	17
35	Hobart and Wm. Smith Colleges, Geneva, N.Y. 14456, Dr. Allan Andrew Kuusisto, President	19,040	33
4	Hofstra University, Hempstead, LI., N.Y. 11550, Clifford L. Lord, President	113,805	196
38	Houghton College, Houghton, N.Y. 14744, Stephen W. Paine, Actg. President	30,080	52
29	Hudson Valley Cmty. Col., Troy, N.Y. 12180, James J. Fitzgibbons, President	91,600	158
26	Iona College, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801, Bro. Joseph G. McKenna, President	49,743	86
33	Ithaca College, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850, Ellis Phillips, Jr., President	36.692	63
38	Jamestown Community Col., Jamestown, N.Y. 14701, Roger C. Seager, President	12,238	21
31	Jefferson Community Col., Watertown, N.Y. 13601, James E. McVean, President	30,380	35
20	Jewish Theol Sem. of Amer., New York, N.Y. 10027, David Kogen, admin. vice chancellor	2,000	3
35	Keuka College, Keuka Park, N.Y. 14478, G. Wayne Glick, President	47,105	81
25	Kings College, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y. 10510, Robert A. Cook, president	26,480	46
32	Kirkland College, Clinton, N.Y. 13323, Samuel F. Babbitt, president	13,475	23
34	Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y. 13214, Very Rev. William L. Reilly, president	81,680	141
3	Long Island University, Greenvale Long Island, N.Y. 11548 John Kiermaier, president	57,686	99
23	Manhattan College, New York, N.Y. 10471, Brother Gregory Nugent, president	139,964	241
18	Manhattan School of Music, New York, N.Y. 10027, George Schick, president	40,295	69
26	Manhattanville College, Purchase, N.Y. 10577, Mother Elizabeth McCormack, president	42,930	74
17	Mannes College of Music, New York, N.Y. 10021, Hubert Doris, president	11,001	19
29	Maria College, Albany, N.Y. 12208, Sister M. Berchmans Mahoney, president	4,127	7
34	Maria Regina College, Syracuse, N.Y. 13208, Sister Mary Rosalie, president	6,466	11
28	Marist College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601, Brother Linus R. Foy, president	43,580	75
25	Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591, John J. Meng, president	53,746	93
17	Marymount Manhattan Col., New York, N.Y. 10021, Sister M. Colette Mahoney, president	58,341	101
31	Mater Dei College, Ogdensburg, N.Y. 13669, Mother M. Immaculata, president	3,440	8
25	Mercy College, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. 10522, Helen W. Coogan, president	19,400	33
13	Mesivta Tor Mod Rabb Sem, 425 E. 9th, New York, N.Y. 11218, Louis J. Septimus, Chr. of the Board	45,714	79
99	Mesivta-East Pkway. Rab. Seminary, Brooklyn, 11203, Mordechai Weinberg, President	7,236	12
19	Mesivtha Tifereth Jerusalem of Amer., New York, N.Y., 10002, Rabbi Moses Feinstein, President	25,492	44
17	Mills College of Educ., New York, N.Y. 10011, Margaret M. Devine, President	6,240	11
13	Mirrer Yeshiva Central Inst., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11223, Rabbi Moses Kalmanowitz, Dean	20,399	35
24	Misericordia Hosp. Sch. of Nursing, Bronx 10466, Catherine Morin, Director	4,126	7
32	Mohawk Valley Cmty. Col., Utica, N.Y. 13501, W. Stewart Tosh, President	43,116	74
36	Monroe Community College, Rochester, N.Y. 14623, Leroy V. Good, President	56,039	97
27	Mount St. Mary College, Newburgh, N.Y. 12550, Sister Mary Francis, President	37,504	65
4	Nassau Cmty. College, Garden City, N.Y. 11533, George F. Chambers, President	146,327	252
36	Nazareth Col. of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y. 14610, Sister Helen Daniel Malone, President	36,182	62
19	New York Inst. of Tech., Old Westbury, N.Y. 11568, Alexander Schure, President	43,040	74
17	New York University, New York, N.Y. 10003, James M. Hester, President	327,778	565
40	Niagara County Cmty. Col., Niagara Falls, N.Y. 14303, Ernest Notar, President	18,703	32
40	Niagara University, Niagara Univ. ,N.Y. 14109, Very Rev. Kenneth F. Slattery, President	48,584	84
31	North Country Cmty. Col., Sarnac Lake, N.Y. 12983, George D. Hodson, President	34,247	59
27	Nyack Missionary College, Nyack, N.Y. 10960, Harold W. Boon, President	11,827	20
34	Onondaga Cmty. College, Syracuse, N.Y. 13210, Marvin A. Rapp, President	11,241	19
27	Orange County Cmty. Col., Middletown, N.Y. 10940, Robert T. Novak, President	8,480	15
27	Our Lady of Hope Mission Seminary, Newburgh, N.Y., The Rev. Joseph C. Schwab, DMT, President	6,000	10
19	Pace College, New York, N.Y. 10038, Edward J. Mortola, President	86,562	149
17	Parsons School of Design, New York, N.Y. 10022, David C. Levy, President	14,464	25
14	Polytechnic Inst. Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201, Benjamin Adler, Acting President	102,729	177
14	Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11205, Henry Saltzman, President	$169,756	293
19	Rabbi Col. Bobover Yesh Bnei Zion, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11219, Aaron Teitelbaum, President	25,084	43
19	Rabbi Jacob Joseph Rabbinical Coll., New York, N.Y., 10002, Irving M. Bunim, President	30,526	53
13	Rabbinical Acad. M & Chaim Berlin, Brooklyn, N.Y., 11230, Bezalel Refman, Executive Vice President	17,652	30
19	Rabbinical Col. Chsan Sofer of N.Y., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11204, Akiba Ehrenfield, Exec. Vice President	33,453	58
12	Rabbinical Col. Kamenitz Yeshiva Am., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11219, Joseph Shaw, President	21,120	36
12	Rabbinical Sem. Netzach Israel, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11213, Rabbi Israel Gustman, President	20,911	36
8	Rabbinical Sem. of America, Forest Hills, N.Y. 11375 Rabbi A. H. Leibowitz, President	10,427	18
30	Rensselaer Poly Institute, Troy, N.Y. 12181, Richard G. Folsom, President	105,200	181
37	Roberts Wesleyan College, Rochester, N.Y. 14624, Lawrence R. Schoenhals, President	30,240	52
37	Rochester Inst. Technology, Rochester, N.Y. 14623, Paul A. Miller, president	44,056	76
27	Rockland Cmty. College, Suffern, N.Y. 10901, Seymour Eskow, president	23,641	41
39	Rosary Hill College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14226, Angela Canavan, president	48,855	84
25	Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y. 10708, Charles Decarlo, president	18,453	32
29	Schenectady Cmty. Col., Schenectady, N.Y. 12305, Robert Larrson, president	34,883	60
29	Siena College, Loudonville, N.Y. 12211, Matthew Conlin, OFM, president	35,920	62
38	St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N.Y. 14776, Reginald A Redlon, president	34,240	59
15	St. Francis College, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201, Rev. Bro. Donald Sullivan, president	31,654	55
36	St. John Fisher Col. Inc., Rochester, N.Y. 14616, Rev. Charles J. Lavery, president	22,080	38
7	St. Johns University, Jamaica, N.Y. 11432, Rev. Joseph T. Cahill, president	115,331	199
14	St. Josephs Col. for Women, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11205, Sister Geo Aquin O'Connor, CSJ, president	5,530	10
31	St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y. 13617, Frank P. Piskor, president	38,720	67
27	St. Thomas Aquinas College, Sparkill, N.Y. 10976, Sister Mary Ann Biller, president	15,103	26
25	St. Vladimir Orth. Theo. Sem., Tuckahoe, N.Y. 10707, Metropolitan Irenly, president	4,800	8
1	Suffolk Cmty. College, Selden, N.Y. 11784, Albert M. Ammerman, president	129,040	222
27	Sullivan County Cmty. Col., South Fallsburg, N.Y. 12779, Richard F. Grego, president	21,430	37
38	Suny AG&Tech Alfred, Alfred, N.Y. 14802, David H. Huntington, president	43,058	74
31	Suny AG&Tech. Canton, Canton, N.Y. 13617, Albert E. French, president	58,759	101
28	Suny AG&Tech. Cobleskill, Cobleskill, N.Y. 12043, Walton A. Brown, president	59,766	103
27	Suny AG&Tech. Delhi, Delhi, N.Y. 13753, William R. Kunsela, president	49,155	85
2	Suny AG&Tech. Farmingdale, Farmingdale, L.I., N.Y. 11735, Charles W. Laffin, Jr., president	158,183	273
32	Suny AG&Tech. Morrisville, Morrisville, N.Y. 13408, Royson N. Whipple, president	41,758	72
29	Suny at Albany, Albany, N.Y. 12203, Louis T. Benezet, president	254,876	439
33	Suny at Binghamton, Binghamton, N.Y. 13901, Bruce Dearing, president	142,717	246
39	Suny at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14214, Robert Ketter, president	579,865	1,000
3	Suny at Old Westbury, Old Westbury 11568, John D. Maguire, president	40,047	69
1	Suny at Stony Brk., Stony Brook, N.Y. 11790, John S. Toll, president	133,440	230
41	Suny Col. at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14222, Elbert K. Fretwell, president	527,414	909
35	Suny Col. at Cortland, Cortland, N.Y. 13045, Richard C. Jones, president	107,872	186
38	Suny Col. at Fredonia, Fredonia, N.Y. 14063, Oscar E. Lanford, president	152,252	263
37	Suny Col. at Geneseo, Geneseo, N.Y. 14454, Robert W. MacVittie, president	120,634	208
28	Suny Col. at New Platz, New Platz, N.Y. 12561, John J. Neumaier, president	67,440	116
35	Suny Col. at Oneonta, Oneonta, N.Y. 13820, Clifford Craven, president	167,680	288
31	Suny Col. at Oswego, Oswego, N.Y. 13126, Dallas Beal, president	122,720	212
30	Suny Col. at Plattsburgh, Plattsburgh, N.Y. 12901, George W. Angell, president	67,814	117
31	Suny Col. at Potsdam, Potsdam, N.Y. 13676, Thomas Barrington, president	106,359	183
26	Suny Col. at Purchase, Purchase, N.Y. 10577, Dr. Abbott Caplan, president	13,496	22
34	Suny Col. of Forestry at Syracuse U., Syracuse, N.Y. 13210, Edward E. Palmer, president	32,494	56
37	Suny College at Brockport, Brockport, N.Y. 14420, Albert W. Brown, president	121,505	209
12	Suny Downstate Med. Ctk., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11203, Chandler C. Brooks, acting president	13,229	23

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NEW YORK (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 164)—Con.		
24	Suny Maritime College, Fort Schuyler, N.Y. 10465, Edward J. O'Donnel, president	$17,002	29
34	Suny Upstate Med. Ctr., Syracuse, N.Y. 13210, Lewis W. Bluemle, Jr., president	5,520	10
34	Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. 13210, John E. Corbally, Jr., chancellor	199,563	344
20	The Juilliard School, New York, N.Y. 10023, Peter Mennin, pres dent	14,240	25
33	Tompkins-Cortland Cmty. Col., Groton, N.Y. 13073, Hushang Bahar, president	13,804	24
41	Trocaire College, Buffalo, N.Y. 14220, Mary Carmina, president	5,829	10
28	Ulster County Cmty. Col., Stone Ridge 12484, George B. Erbstein, president	12,080	21
29	Union College, Schenectady, N.Y. 12308, Harold C. Martin, president	58,906	102
36	University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y. 14627, W. Allen Wallis, president	60,427	104
32	Utica Col. of Syracuse Univ., Utica, N.Y. 13502, Ambrose J. De Flumere, president	94,115	162
28	Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601, Alan Simpson, president	34,661	50
41	Villa Maria Col. of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14225, Mother Mary Pachomia, president	2,476	4
16	Wagner College, Staten Island, N.Y. 10301, Arthur O. Davidson, president	59,633	103
35	Wells College, Aurora, N.Y. 13026, John D. Wilson, president	19,752	34
26	Westchester Cmty. College, Valhalla, N.Y. 12992, Philip C. Martin, president	33,303	57
15	Yeshiva Beth Shearim Mishne, 5305 16th Ave., N.Y.C., N.Y. 11204, Rabbi Samuel Blum, exec. director	10,238	18
20	Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y. 10033, Samuel Belkin, president	291,631	503
	NORTH CAROLINA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 95)		
	Total	4,292,126	7,399
8	Anson Technical Institute, Ansonville, N.C. 28007, Donald R. Warren, president	3,920	7
9	Appalachian State University, Boone, N.C. 28608, Herbert W. Wey, president	100,080	173
2	Atlantic Christian Col., Wilson, N.C. 27893, Arthur D. Wenger, president	32,080	55
9	Barber-Scotia College, Concord, N.C. 28025, Jerome L. Gresham, president	72,411	125
1	Beaufort Co. Technical Inst., Washington, N.C. 27889, Charles H. Byrd, president	8,044	14
10	Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, N.C. 28012, John P. Bradley, president	17,120	30
6	Bennett College, Greensboro, N.C. 27402, Issac H. Miller, Jr., president	74,126	128
17	Bladen Tech. Inst., Elizabethtown, N.C. 28337, George I. Resseguie, President	3,891	7
11	Brevard College, Brevard, N.C. 28712, Robert A. Davis, President	5,248	9
9	Caldwell Tech. Inst., Lenoire, N.C. 28803, H. Edwin Beam President	4,299	7
3	Campbell College, Buies Creek, N.C. 27506, Norman A. Wiggins, President	99,344	171
7	Cape Fear Technical Inst., Wilmington, N.C. 28401, M. J. McLeod, President	5,280	9
3	Carteret Technical Inst., Morehead City, N.C. 28557, Henry J. McGee, Jr., President	2,774	5
9	Catawba College, Salisbury, N.C. 28144, Martin L. Shotzberger, President	14,306	25
8	Central Carolina Tech. Inst., Sanford, N.C. 27330, J. F. Hockaday, President	6,720	12
8	Central Piedmont Cmty. Col., Charlotte, N.C. 28204, Richard H. Hagemeyer, President	6,164	11
1	Chowan College, Murfreesboro, N.C. 27855, Bruce E. Whitaker, President	20,504	35
1	College of the Albermarle, Elizabeth City, N.C. 27909, S. B. Petteway, President	26,188	45
3	Coastal Carolina Cmty. College, Jacksonville, N.C. 28540, James L. Henderson, Jr., President	2,431	4
1	Craven Co. Tech. Inst., New Bern, N.C. 28560, Thurman Brock, President	2,400	5
6	Davidson Co. Cmty. Col., Lexington, N.C. 27292, Grady E. Love, President	3,120	5
8	Davidson College, Davidson, N.C. 82036, Samuel R. Spencer, President	30,314	52
5	Duke University, Durham, N.C. 27706, Terry Sanford, Chancellor	71,840	124
5	Durham Business College, Durham, N.C. 27707, Mrs. L. McCauley Harris, president	54,872	49
5	Durham Tech. Inst., Durham, N.C. 27703, H. K. Collins, president	4,032	7
1	East Carolina Univ., Greenville, N.C. 27834, Leo W. Jenkins, president	109,595	199
2	Edgecombe County Technical Insti., Tarboro, N.C. 27886, Charles B. McIntyre, president	2,266	4
1	Elizabeth City State University, Elizabeth City, N.C. 27909, Marion O. Thorpe, president	137,740	237
6	Elon College, Elon College, N.C. 27244, J. Earl Danieley, president	27,360	47
7	Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, N.C. 28301, Charles A. Lyons, Jr., president	262,426	452
7	Fayetteville Tech. Inst., Fayetteville, N.C. 28303, Howard E. Boudreau, president	6,239	11
10	Gardner Webb College, Boiling Springs, N.C. 28017, E. Eugene Poston, president	$43,712	75
10	Gaston College, Dallas 28034, W. B. Sugg, president	6,460	11
6	Greensboro College, Greensboro, N.C. 27402, David G. Mobberley, president	9,228	18
6	Guilford College, Greensboro, N.C. 27410, Grimsley T. Hobbs, president	15,316	28
6	Guilford Technical Institute, Jamestown, N.C. 27282, Luther R. Medlin, president	6,385	11
2	Halifax County Technical Institute, Weidon 27890, Phillip W. Taylor, president	4,288	7
6	High Point College, High Point, N.C. 27262, Wendell M. Patton, Jr., president	13,521	23
11	Isothermal Cmty Col., Spindale, N.C. 28160, Fred J. Eason, president	11,120	19
3	James Sprunt Institute, Kenansville, N.C. 27699, Dixon Hall, president	2,360	4
8	Johnson C. Smith Univ., Charlotte, N.C. 28208, Lionel H, Newsom, president	204,880	353
99	Johnston Cty. Tech. Institute, Smithfield N.C. 27577, John L. Tart, president	6,036	10
5	Kernersville Wesleyan College Kernersville, N.C. 27284, Gordon E. Miller, president	2,320	4
2	Kittrell Col, Kittrell, N.C. 27544, Rev. L. G. Horton, president	74,670	129
10	Lees McRae College, Banner Elk, N.C. 28604, H. C. Evans, president	23,520	41
2	Lenoir Co. Cmty. Col., Kinston, N.C. 28501, Ben E. Fountain Jr., president	5,425	9
10	Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory, N.C. 28601, Raymond M. Bost, president	14,755	25
9	Livingstone College, Salisbury, N.C. 28144, F. George Shipman, president	180,573	311
2	Louisburg College, Louisburg, N.C. 27549, C. W. Robbins, president	12,538	22
11	Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, N.C. 28754, Dr. Fred Bentley president	46,026	79
1	Martin Tech. Inst., Williamston, N.C. 27892, E. M. Hunt president	$5,715	10
4	Meredith College, Raleigh, N.C. 27602, E. Bruce Heilman, president	25,525	44
7	Methodist College, Fayetteville, N.C. 28301, L. Stacy Weaver, president	13,799	24
10	Mitchell College, Statesville, N.C. 28677, Barton Herrscher, president	16,050	28
8	Montgomery Tech Inst, Troy, N.C. 27371, David H. Bland, president	2,100	3
11	Montreat-Anderson Col., Montreat, N.C. 28757, C. Grier Davis, president	15,157	26
3	Mount Olive Jr. Col., Inc., Mount Olive, N.C. 28365, W. Burkette Raper, president	6,160	11
6	N.C. Agric. & Tech. St. Univ., Greensboro, N.C. 27411, L. C. Dowdy, president	402,338	694
5	N.C. School of the Arts, Winston-Salem, N.C. 27107, Robert Ward, president	12,000	21
2	Nash Technical Inst., Rocky Mount, N.C. 27801, Jack Ballard, president	2,400	5
4	N.C. State U. at Raleigh, Raleigh, N.C. 27607, John T. Caldwell, chancellor	156,400	270
5	North Carolina Central Univ., Durham, N.C. 27707, Albert N. Whiting, president	181,080	312
4	North Carolina Wesleyan College, Rocky Mt. N.C. 27801, Thomas A. Collins, president	36,559	63
7	Pembroke State University, Pembroke, N.C. 28372, English L. Jones, president	33,312	57
2	Person Tech. Inst., Roxboro, N.C. 27573, Craven H. Sumerell, president	2,000	3
9	Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer, N.C. 28109, Jack J. Early, president	24,560	42
1	Pitt Technical Inst., Greenville, N.C. 27834, William F. Fulford, acting president	7,835	14
8	Queens College, Inc., Charlotte, N.C. 28207, John E. Smylie, president	10,080	17
1	Roanoke-Chowan Tech. Inst., Ahoskie, N.C. 27910, J. W. Young, president	3,734	6
5	Rockingham Cmty. Col., Wentworth, N.C. 27375, Gerald B. James, president	20,640	36
10	Sacred Heart College, Belmont, N.C. 28012, Sister M. Stephen, president	22,940	40
3	Sampson Tech. Inst., Clinton, N.C. 28328, James E. Vann, president	4,769	8
4	Sandhills Cmty. Col., Southern Pines, N.C. 28387, Raymond A. Stone, president	39,406	68
4	Shaw University, Raleigh, N.C. 27602, King V. Cheek, president	240,009	414
7	Southeastern Cmty. Col., Whiteville, N.C. 28472, W. T. Cottingham, president	37,964	65
11	Southwestern Tech. Inst., Sylva, N.C. 28779, Edward E. Bryson, president	5,505	9
3	Southwood College, Salemburg, N.C. 28385, William J. Blanchard, president	2,000	3
7	St. Andrews Presby. Col., Laurinburg, N.C. 28352, Donald Hart, president	42,880	74
4	St. Augustines Col., Raleigh N.C. 27602, Prezell R. Robinson, president	232,651	401
9	Surry Cmty. Col., Dobson, N.C. 27017, I. John Krepick, president	6,498	11
6	Tech. Inst. of Alamance, Burlington, N.C. 27215, William E. Taylor, president	3,969	7
4	Univ. of N.C. at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514, J. Carlyle Sitterson, chancellor	345,187	595
6	Univ. of N.C. at Greensboro, Greensboro, N.C. 27412, James S. Ferguson, chancellor	64,800	112

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	NORTH CAROLINA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 95)—Continued		
11	Univ. of N.C. at Asheville, Asheville, N.C. 28802, William E. Highsmith, chancellor	$23,844	41
8	Univ. of N.C. at Charlotte, Charlotte, N.C. 28205, Dean W. Colvard, chancellor	39,920	69
7	Univ. of N.C. at Wilmington, Wilmington, N.C. 28401, William H. Wagoner, president	10,310	18
11	Vance County Technical Institute, Henderson, N.C. 27535, Dr. Donald R. Mohorn, president	2,000	3
4	W. W. Holding Technical Inst., Raleigh, N.C. 27603, Robert W. LeMay, Jr., president	6,960	12
5	Wake Forest Univ., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27106, James R. Scales, president	60,880	105
11	Warren Wilson College, Inc., Swannanoa, N.C. 28778, Arthur M. Bannerman, president	38,240	66
3	Wayne Cmty. Col., Goldsboro, N.C. 27530, Clyde A. Erwin, president	6,944	12
11	Western Carolina College, Cullowhee, N.C. 28723, Alex S. Pow, president	44,888	77
10	Western Piedmont Cmty. Col., Morganton, N.C. 28655, Gordon C. Blank, president	3,360	6
8	Wingate College, Wingate, N.C. 28174, Budd E. Smith, president	5,160	9
5	Winston-Salem State University, Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102, Kenneth R. Williams, president	123,321	213
	NORTH DAKOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 15)		
	Total	906,891	1,564
2	Bismarck Jr. College, Bismarck, N. Dak. 58501, Ralph Werner, president	11,235	19
2	Dickinson State College, Dickinson, N. Dak. 58601, R. C. Gillund, president	60,814	105
1	Jamestown College, Jamestown, N. Dak. 58401, Roy J. Stuckey, president	34,316	59
1	Lake Region Jr. College, Devils Lake, N. Dak. 58301, Merril Berg, dean	7,510	13
2	Mary College, Bismarck, N. Dak. 58501, Harold Miller, president	103,035	178
1	Mayville State College, Mayville, N. Dak. 58257, T. S. Jenkins, president	47,355	62
2	Minot State College, Minot, N. Dak. 58701, Gordon Olson, president	46,603	80
1	N. Dak. State School Sci., Wahpeton, N. Dak. 58075, Clare T. Blikre, president	15,511	27
2	N.D. S.U.–Bottineau Branch & Inst. Forestry, Bottineau, N. Dak. 58318, C. N. Nelson, president	4,389	8
1	North Dakota State Univ., Fargo, N. Dak. 58102, Laurel Loftsgard, president	270,007	466
2	Northwest Bible College, Minot, N. Dak. 58701, Laud O. Vaught, president	2,000	3
1	U. of North Dakota, Ellendale Br., Ellendale, N. Dak. 58436 Merton W. Andresen, dean	9,920	17
2	Univ. of North Dakota, Williston, N. Dak. 58801, Garvin L. Stevens, dean	12,609	22
1	Univ. of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak. 58202, Thomas J. Clifford, president	239,679	413
1	Valley City State College, Valley City, N. Dak. 58072, Howard Rose, president	41,908	72
	OHIO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 71)		
	Total	7,784,681	13,420
7	Antioch College, Yellow Sprgs., Ohio 45387, James P. Dixon, president	310,595	536
1	Art Academy of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, Phillip H. Adams, director	1,750	3
17	Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio 44805, Glenn L. Clayton, president	62,931	109
1	Athenaeum of Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio 45212, Robert H. Tensing, president	7,200	12
23	Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio 44017, Alfred B. Bonds, president	182,892	315
4	Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio 45817, Mark Houshower, acting president	135,120	233
11	Borromeo Sem. of Ohio, Wickliffe, Ohio 44092, Robert C. Wolff, rector	8,900	15
5	Bowling Green State Univ., Bowling Green, Ohio 43402, Hollis A. Moore, president	143,153	247
12	Capital University, Columbus, Ohio 43209, Thomas H. Langevin, president	133,705	231
22	Case Western Reserve, Univ, Cleveland, Ohio 44106, Louis A. Toepfer, acting president	363,377	627
7	Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio 45314, James T. Jeremiah, president	62,262	107
7	Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio 45384, Herman R. Branson, president	546,206	942
7	Clark Co. Tech. Inst., Springfield, Ohio 45502, R. O. Brinkman, president	3,884	7
22	Cleveland Inst. of Music, Cleveland, Ohio 44106, Victor Babin, director	21,602	37
20	Cleveland State Univ., Cleveland, Ohio 44115, Harold L. Enarson, president	64,355	111
2	Col. Mt. St. Joseph on Ohio, Mt. St. Joseph, Ohio 45051, Sister Adele Clifford, president	13,602	23
18	College of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio 43952, Kevin R. Keelan, president	27,548	47
17	College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio 44691, J. Garber Drushel, president	45,293	78
12	Columbus Col. of Art & Design, Columbus, Ohio 43215, Joseph V. Canzani, dean	23,053	40
12	Columbus Technical Inst., Columbus, Ohio 43215, Clinton E. Tatsch, exec. director	$22,869	39
20	Cuyahoga Community Col., Cleveland, Ohio 44115, Charles E. Chapman, president	71,440	123
17	Denison University, Granville, Ohio 43023, Joel P. Smith, president	20,591	38
20	Dyke College, Cleveland, Ohio 44114, Jay R. Gates, president	5,667	10
1	Edgecliff Col., Cincinnati, Ohio 45206, Jane Kirchner, president	54,608	94
8	Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio 45840, Ivan B. Frick, president	104,016	179
8	Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio 44883, Leslie H. Fishel, Jr., President	86,607	149
11	Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio 44234, Elmer Jagow, President	134,420	232
22	John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio 44118, Henry F. Birkenhauer, President	89,513	154
11	Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44240, Robert I. White, President	260,547	449
17	Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio 43022, William G. Caples, President	20,119	35
3	Kettering Col. of Medical Art, Kettering, Ohio 45429, Winston H. Beaven, Dean	1,467	3
11	Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio 44077, Paul Weaver, President	7,738	13
13	Lorain Co. Cmty. College, Elyria, 44035, Max J. Lerner, President	32,800	57
16	Malone College, Canton, Ohio 44709, Everett L. Cattell, President	40,436	70
10	Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio 45750, Frank E. Duddy, Jr., President	95,944	165
9	Mary Manse College, Toledo, Ohio 43620, Rose Margaret Dostal, President	17,336	30
24	Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056, Phillip R. Shriver, President	123,120	212
16	Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio 44601, Ronald G. Weber, President	69,250	119
17	Mount Vernon Nazarene Col., Mt. Vernon, Ohio 43050, Stephenson W. Nease, President	34,474	59
10	Muskingum Area Tech. School, Zanesville, Ohio 43701, Walker J. Huffman, Director	16,696	29
17	Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio, 43762 William P. Miller, Acting President	50,377	87
22	Notre Dame College, Cleveland, Ohio 44121, Sister Mary Luke, president	46,960	81
13	Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio 44074, Robert W. Fuller, president	97,577	168
12	Ohio Dominican Col, Columbus, Ohio 43219, Sister M. Suzanne Uhrhane, president	85,749	113
4	Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio 45810, Samuel L. Meyer, president	112,680	194
15	Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, Novice G. Fawcett, president	819,051	1,412
10	Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701, Claude R. Sowle, president	267,978	462
12	Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio 43015, Thomas E. Wenzlau, president	78,666	136
12	Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio 43081, Lynn Warren Turner, president	96,810	167
5	Penta County Voc. Sch. Tech. Col, Perrysburg, Ohio 43551, Jacob H. See, president	11,119	19
12	Pontifical Col Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio 43085, Rt. Rev. Thomas P. Campbell, president	26,480	46
11	Rabbinical Col of Telshe, Wickliffe, Ohio 44092, Rabbi Modecai Gifter, dean	29,540	51
10	Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio 45674, Alphus R. Christensen, president	69,218	119
3	Sinclair Community College, Dayton, Ohio 45402, Marvin Knudson, president	29,604	51
20	St. John Col of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio 44114, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lawrence P. Cahill, president	39,669	68
8	Tiffin University, Tiffin, Ohio 44883, Richard C. Pfeiffer, president	5,400	9
10	Tri-County Tech. Inst., Nelsonville, Ohio 45764, John J. Light, vice president	16,173	28
14	University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44304, Dominic J. Guzzetta, president	93,466	161
2	University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, Walter C. Langsam, president	580,689	1,001
3	University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio 45409, Very Rev. Raymond A. Roesch, president	321,952	555
9	University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606, William S. Carlson, president	96,331	166
7	Urbana College, Urbana, Ohio 43078, Paul Zehner, president	49,194	85
22	Ursuline College, Cleveland, Ohio 44124, Sister Kenan Dulzer, president	30,000	52
16	Walsh College, Canton, Ohio 44720, Robert Francoeur, president	20,560	35
24	Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio 45056, W. C. Spencer, president	25,319	44
7	Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio 45384, Rembert E. Stokes, president	738,183	1,273
24	Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio 45177, W. Brooke Morgan, acting president	70,907	122
7	Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio 45501, Dr. G. Kenneth Andeen, president	113,614	196
7	Wright State Univ., Dayton, Ohio 45431, B. Golding, president	153,920	265
1	Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio 45207, Victor B. Nieporte, acting president	39,174	68
19	Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio 44503, Albert Leroy Pugsley, president	121,235	209

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	OKLAHOMA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 35)		
	Total	$2,480,938	4,275
2	Bacone College, Bacone, Okla. 74420, Garold D. Holstine, president	53,957	93
2	Bartlesville Wesleyan Col., Bartlesville, Okla. 74003, Leo Cox, president	15,171	26
5	Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany, Okla. 73008, Roy H. Cantrell, President	76,235	131
4	Cameron State Agric. Col., Lawton, Okla. 73501, Don Owen, President	54,766	94
5	Central State College, Edmond, Okla. 73034, Garland Godfrey, President	97,436	158
2	Connors State College, Warner, Okla. 74469, Melvin Self, President	28,664	49
3	East Central State Col., Ada, Okla. 74820, Stanley P. Wagner, President	98,244	169
3	Eastern Okla. State Col., Wilburton, Okla. 74578, James Miller, President	54,057	93
4	Langston University, Langston, Okla. 73050, William E. Sims, President	114,866	198
3	Murray State Col. of Agr. App., Sc., Tishomingo, Okla. 73460, Clyde R. Kindell, President	63,200	109
2	Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College, Miami, Okla. 74354, D. D. Creech, President	56,935	98
2	Northeastern State Oil, Tahlequam, Okla. 74464, Robert Collier, President	193,654	334
6	Northern Okla. College, Tonkawa, Okla. 74653, Edwin E. Vineyard, President	30,037	52
6	Northwestern State Col., Alva, Okla. 73717, J. W. Martin, President	25,754	44
5	Okla. State Univ. Tech. Inst., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73106, Philip P. Chandler, Director	3,223	6
6	Okla. St. U. Agric. & App. Sci., Stillwater, Okla. 74074, Robert B. Kamm, President	329,870	569
2	Okla. St. Univ. Schl. of Tech. Training, Okmulgee, Okla. 74447, Wayne W. Miller, Director	350,533	604
4	Oklahoma Baptist Univ., Shawnee, Okla. 74801, Robert L. Lynn, Interim President	59,046	102
5	Oklahoma Christian Col., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73111, J. O. Baird, president	100,330	173
5	Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73106, Dr. Dolphus Whitten, Jr., acting president	67,466	118
4	Oklahoma Col. of Liberal Arts, Chickasha, Okla. 73018, Robert L. Martin, president	28,650	49
2	Oklahoma Military Acad., Claremore, Okla. 74017, Col. John E. Horne, president	28,990	50
1	Oral Roberts Univ., Tulsa, Okla. 74105, Oral Roberts, president	79,632	137
4	Oscar Rose Junior College, Midwest City, Okla. 73110, Dr. Jacob Johnson, executive officer	23,426	40
6	Panhandle St. Col. Agr. and App. Sc., Goodwell, Okla. 73939, Freeman McKee, president	18,960	33
1	Phillips University, Univ. Station Enid, Okla. 73701 Hallie G. Gantz, president	36,577	63
3	Poteau Cmty. College, Poteau, Okla. 74953, Orville Johnson, president	63,516	110
3	Seminole Junior College, Seminole, Okla. 74686, Elmer Tanner, president	7,298	13
3	Southeastern State Col., Durant, Okla. 74701, Leon Hibbs, president	77,829	134
5	Southwestern College, Okla. City, Okla. 73127, W. R. Corvin, president	19,039	33
6	Southwestern State Col., Weatherford, Okla. 73096, Al Harris, president	62,689	108
4	St. Gregorys College, Shawnee, Okla. 74801, Michael Roethler, president	17,677	30
2	Tulsa Jr. College, Tulsa, Okla. 74119, Alfred M. Philips, president	8,433	15
4	University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla. 73069, Pete Kyle McCarter, president	121,804	210
1	University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla. 74104, J. Paschal Twyman, President	12,974	22
	OREGON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 32)		
	Total	2,426,129	4,182
2	Blue Mountain Cmty. Col., Pendleton, Oreg. 97801, Wallace W. McCrae, President	18,000	31
2	Central Oregon Col., Bend, Oreg. 97701, Frederick H. Boyle, President	7,761	13
2	Chemeketa Cmty. Col., Salem, Oreg. 97303, Paul F. Wilmeth, Director	27,690	48
1	Clackamas Cmty. College, Oregon City, Oreg. 97045, John W. Hakanson, President	16,321	28
1	Clatsop Cmty. Col., Astoria, Oreg. 97103, Philip L. Bainer, President	14,280	25
3	Columbia Christian Col., Portland, Oreg. 97220, Dr. Rex F. Johnston, President	12,461	21
3	Concordia College, Portland, Oreg. 97211, E. P. Weber, President	5,760	10
2	Eastern Oregon College, La Grande, Oreg. 97850, Averno M. Rempel, President	48,606	84
1	George Fox College, Newberg, Oreg. 97132, David Le Shana, Actg President	26,080	43
4	Lane Community College, Eugene, Ore. 97402, Eldon Schafer, President	250,193	431
1	Lewis & Clark College, Portland, Oreg. 97219, John R. Howard, President	48,148	83
1	Linfield College, McMinnville, Oreg. 97128, Gordon C. Bjork, President	55,534	96
4	Linn Benton Cmty. Col., Albany, Oreg. 97321, Raymond Needham, President	$8,720	15
1	Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Oreg. 97036, Robert Krupp, President	28,720	50
2	Mount Angel College, Mt. Angel, Oreg. 97362, Christian Mondor, President	20,080	35
3	Mount Hood, Cmty. Col., Gresham, Oreg. 97030, Earl L. Klapstein, President	39,244	68
3	Museum Art School, Portland, Oreg. 97205, William H. Givler, Dean	15,210	26
1	Oregon College of Educ., Monmouth, Oreg. 97361, Leonard W. Rice, President	167,203	288
1	Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg. 97331, Robert Mac Vicar, President	288,422	497
2	Oregon Tech. Institute, Klamath Falls, Oreg. 97601, W. D. Purvine, President	44,160	76
1	Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oreg. 97116, Brock Dixon, Provost	94,720	163
3	Portland Cmty. College, Portland, Oreg., 97201, Amo Debernardis, President	79,866	138
3	Portland State Univ., Portland, Oreg. 97207, Gregory B. Wolfe, President	284,019	490
3	Reed College, Portland, Oreg. 97202, Ross B. Thompson, Acting President	49,200	85
4	Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oreg. 97520, James K. Sours, President	179,993	310
4	Southwestern Ore. Cmty. Col., Coos Bay, Oreg. 97420, Jack E. Brookins, President	14,769	25
2	Treasure Valley Cmty. Col., Ontario, Oreg. 97914, Emery Skinner, President	20,468	35
4	Umpqua Community Col., Roseburg, Oreg. 97470, Harry Jacoby, President	6,320	11
4	University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg. 97403, Robert D. Clark, President	440,738	760
3	University of Portland, Portland, Oreg. 97203, Rev. Paul E. Waldschmidt, President	40,800	70
3	Warner Pacific College, Portland, Oreg. 97215, E. Joe Gilliam, President	22,073	38
2	Willamette University, Salem, Oreg, 97301, Roger J Fritz, president	50,570	67
	PENNSYLVANIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 110)		
	Total	8,029,823	13,849
6	Albright College, Reading, Pa. 19604, Arthur L. Schultz, president	19,782	34
24	Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 16335, Lawrence L. Pelletier, president	55,450	96
8	Allentown Col. St. Francis De Sales, Center Valley, Pa. 18034, Very Rev. J. Stuart Dooling, president	40,159	69
24	Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa. 16403, Henry J. Parcinski, president	27,166	47
6	Alvernia College, Reading, Pa. 19607, Mary Victorina, president	14,800	26
13	Beaver College, Glenside, Pa. 19038, Edward D. Gates, president	26,706	46
11	Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Pa. 17815, Robert J. Nossen, president	81,339	140
13	Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010, Harris L. Wofford Jr., president	20,414	35
17	Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 17837, Frederick P. Sample, president	67,680	117
8	Bucks Co. Community Col., Newtown, Pa. 18940, Charles E. Rollins, president	9,316	16
25	Butler Co. Cmty. Col., Butler Pa. 16001, Thomas Hoeve, president	1,500	3
7	Cabrini College, Radnor, Pa. 19088, Regina Casey, president	24,699	43
26	California State College, California, Pa. 15419, George H. Roadman, president	150,414	259
14	Carlow College, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213, Sister M. Camillus Scully, president	51,040	86
14	Carnegie Mellow Univ., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213, H. Guyford Stever, president	177,448	306
15	Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pa. 18104, Pauline Tompkins, president	20,894	36
14	Chatham College, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232, Edward D. Eddy, president	38,551	66
2	Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19118, Sister Mary Xavier Kerby, president	23,440	40
9	Cheyney State College, Cheyney, Pa. 19319, Wade Wilson, president	125,551	216
22	Christ The Saviour Sem., Johnstown, Pa. 15906, Most Rev. John R. Martin, rector	2,000	3
22	Clarion State College, Clarion, Pa. 16124, James Gemmell, president	105,479	182
14	Cmty. Col. of Allegheny Co-cent OFC, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219, Kermit C. Morrissey, president	100,134	173
25	Cmty Col. of Beaver Co., Freedom, Pa. 15042, H. B. Monroe, president	13,199	23
7	Cmty Col. of Delaware Co., Media, Pa. 19063, Douglas F. Libby Jr., president	18,000	31
11	College Misericorcia, Dallas, Pa. 18612, Sister Miriam Teresa O'Donnell, president	65,836	114
3	Community Col. of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107, Allen T. Bonnell, president	323,449	558
8	Del. Val. Col. of Sci. & Agri., Doylestown, Pa. 18901, James Work, president	47,896	83
19	Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 17013, Howard L. Rubendall, president	38,235	66

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	PENNSYLVANIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 110)—Continued		
1	Drexel Inst. of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104, William W. Hagerty, president	$296,966	512
14	Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219, Rev. Henry J. McAnulty, president	212,209	366
15	East Stroudsburg St. Col., E. Stroudsburg, Pa. 18301, Frank D. Sills, president	50,719	87
7	Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pa. 19087, Dr. J. Lester Farnish, President	24,457	42
24	Edinboro State College, Edinboro, Pa. 16412, Chester T. McNerney, Acting President	52,002	90
16	Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022, Morley J. Mays, President	36,780	63
7	Ellen Cushing Jr. College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010, Warren Mild, President	23,520	41
16	Franklin & Marshall Col., Lancaster, Pa. 17604, Keith Spalding, President	84,640	146
24	Gannon College, Erie, Pa. 16501, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Wilfred J. Nash, President	166,463	287
25	Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa. 15010, Edwin C. Clark, President	34,760	60
19	Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa. 17325, C. A. Hanson, President	46,935	31
13	Gwynedd-Mercy College, Gwynedd Valley, Pa. 19437, Sister Mary Gregory, President	18,517	32
13	Harcum Jr. College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010, Michael Cuzy, President	8,160	14
17	Harrisburg Area Cmty. College, Harrisburg, Pa. 17110, Clyde E. Blocker, President	16,183	26
13	Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 19041, John R. Coleman, President	21,795	36
4	Holy Family College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19114, Sister M. Aloysius, President	13,365	23
9	Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pa. 19345, Sister Mary of Lourdes, President	51,692	99
22	Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pa. 15701, William W. Hassler, President	187,750	324
6	Industrial Management Inst., Reading, Pa. 19601, Joseph E. Russon, President	23,730	41
12	Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa. 16652, John N. Stauffer, president	34,530	60
10	Keystone Jr. College, La Plume, Pa. 18440, Harry K. Miller, Jr., president	72,755	125
11	Kings College, Wilkes Barre, Pa. 18702, Rev. Lane D. Kilburn, president	114,630	198
6	Kutztown State College, Kutztown, Pa. 19530, Lawrence M. Strattan, president	86,235	149
18	La Roche College, Allison Park, Pa. 15101, Delasalle Mahler, acting president	25,200	43
5	La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19141, Brother Daniel Burke, FCS president	56,330	97
10	Lackawanna Jr. Coll., Scranton, Pa. 18510, C. R. Walther Thomas, president	9,634	17
15	Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 18042, K. Roald Bergethon, president	20,235	35
16	Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa. 17003, Allan Mund, president	25,200	43
8	Lehigh Co. Community Col., Schnecksville 18078, John G. Berrier, president	15,801	27
15	Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 18015, W. Deming Lewis, president	41,958	72
9	Lincoln University, Lincoln Univ., Pa. 19352, Herman Branson, president	272,307	469
23	Lock Haven State College, Lock Haven, Pa. 17745, Francis Hamblin, president	110,841	191
17	Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pa. 17704, Rev. Harold H. Hutson, president	73,280	126
13	Manor Jr. College, Jenkintown, Pa. 19046, Olga, president	6,464	11
10	Mansfield State College, Mansfield, Pa. 16933, Lawrence Park, president	53,631	92
10	Marywood College, Scranton, Pa. 18509, Sister M. Coleman Nee, president	95,934	185
24	Mercyhurst College, Erie, Pa. 16501, Sister M. Carolyn Herrmann, president	29,141	10
19	Messiah College, Grantham, Pa. 17027, D. Ray Hestetter, president	121,580	210
16	Millersville State Col., Millersville, Pa. 17551, William H. Duncan, president	45,723	79
13	Montgomery Co. Cmty. College, Conshohocken, Pa. 19428, Leroy Brendlinger, president	35,279	81
15	Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa. 18018, Dr. Herman Collier, president	44,541	77
22	Mount Aloysius Jr. College, Cresson, Pa. 16630, Sister Mary Ursula, president	10,000	17
15	Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 18104, John H. Murey, president	39,823	69
15	Northampton Co. Area Cmty. Col., Bethlehem, Pa. 18042, Richard C. Richardson, Jr., president	11,440	20
7	Northeastern Christian Junior Col., Villanova, Pa. 19085, Elza Huffard, president	14,960	28
9	Our Lady of Angels Col., Glen Riddle, Pa. 19037, Mother Mary Everilda, president	5,120	9
9	P. M. C. Colleges, Chester, Pa. 19013, Clarence R. Moll, president	70,335	121
3	Peirce Junior College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102, Thomas Peirce III, president	15,134	25
15	Penn Wesleyan College, Allentown, Pa. 18103, Charles L. Felsburg, president	27,360	47
23	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, Pa. 16802, J. W. Oswald, president	924,321	1,594
2	Phila. Col. of Tex. & Sci., Philadelphia, Pa. 19144, Bertrand W. Hayward, president	$29,642	51
3	Phila College of Art, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102, George D. Culler, President	30,960	53
3	Phila College of Bible, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103, Douglas Maccorkle, President	57,020	98
3	Phila Musical Academy, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103, Joseph Castaldo, President	20,720	36
14	Point Park College, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222, Arthur M. Blum, President	98,538	170
14	Robert Morris Jr. College, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219, Charles L. Sewall, President	28,415	49
13	Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa. 19010, Mother Mary George, President	9,479	16
21	Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa. 15601, Mary Schmidt, Acting President	71,920	124
19	Shippensburg State Col., Shippensburg, Pa. 17257, Gilmore B. Seavers, President	59,791	103
25	Slippery Rock State Col., Slippery Rock, Pa. 16057, Albert A. Watrel, President	100,880	174
3	Spring Garden College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19118, Robert H. Thompson, President	20,762	36
25	St. Fidelis Col. & Sem., Herman, Pa. 16039, Edmund Quinn, President	6,200	11
22	St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa. 15940, Rev. Vincent Negherbon, President	49,593	86
2	St. Josephs College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19131, Terrence Toland, President	86,981	150
21	St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pa. 15650, Rev. Fintan Shoniker, OSB President	62,960	109
17	Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa. 17870, Gustave W. Weber, President	44,004	76
7	Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 19081, Dr. Robert D. Cross, President	46,177	80
3	Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122, Paul R. Anderson, president	338,645	584
24	Thiel College, Greenville, Pa. 16125, Chauncey G. Bly, president	70,240	121
1	Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104, Martin Meyerson, president	209,209	361
14	University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213, Wesley W. Posvar, chancellor	354,875	612
10	University of Scranton, Scranton, Pa. 18510, Very Rev. Dexter Hanley, president	99,520	172
13	Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa. 19426, William S. Pettit, president	20,240	35
24	Villa Maria College, Erie, Pa. 16505, Sister M. Lawrence, president	26,160	45
7	Villanova University, Villanova, Pa. 19085, Very Rev. Robert J. Welsh, president	116,610	201
26	Washington & Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 15301, Howard J. Burnett, president	14,162	24
26	Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa. 15370, Bennett M. Rich, president	50,190	87
9	West Chester State Col., West Chester, Pa. 19380, Paul W. Rossey, president	62,643	108
25	Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. 16142, Earland I. Carlson, president	46,869	81
11	Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18703, Francis Michelini, president	156,354	270
12	Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa. 17201, Charles C. Cole, Jr., president	35,760	62
19	York College of Pa., York, Pa. 17405, Ray A. Miller, president	33,360	58
	RHODE ISLAND (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 12)		
	Total	385,649	1,440
1	Barrington College, Barrington, R.I. 02806, Charles E. Hummel, president	36,079	62
1	Brown University, Providence, R.I. 02912, Dr. Donald F. Hornig, president	130,021	224
1	Bryant College, Providence, R.I. 02906, Harry Evarts, acting president	33,248	57
2	Johnson & Wales Jc of Bus, Providence R.I. 02903, Morris Gaebe, president	60,500	104
2	Providence College, Providence, R.I. 02918, Rev. W. Haas, president	145,650	251
2	Rhode Island College, Providence, R.I. 02908, Joseph E. Kauffman, Acting president	74,771	129
2	Rhode Island Junior Col, Providence, R.I. 02908, William F. Flanagan, president	15,790	27
1	Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, R.I. 02903, Talbot Rantoul, president	18,471	32
2	Roger Williams Col, Providence, R.I. 02903, Ralph Gauvey president	62,843	108
1	Salve Regina College, Newport, R.I. 02840, Sr M. Christopher Orourke, president	39,178	68
2	Sem of Our Lady of Prov, Warwick, R.I. 02889, Robert J. Randall, Rector	5,885	10
2	Univ of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I. 02881, Dr. Werner A. Baum, President	213,231	368
	SOUTH CAROLINA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 35)		
	Total	1,965,887	2,923
2	Allen University, Columbia, S.C. 29204, J. W. Hairston, president	208,773	368
3	Anderson College, Anderson, S.C. 29621, J. E. Rouse, president	4,880	8

Footnotes at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	SOUTH CAROLINA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 35)—Continued		
1	Baptist Col at Charleston, Charleston, S.C. 29411, John Harmick, president	$45,182	78
2	Benedict College, Columbia, S.C. 29204, Benjamin F. Payton, president	161,587	279
3	Central Wesleyan College, Central, S.C. 29630, Claude R. Rickman, president	13,098	23
1	Citadel Military Col., S.C., Charleston, S.C. 29409, James Duckett, president	21,098	36
2	Claflin College, Orangeburg, S.C. 29115, H. V. Manning, president	221,829	382
3	Clemson University, Clemson, S.C. 29631, R. C. Edwards, president	9,102	15
6	Coker College, Hartsville, S.C. 29550, Gus Tuberville president	28,080	48
1	College of Charleston, Charleston, S.C. 29401, Theodore S. Stern, president	33,542	58
2	Columbia College, Columbia, S.C. 29203, R. Wright Spears, president	13,440	23
3	Erskine College, Due West, S.C. 29639, Joseph Wightman, acting president	15,760	27
6	Florence-Darlington Tech. Educ. Ctr., Florence, S.C. 29501 Fred Fore, director	21,075	35
6	Francis Marion College, Florence, S.C. 29501, Walter Douglas Smith, president	20,318	35
5	Friendship Jr. Col., Rock Hill S.C. 29730, James H. Goudlock, president	19,751	34
4	Furman University, Greenville, S.C. 29613, Gordon W. Blackwell, president	39,200	68
6	Horry-Marion-Georgetown Tech. Ed. Ctr., Conway, S.C 29526, George W. Dudley Jr., director	4,192	7
3	Lander College, Greenwood, S.C. 29646, E. Don Herd, Jr., president	3,339	6
5	Limestone College, Gaffney, S.C. 29340, M. Stanyarne Bell, president	12,597	22
2	Midlands Tech. Educ. Ctr., Columbia, S.C. 29205, R. L. Grigsby, executive director	8,240	14
5	Morris College, Sumter, S.C. 29150, H. E. Hardin, acting president	112,251	194
3	Newberry College, Newberry, S.C. 29108, A. G. D. Wiles, president	14,384	25
4	North Greenville Jr. Col., Tigerville, S.C. 29688, Harold Lindsey, president	13,267	23
2	Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech. Educ. Ctr., Orangeburg, S.C. 29115, Charles P. Weber, director	7,775	13
1	Palmer College, Charleston, S.C. 29401, Charles E. Palmer, president	96,770	167
3	Piedmont Tech. Educ. Center, Greenwood, S.C. 29646 L. D. Walters, director	2,200	4
4	Presbyterian College, Clinton, S.C. 29325, Marc C. Weersing, president	13,137	23
2	South Carolina St. College, Orangeburg, S.C. 29115, M. Maceo Nance, Jr., president	82,950	143
4	Spartanburg Jr. Col., Spartanburg, S.C. 29301, James S. Barrett, president	10,060	17
5	Sumter Area Technical Educ. Ctr., Sumter, S.C. 29150, William Cecil Walters, executive director	2,000	3
2	Univ. of S.C. Regional Campuses, Columbia, S.C. 29208, John J. Duffy, president	53,648	92
2	Univ. of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C. 29208, Thomas F. Jones, president	86,880	150
2	Voorhees Col., Denmark, S.C. 29042, Harry P. Graham, acting president	179,123	309
5	Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S.C. 29730, Charles S. Davis, president	78,999	138
4	Wofford College, Spartanburg, S.C. 29301, Paul Hardin III, president	37,360	64
	SOUTH DAKOTA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 15)		
	Total	891,706	1,538
1	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D. 57102, Charles L. Balcer, president	112,469	194
2	Black Hills State College, Spearfish, S.D. 57783, Meredith Freeman, president	111,247	192
1	Dakota State Col., Madison, S. Dak. 57042, Harry R. Bowes, President	98,362	170
2	Dakota Wesleyan Univ., Mitchell, S. Dak. 57301, Robert R. Huddleston, President	45,801	79
1	Freeman Jr. College, Freeman, S. Dak. 57029, Eldon Graber, President	3,800	7
2	Huron College, Huron, S. Dak. 57350, Richard H. Timmins, President	78,389	136
1	Mount Marty College, Yankton, S. Dak. 57078, Sister M. Evangeline Anderson, President	31,160	54
1	Northern State College, Aberdeen, S. Dak. 57401, Norbert K. Baumgart, President	73,923	127
1	Presentation College, Aberdeen, S. Dak. 57401, Sister Francis Mary Dunn, President	3,767	6
2	S. Dak. Sch. Mines & Tech., Rapid City, S. Dak. 57701 H. R. Fraser, President	24,548	42
1	Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. 57101, John L. Butler, President	31,041	54
1	South Dakota State Univ., Brookings, S. Dak. 57006, H. M. Briggs, President	97,497	188
1	Southern State College, Springfield, S. Dak. 57062, Dr. Allen R. Millar, President	44,550	77
1	University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak. 57069, Richard L. Brown, President	80,884	139
1	Yankton College, Yankton S. Dak. 57078, Fred Honkala, President	54,488	94
	TENNESSEE (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 53)		
	Total	$3,444,056	5,940
5	Aquinas Jr. Col., Nashville, Tenn. 37205, Sister Henry Suso Fletcher, OP, President	3,400	8
6	Austin Peay State Univ., Clarksville, Tenn. 37040, Joe Morgan, President	54,147	93
5	Belmont College, Nashville, Tenn. 37203, Herbert C. Gabhart, President	35,299	61
7	Bethel College, McKenzie, Tenn. 38201, James E. McKee, president	9,182	16
1	Carson Newman, College, Jefferson, Cty, Tenn. 37760, John A. Fincher, president	68,419	118
3	Chattanooga, St. Tech. Inst., Chattanooga, Tenn. 37403, Edgar H. Sessions, Director	8,534	15
9	Christian Brothers Col., Memphis, Tenn. 38104, Malcolm O. Sullivan, president	21,310	37
3	Cleveland State Cmty. College, Cleveland, Tenn. 37311, Dave Adkisson, president	22,476	39
6	Columbia State Cmty. Col., Columbia, Tenn. 38401, Harold S. Pryor, president	28,227	49
4	Cumberland College of Tennessee, Lebanon, Tenn. 37087, Ernest L. Stockton, Jr., president	23,605	41
5	David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn. 37203 Athens C. Pullias, president	42,331	73
8	Dyersburg St. Cmty, Col., Dyersburg, Tenn. 38024, E. B. Eller, president	26,413	46
1	East Tenn State Univ, Johnson City Tenn, 37601, Delos, Poe Culp, president	94,117	162
5	Fisk University, Nashville Tenn, 37203, James R. Lawson, president	151,200	261
7	Freed Hardman College, Henderson, Tenn, 38340, E. Claude Gardner, president	68,492	118
5	George Peabody, Col. Tchrs., Nashville, Tenn. 37203, John M. Claunch, president	21,082	36
3	Hiwassee College, Madisonville, Tenn. 37354, Horace N. Barker, president	37,551	65
7	Jackson State Cmty. College, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, F. E. Wright, president	14,314	25
1	King College, Bristol, Tenn, 37620, Powell A. Fraser, Acting pres	32,906	57
2	Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn. 37921, Robert L. Owens III, president	274,651	474
7	Lambuth College, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, James S. Wilder, Jr., president	42,509	73
7	Lane College, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, Herman Stone, president	245,475	423
9	Le Moyne-Owen College, Memphis, Tenn. 38126, Odell Horton, president	123,534	213
3	Lee College, Cleveland, Tenn. 37311, Charles W. Conn, president	93,328	161
2	Lincoln Memorial Univ., Harrogate, Tenn. 37752, H. Y. Livesay, president	40,504	70
7	Martin College, Pulaski, Tenn. 38478, Harry D. Wagner, president	19,433	34
2	Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn. 37801, Joseph J. Copeland, president	22,154	36
3	McKenzie College, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37401, Roy McKenzie, Jr., president	25,384	44
9	Memphis Academy of Arts, Memphis, Tenn. 38112, Edwin C. Rust, director	2,800	4
9	Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn. 38111, C. C. Humphreys, president	121,282	209
6	Middle Tenn. State Univ., Murfreesboro, Tenn. 37130, M. G. Scarlett, president	133,829	231
1	Milligan College Inc., Milligan Coll., Tenn. 37682, Jesse W. Johnson, president	25,716	44
3	Morristown College, Morristown, Tenn. 37814, J. Otis Erwin, president	38,534	66
4	Motlow St. Cmty. Col., Tullahoma, Tenn. 37388, Sam Ingram, president	21,498	37
5	Nashville State Tech. Institute, Nashville, Tenn. 37209, Edward L. Weld, director	3,806	7
4	Roane State Comm. College, Harriman, Tenn. 37748, Cuyler A. Dunbar, president	6,161	11
3	Southern Missionary Col., Collegedale, Tenn. 37315, Wilbert D. Schneider, president	89,419	154
9	Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis, Tenn. 38112, William L. Bowden, chancellor	54,011	93
9	State Tech. Inst. at Memphis, Memphis, Tenn. 38128, Charles O. Whitehead, director	2,341	4
5	Tenn. A & I St. Univ., Nashville, Tenn. 37203, A. P. Torrence, president	354,266	611
4	Tenn. Technogical Univ., Cookeville, Tenn. 38501, Everett Derryberry, president	92,767	160
3	Tenn. Wesleyan College, Athens, Tenn. 37303, Charles C. Turner Jr., president	24,396	42
3	Tennessee Temple College, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37404, Lee Roberson, president	23,104	40
8	The University of Tenn. at Martin, Martin, Tenn. 38273 Archie R. Dykes, chancellor	75,935	131
5	Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville, Tenn. 37210, Mark R. Moore, president	110,732	191
1	Tusculum College, Greeneville, Tenn. 37743, Andrew N. Cothran, president	13,360	23
7	Union University, Jackson, Tenn. 38301, Robert E. Craig, president	49,811	86
3	Univ. of Tenn. Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37403, William H. Masterson, Chancellor	148,602	256
2	University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. 37916, Charles H. Weaver, chancellor	270,617	467
4	University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn. 37375, Edward McCrady, vice chancellor	25,661	44

Footnotes at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	TENNESSEE—Continued		
	Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 37203, Alexander Heard, chancellor	$54,131	93
1	Walters St. Cmty. College, Morristown, Tenn. 37814, Dr. James W. Clark, President	16,416	28
3	William J. Bryan College, Dayton, Tenn. 37321, Theodore C. Mercer, President	34,884	60
	TEXAS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 97)		
	Total	8,054,982	13,887
17	Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Tex. 79601, John C. Stevens, President	109,865	189
2	Angelina College, Lufkin, Tex. 75901, Jack W. Hudgins, President	46,413	80
21	Angelo State Univ., San Angelo, Tex. 76903, L. D. Vincent, President	45,691	79
4	Austin College, Sherman, Tex. 75090, John D. Moseley, President	62,507	108
11	Baylor University, Waco, Tex. 76706, Abner V. McCall, President	257,935	445
23	Bee County Col., Beeville, Tex. 78102, Grady C. Hogue, President	40,782	70
5	Bishop College, Dallas, Tex. 75241, Milton K. Curry, Jr., President	754,545	1,301
10	Blinn College, Brenham, Tex. 77833, James H. Atkinson, President	23,840	41
14	Brazosport Jr. Col. Dist., Freeport, Tex. 77541, J. R. Jackson, President	1,728	3
11	Central Texas College, Killeen, Tex. 76541, L. M. Morton, Jr., President	53,303	92
5	Christian Col. of the Southwest, Dallas, Tex. 75228, Henry Speck, Jr., President	18,320	32
17	Cisco Jr., College, Cisco, Tex. 76437, W. Leland Willis, President	11,025	19
18	Clarendon College, Clarendon, Tex. 79226, Kenneth D. Vaughan, President	31,368	54
22	College of the Mainland, Texas City, Tex. 77590, Herbert F. Stallworth, President	19,149	33
10	Concordia Lutheran College, Austin, Tex. 78705, Paul G. Elbrecht, President	6,351	11
3	Dallas Baptist College, Dallas, Tex. 75211, Charles P. Pitts, President	64,318	111
5	Dallas Cty. Jr. College, District, Dallas, Tex. 75202, Bill J. Priest, Chancellor	74,470	128
14	Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, Tex. 78404, Jean Richardson, President	40,925	71
22	Dominican College, Houston, Tex. 77021, Antoinette Boykin, President	17,127	30
1	E. Tex. Bapt. College, Marshall, Tex. 75670, Howard C. Bennett, President	114,160	197
4	East Texas State Univ., Commerce, Tex. 75428, Daniel W. Halladay, President	64,789	112
12	Ft. Worth Christian Col., Ft. Worth, Tex. 76118, A. V. Isbell, President	25,000	43
9	Galveston Cmty. Col., Galveston, Tex. 77550, M. M. Plexco, President	12,642	22
22	Gulf Coast Bible Col., Houston, Tex. 77008, Max R. Caulke, President	2,000	3
17	Hardin Simmons University, Abilene, Tex. 79601, Elwin L. Skiles, President	122,560	211
6	Hill Junior College, Hillsboro, Tex. 76645, Oran B. Bailey, President	13,768.	24
7	Houston Baptist Col., Houston, Tex. 77036, W. H. Hinton, President	36,175	62
17	Howard County Jr. Col., Big Spring, Tex. 79720, W. A. Hunt, President	9,230	16
17	Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex. 76801, Guy D. Newman, President	66,397	114
10	Huston Tillotson College, Austin, Tex. 78702, John T. King, President	131,950	228
20	Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, Texas 78209, Sterling F. Wheeler, interim president	65,062	112
1	Jacksonville College, Jacksonville, Tex. 75766, Curtis M. Carroll, president	6,074	10
1	Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins, Tex. 75765, J. O. Perpener, president	238,104	497
4	Kilgore College, Kilgore, Tex. 75662, R. C. Watson, president	12,125	21
9	Lamar State Col. Tech., Beaumont, Tex. 77704, Frank A. Thomas, Jr., acting president	24,567	42
23	Laredo Jr. College, Laredo, Tex. 78040, Ray A. Laird, president	49,485	85
4	Letourneau College, Longview, Tex. 75601, Harry Hardwick, president	96,211	185
1	Lun Morris College, Jacksonville, Tex. 75766, C. E. Peeples, president	13,040	22
19	Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, Tex. 79407, F. W. Mattox, president	53,115	92
11	Mary Hardin Baylor Col., Belton, Tex. 76513, William G. Tanner, president	37,992	66
11	McLennan Cmty. Col., Waco, Tex. 76705, Wilbur A. Ball, president	24,950	43
17	McMurry College, Abilene, Tex. 79605, Thomas K. Kim, president	111,269	192
18	Mid-Continent Campuststi, Amarillo, Tex. 79105, J. N. Baker, president	23,879	41
13	Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Tex. 76308, Travis A. White, president	14,400	25
6	Navarro Jr. College, Corsicana, Tex. 75110, Ben W. Jones, president	4,709	8
13	North Texas State Univ., Denton, Tex. 76203, John Carter, acting president	104,909	181
20	Our Lady of the Lake Col., San Antonio, Tex. 78207, John L. McMahon, president	$229,305	395
15	Pan American College, Edinburg, Tex. 78539, Ralph Schilling, president	172,588	298
1	Panola College, Carthage, Tex. 75633, Q. M. Martin, president	13,856	24
1	Paris Jr. College, Paris, Tex. 75460, Louis B. Williams, president	8,254	14
11	Paul Quinn College, Waco, Tex. 76704, Dr. S. E. Rutland, president	180,672	312
10	Prairie View A. & M. Col., Prairie View, Tex. 77445, A. I. Thomas, president	173,542	299
17	Ranger Jr. College, Ranger, Tex. 76470, Jack Elson president	21,600	37
22	Rice University, Houston, Tex. 77001, Norman Hackerman, president	71,977	124
2	Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex. 77340, Elliot Bowers, president	6,490	11
20	San Antonio Union J. C. District, San Antonio, Tex. 72122, Wayland P. Moody, president	48,160	83
22	San Jacinto College, Pasadena, Tex. 77505, Thomas M. Spencer, president	5,027	9
19	South Plains College, Levelland, Tex. 79336, Marvin L. Baker, president	21,056	36
5	Southern Methodist Univ., Dallas, Tex. 75222, Willis M. Tate, president	90,568	158
21	Southwest Texas Jr. Col., Uvalde, Tex. 78801, Wayne Matthews, president	12,000	21
10	Southwest Texas State Univ., San Marcos, Tex. 78666, Dr. Billy Jones, president	55,470	96
4	Southwestern Christian College, Terrell, Tex. 75160, Jack Evans, president	57,627	99
199	Southwestern Union Col., Keene, Tex. 76059, E. C. Wines, president	36,367	63
10	Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex. 78626, Durwood Flemming, president	10,408	18
10	St. Edwards University, Austin, Tex. 78704, Edgar L. Roy, Jr., president	57,627	99
21	St. Marys University, San Antonio, Tex. 78228, Very Rev. Louis J. Blume, president	205,856	355
2	Stephen F. Austin Univ., Nacogdoches, Tex. 75961, R. W. Steen, president	118,753	205
16	Sul Ross State Univ., Alpine, Tex. 79830, Norman L. McNeil, president	54,060	93
17	Tarleton State College, Stephenville, Tex. 76401, W. O. Trogdon, president	42,046	72
6	Tarrant Co. Jr. Col., Fort Worth, Tex. 76102, Joe Bob Rushing, chancellor	48,512	84
11	Temple Jr. College, Temple, Tex. 76501, Hubert M. Dawson, president	13,440	23
6	Texas A&M University, College Station, Tex. 77843, Jack K. Williams, president	134,743	232
15	Texas A & I Univ., Kingsville, Tex. 78363, James C. Jernigan, president	251,402	433
6	Texas Christian Univ., Fort Worth, Tex. 76129, James M. Moudy, chancellor	22,206	38
4	Texas College, Tyler, Tex. 75701, Allen C. Hancock, president	222,748	384
23	Texas Lutheran College, Seguin, Tex. 78155, Joe K. Menn, president	40,369	70
22	Texas Southern Univ., Houston, Tex. 77004, Granville Sawyer, president	286,502	494
15	Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex. 78520, William H. Walton, president	29,503	51
11	Texas St. Tech. Inst., Connally Campus, Waco, Tex. 76705, Roy W. Dugger, director	84,095	145
19	Texas Tech. Univ., Lubbock, Tex. 79409, Grover L. Murray, President	142,298	245
12	Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth, Tex. 76105, W. M. Pearce, President	12,080	21
13	Texas Womans University, Denton, Tex. 76204, John A. Quinn, President	250,094	431
20	Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex. 78212, Dr. Gordon D. Wimpress, Jr., President	85,051	147
15	Tx. St. Tech. Inst. Rio Grande Campus, Harlingen, Tx. 78550, Dr. Roy W. Dugger, President	56,430	97
14	Univ. of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Tex. 78411 Kenneth A. Maroney, President	73,520	127
3	Univ. of Dallas, Irving, Tex. 75060, Donald A. Cowan, President	53,376	92
12	Univ. of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Tex. 76010, Frank Harrison, President	89,277	154
10	Univ. of Texas at Austin, Austin, Tex. 78712, Stephen H. Spurr, President	290,740	501
16	Univ. of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Tex. 79902, Joseph R. Smiley, President	224,190	387
22	University of Houston, Houston, Tex. 77004, Robert Morris, President	291,844	503
7	University of St. Thomas, Houston, Tex. 77006, Rev. Patrick D. Braden, President	116,026	203
19	Wayland Baptist College, Plainview, Tex. 79072, Roy C. McClung, President	49,280	85
11	Weatherford College, Weatherford, Tex. 76066, J. C. Nichols, President	4,207	7
18	West Texas State Univ., Canyon, Tex. 79015, James P. Cornette, President	118,776	205
19	Western Tx. College, Snyder, Tex. 79549, Robert L. Clinton, president	2,000	3
10	Wharton County Jr. Col., Wharton, Tex. 77488, Theodore Nicksick, Jr., president	60,835	105
1	Wiley College, Marshall, Tex. 75670, T. W. Cole, Sr., president	98,082	169

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	UTAH (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 10)		
	Total	$1,440,243	2,434
1	Col. of Eastern Utah, Price, Utah 84501, M. McDonald, president	39,254	68
1	Dixie College, St. George, Utah 84770, Ferron C. Losee, president	65,589	113
1	Snow Col., Ephriam, Utah 84627, Floyd S. Holm, director	55,176	95
2	Southern Utah State Coll., Cedar City, Utah 84720, Royden C. Braithwaite, president	89,363	154
2	University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112, James C. Fletcher, president	597,724	1,031
1	Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84321, Glen L. Taggart, president	380,213	656
2	Utah Tech. College at Salt Lake City, Salt Lake City, Utah 84107, Jay L. Nelson, president	30,934	53
1	Utah Technical Col. at Provo, Provo, Utah 84601, Wilson W. Sorensen, president	9,520	16
1	Weber State College, Ogden, Utah 84403, William P. Miller, president	141,849	245
2	Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah 84105, Manford A. Shaw, president	30,621	53
	VERMONT (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 17)		
	Total	539,491	931
1	Bennington College, Bennington, Vt. 05201, Edward J. Bloustein, president	10,074	17
1 1	Castleton State College, Castleton, Vt. 05735, Harold Abel, acting president	34,050	59
1 1	Champlain College, Burlington, Vt. 05401, C. Bader Brouilette, president	16,305	28
1 1	Goddard College, Plainfield, Vt. 05667, Gerald S. Witherspoon, President	31,623	55
1 1	Green Mountain College, Poultney, Vt. 05764, Raymond A. Withey, President	2,600	4
1 1	Johnson State College, Johnson, Vt. 05656, William G. Craig, Acting President	57,183	99
1 1	Lyndon State College, Lyndon Center, Vt. 05850, A. John Holden, Jr., Acting President	16,778	29
1 1	Marlboro College, Marlboro, Vt. 05344, Thomas Ragle, Acting President	4,860	8
1 1	Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 05753, James I. Armstrong, President	16,248	28
1 1	Norwich University, Northfield, Vt. 05663, Barksdale Hamlett, President	13,398	23
1 1	St. Joseph College, Old Bennington, Vt. 05201, Father Charles C. Matusik, President	3,097	5
1 1	St. Michaels College, Winooski, Vt. 05404, Bernard L. Boutin, President	45,630	79
1 1	Trinity College, Burlington, Vt. 05401, Sister Elizabeth Candun, RSM, President	19,144	33
1 1	Univ. of Vt. & St. Agric. Col., Burlington, Vt. 05401, Edward C. Andrews, Jr., President	174,557	301
1 1	Vermont College, Montpelier, Vt. 05602, William L. Irvine, President	7,479	13
1 1	Vermont Tech. College, Randolph Center, Vt. 05061, Pierre V. Kieffer, Jr., President	50,769	88
1 1	Windham College, Putney, Vt. 05346, Eugene C. Winslow, President	35,696	62
	VIRGINIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 53)		
	Total	2,470,919	4,262
5	Averett College, Danville, Va. 24514, Conwell A. Anderson, President	15,528	27
7	Blue Ridge Cmty. Col., Weyers Cave, Va. 24486, James A. Armstrong, President	35,545	61
7	Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Va. 22812, Wayne Geisert, president	35,520	61
6	Central Va. Cmty Col., Lynchburg, Va. 24504, S. A. Burnette, president	14,726	25
1	College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Va. 23185, Davis Y. Paschall, president	31,006	53
6	Dabney S. Lancaster Cmty. Col., Clifton Forge, Va. 24422, John F. Backels, president	14,819	26
5	Danville Cmty. Col. V.P.I., Danville, Va. 24541, J. M. Taylor, president	9,519	16
7	Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Va. 22801, Myron S. Augsburger, president	94,394	163
9	Emory & Henry College, Emory, Va. 24327, William C. Finch, president	34,429	59
5	Ferrum Jr. College, Ferrum, Va. 24088, Fred O. Wygal, president	37,740	65
7	Front Royal-Winchester Ar. Cmty. Col., Middletown, Va. 22645, Dr. William H. McCoy, president	51,853	39
8	Germanna Community College, Fredericksburg, Va. 22401, Dr. Arnold L. Wirtala, president	13,653	24
4	Hampden Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va. 23943, W. Taylor Reveley, president	22,644	39
1	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va. 23368, Roy D. Hudson, president	71,373	123
6	Hollins College, Hollins College, Va. 24020, John A. Logan, Jr., president	16,657	29
3	John Tyler Cmty. Col., Chester, Va. 23831, James R. Walpole, president	14,477	25
4	Longwood College, Farmville, Va. 23901, Henry I. Willett, Jr., president	14,700	25
6	Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Va. 24504, Carey Brewer, president	56,684	96
7	Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va. 22801, Ronald Carrier, president	$36,353	63
7	Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va. 24401, William W. Kelly, president	2,000	3
9	New River Cmty College, Dublin, Va. 24084, Dr. F. L. Wellman, acting president	12,974	22
2	Norfolk State Col., Norfolk, Va .23504, Lyman B. Brooks, president	398,626	687
10	Northern Va. Community College, Annandale 22003, Richard J. Ernst, president	6,448	11
2	Old Dominion Univ., Norfolk, Va. 23508, James L. Bugg, president	44,910	77
4	Paul D. Camp Cmty. Col., Franklin, Va. 23851, Perry R. Adams, president	7,105	12
6	Radford College, Radford, Va. 24141, Charles K. Martin, Jr., president	112,258	194
8	Randolph Macon College, Ashland, Va. 23005, Luther W. White III, president	17,278	30
6	Randolph Macon Womans Col., Lynchburg, Va. 24503, Wiliam F. Quillian, Jr., president	18,629	32
8	Rappahannock Cmty. College, Warsaw, Va. 22572, John H. Upton, president	3,828	7
6	Roanoke College, Salem Va. 24153, Perry F. Kendig, president	52,399	90
7	Shenandoah Col. & Cons. Mus., Winchester, Va. 22601 Robert P. Parker, president	20,237	35
5	Southside Virginia Cmty. College, Alberta 23831, Dr. Kenneth Dawson, president	10,377	18
9	Southwest Va. Cmty. Col., Richlands, Va. 24641, Charles R. King, president	20,022	35
5	St. Pauls College, Lawrenceville, Va. 23868, Jame Alvin Russell, Jr. president	140,823	243
99	The College of the Potomac, McLean, Va. 22101, Dr. James L. Russell, president	7,519	13
1	Thomas Nelson Cmty. Col., Hampton, Va. 23369, Thomas V. Jenkins, president	13,296	23
2	Tidewater Comm. College, Portsmouth, Va. 23703, Douglas M. Montgomery, president	12,703	22
9	U. of Va. Clinch Valley Col, Wise, Va. 24293, J. C. Smiddy, chancellor	36,863	64
10	U. of Va. George Mason Col., Fairfax, Va. 22030, Lorin A. Thompson, Chancellor	7,844	14
8	Univ. of Va., Mary Wash. Col., Fredericksburg, Va. 22401, Grellet C. Simpson, Chancellor	18,574	32
3	University of Richmond, Richmond, Va. 23173, George M. Modlin, president	31,746	55
7	University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 22903, Edgar F. F. Shannon, Jr., president	118,104	204
6	Virginia College, Lynchburg, Va. 24501, M. C. Sutherland, president	5,542	10
3	Virginia Commonwealth Univ., Richmond, Va. 23220, Warren W. Brandt, president	76,090	131
9	Virginia Highlands Cmty. College, Abingdon, Va. 24210, Donald E. Puyear, president	47,416	82
7	Virginia Military Inst., Lexington, Va. 24450, George R. E. Shell, superintendent	10,286	18
6	Virginia Polytechnic Inst., Blacksburg, Va. 24061, T. Marshall Hahn, Jr., president	214,441	370
4	Virginia State College, Petersburg, Va. 23803, Walker H. Quarles, acting president	105,973	183
3	Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va. 23220, Allix B. James, president	202,629	349
2	Virginia Wesleyan Col., Norfolk, Va. 23502, Lambuth M. Clarke, president	9,211	16
6	Virginia Western Cmty. Col. Roanoke, Va. 24015, Harold H. Hopper, president	9,083	16
7	Washington & Lee Univ., Lexington, Va. 24450, Robert E. R. Huntley, president	25,482	44
9	Wytheville Cmty. Col., Wytheville, Va. 24382, J. Wade Gilley, president	28,538	49
	WASHINGTON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 42)		
	Total	2,790,890	4,811
1	Bellevue Cmty. Col., Bellevue, Wash. 98004, Merle E. Landerholm, president	20,856	36
4	Big Bend Community Col., Moses Lake, Wash. 98837 Don A. Morgan, president	11,679	20
4	Central Washington St. Col., Ellensburg, Wash. 98926, James E. Brooks, president	107,182	185
3	Centralia College, Centralia, Wash. 98531, Nels Hanson, president	17,901	31
3	Clark College, Vancouver, Wash. 98663, Dwight C. Baird, president	5,132	9
4	Columbia Basin College, Pasco, Wash. 99301, Fred L. Esvelt, president	32,289	56
5	Eastern Washington St. Col., Cheney, Wash. 99004, Emerson C. Schuck, president	128,343	221
2	Edmonds Cmty. Col., Lynnwood 98036, James R. Warren, president	18,543	32
2	Everett Cmty. Col., Everett, Wash. 98201, Jeanette Poore, president	25,392	44
3	Evergreen State Col., Olympia, Wash. 98501, Charles J. McCann, president	23,270	40
6	Fort Steilacoom Cmty. Col., Tacoma, Wash. 98499, Marion O. Oppelt, president-elect	23,144	40
5	Ft. Wright Col. Holy Names, Spokane, Wash. 99204, Monica Schmidt, president	29,150	50
5	Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash. 99202, Richard E. Twohy, president	81,472	140
3	Grays Harbor College, Aberdeen, Wash. 98520, Edward P. Smith, president	21,161	36

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	WASHINGTON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 42)—Con.		
7	Green River Cmty. Col., Auburn, Wash. 98002, Melvin Lindbloom, president	$79,689	137
7	Highline Community Col., Midway, Wash. 98031, M. A. Allan, president	26,904	46
4	J. M. Perry Institute, Yakima, Wash. 98902, John M. Wilson, director	11,436	20
3	Lower Columbia College, Longview, Wash. 98632, David B. Story, president	30,140	52
1	N. Seattle Cmty. Coll., Seattle, Wash., 98103, Cecil Baxter, president	17,029	29
1	Northwest Col. Assemblies of God, Kirkland, Wash. 98033, D. V. Hurst, president	19,912	34
6	Olympic College, Bremerton, Wash. 98310, Norman Richardson, president	26,625	48
6	Pacific Lutheran Univ., Tacoma, Wash. 98447, Eugene Wiegman, president	53,504	92
2	Peninsula College, Port Angeles, Wash. 98362, E. John Maier, president	7,340	13
1	Settle Community College, Seattle, Wash. 98109, William Moore, Jr., president	169,079	292
1	Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Wash. 98119, David L. McKenna, president	99,940	172
7	Seattle University, Seattle, Wash. 98122, Kenneth Baker, president	143,488	247
1	Shoreline Community Col., Seattle, Wash. 98133, Richard S. White, president	32,756	56
2	Skagit Valley College, Mt. Vernon, Wash. 98273, Norwood M. Cole, president	31,197	54
5	Spokane Community College, Spokane, Wash. 99202, Hobart G. Jenkins, president	43,158	74
5	Spokane Falls Cmty. College, Spokane, Wash. 99204, Max M. Synder, president	39,299	68
3	St. Martins College, Olympia, Wash. 98501, Very Rev. Michael Feeney, president	33,744	58
6	Tacoma Community Col., Tacoma, Wash. 98465, Thornton M. Ford, President	20,359	35
6	Univ. of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Wash. 98416, R. Franklin Thompson, president	78,356	135
1	University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 98105, Charles E. Odegaard, President	639,804	1,103
4	Walla Walla College, College Place, Wash. 99324, R. L. Reynolds, president	54,867	95
4	Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, Wash. 99362, Eldon Dietrich, President	19,131	33
4	Washington State Univ., Pullman, Wash. 99163, Glenn Terrell, president	235,781	407
5	Wenatchee Valley Col., Wenatchee, Wash. 98801, William E. Steward, president	19,608	34
2	Western Washington St. Col., Bellingham, Wash. 98225, Charles J. Flora, president	144,189	249
4	Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 99362, Donald Sheehan, president	51,376	89
5	Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash. 99218, Edward B. Lindaman, president	65,740	113
4	Yakima Valley College, Yakima, Wash. 98902, Thomas E. Deem, president	50,925	88
	WEST VIRGINIA (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 21)		
	Total	1,506,781	2 598
2	Alderson Broaddus College, Philippi, W. Va. 26416, Richard E. Shearer, president	42,480	73
5	Beckley College, Beckley, W. Va. 25801, John W. Saunders, president	50,804	88
1	Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va. 26032, Perry E. Gresham, President	62,963	109
5	Bluefield State College, Bluefield, W. Va. 24701, Wendell G. Hardway, President	69,452	120
9	Concord College, Athens, W. Va. 24712, Joseph F. Marsh Jr., President	120,529	208
2	Davis & Elkins College, Elkins, W. Va. 26241, Gordon E. Hermanson, President	57,236	99
1	Fairmont State College, Fairmont, W. Va. 26554, Eston K. Flaster, President	85,355	147
1	Glenville State College, Glenville, W. Va. 26351, D. Banks Wilburn, President	108,271	183
4	Marshall University, Huntington, W. Va. 25701, John G. Barker, President	148,717	256
3	Morris Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va. 25304, Marshall Buckalew, President	36,026	52
4	Ohio Valley College, Inc., Parkersburg, W. Va. 26104, Justin B. Roberts, Acting President	10,744	19
99	Parkersburg Center W. Va. University, Parkersburg, W. Va. 26101, James G. Harlow, President	13,344	23
2	Potomac St. Col. of W. Va. U., Keyser, W. Va. 26726, Harold C. Lester, President	28,519	49
1	Salem College, Salem, W. Va. 26426, K. Duane Hurley, President	63,124	109
2	Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, W. Va. 25443, James A. Butcher, President	64,780	112
5	W. Virginia Inst. of Tech., Montgomery, W. Va. 25136, Leonard C. Nelson, President	109,257	188
2	W. Virginia Wesleyan Col., Buckhannon, W. Va. 26201, Stanley R. Martin, President	33,562	58
1	West Liberty State Col., West Liberty, W. Va. 26074, James L. Chapman, President	87,720	151
3	West Virginia State Col., Institute, W.Va. 25112, William J. L. Wallace, president	107,443	185
2	West Virginia University, Morgantown, W.Va. 26506, James G. Harlow, president	$177,564	306
1	Wheeling College, Wheeling, 26003, Very Rev. Frank R. Haig, president	30,889	53
	WISCONSIN (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 38)		
	Total	4,728,156	8,148
4	Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53215, Joel Read, president	23,652	41
1	Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 53511, Miller Upton, president	41,280	71
9	Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53217, Sister Mary Aquin O. S. F. president	11,120	19
9	Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis. 53186, Morris Spencer, Chief Admin. Officer	63,643	110
1	Carthage College, Kenosha, Wis. 53140, Dr. Harold H. Lentz, president	40,960	71
5	Concordia College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53208, Dr. Walter W. Stuenkel, president	4,500	8
2	Dodge County Teachers Col. Mayville, Wis. 53050, Dr. Arthur K. Mehren, president	4,450	8
1	Dominican College, Racine Wis. 53402, Thomas C. Stevens, president	50,301	87
10	Eau Claire Tech. Instit. Dist 1, Eau Claire, Wis. 54701, Cecil W. Beede, Dist. director	16,629	29
2	Edgewood College, Madison, Wis. 53711, Sister Mary Cecillia Cary president	10,400	18
8	Holy Family College, Manitowoc, Wis. 54220, Sister Anne Kennedy OSF, president	8,300	9
1	Kenosha Tech. Inst. Kenosha, Wis. 53140, Keith W. Stoehr, director	7,600	13
6	Lakeland College, Sheboygan, Wis. 53081, Dr. John B. Morland, president	36,622	63
6	Lakeshore Tech. Schools-VTAE Dist. 11 Sheboygan, Wis. 53081, Frederick J. Nierodl, district director	7,421	13
8	Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis. 54911, Thomas S. Smith, president	46,332	80
2	Madison Technical College Dist. #4, Madison, Wis. 53703 Norman P. Mitby, director	50,720	87
6	Marian Col. of Fond du Lac Fond Du Lac, Wis. 54935, Sister Mary Sheila CSA, president	7,600	13
5	Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis. 53233, John P. Raynor, president	136,197	235
1	Milton College, Milton, Wis. 53563, Kenneth E. Smith president	16,341	28
5	Milwaukee Area Tech. College, Milwaukee ,Wis. 53203, William L. Ramsey, Dist. director	28,400	49
4	Milwaukee School of Engrg., Milwaukee, Wis. 53201, Karl O. Werwath, president	21,440	37
9	Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wis. 53222, Mary Huberta, president	17,908	31
10	Mount Senario Col., Ladysmith, Wis. 54848, Robert E. Lovett, president	47,120	81
10	Nicolet Col. and Techinst, Rhinelander, Wis. 54501, Dr. Richard J. Brown, director	8,199	14
7	North Central Tech. Inst., Wausau, Wis. 54401, Lawrence B. Hoyt, director	33,280	57
8	Northeast Wis. Tech. Inst., Green Bay, Wis. 54303, K. W. Haubenschild, area director	3,788	7
10	Northland College, Ashland, Wis. 54806, Robert V. Cramer, president	63,600	110
6	Ripon College, Ripon, Wis. 54971, Bernard S. Adams, president	38,343	66
8	St. Norbert College, West De Pere. Wis. 54178, Robert E. Christin, president	78,860	136
2	U. of Wis., Madison, Madison, Wis. 53706, John C. Weaver, president	737,840	1,272
5	U. of Wis., Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis. 53201, J. Martin Klotsche, chancellor	259,304	447
99	University Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha, WI. 53140, Irvin G. Wyllie, chancellor	48,421	83
3	Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wis. 54601, J. T. Finucan, president	60,880	105
6	Vtae Area #10, Fond du Lac, Wis. 54935, H. S. Van Valkenburg, dist. director	3,200	6
9	Waukesha Co. Technical Inst., Waukesha, Wis. 53186, A. J. Natalizio, dist. dir	4,080	7
3	Western Wisc. Tech. Inst., La Crosse, Wis. 54601, Charles G. Richardson, director	8,000	14
2	WI. State Universities System, Madison, WI. 53701, Eugene R. McPhee, director	2,678,625	4,618
5	Wisconsin College Conservatory, Milwaukee, WI. 53202, Dr. Vincent McDermott, dean of faculties	2,800	5
	WYOMING (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 8)		
	Total	431,749	744
11	Casper College, Casper, Wyo. 82601, Tilghman H. Aley, president	32,786	57
11	Central Wyoming College, Riverton, Wyo. 82501, Walter H. Palmberg, president	10,037	17
1	Eastern Wyoming College, Torrington, Wyo. 82240, Charles Rogers, dean	7,100	12
99	Laramie County Comm. College, Cheyenne, WY. 82001, Charles E. Carpenter, president	23,454	40
11	Northwest Community Col., Powell, Wyo. 82435, Sinclair Orendorff, president	10,533	18
1	Sheridan College, Sheridan, Wyo. 82801, Dana Peitersen, president	11,200	91

Footnote at end of table.

District No.	Institution address and Head of institution	Allocation	Estimate number of student awards
	WASHINGTON (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 42)—Con.		
[1]	University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo. 82070, William D. Carlson, president	$333,437	575
1	Western Wyoming College, Rock Springs 82901, Charles C. Crandall, president	3,200	6
	GUAM (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 1)		
	Total	12,500	22
	University of Guam, Box EX Agana, Guam 96910, Pedro Sanchez, president	12,500	22
	PUERTO RICO (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 5)		
	Total	1,429,070	2,464
	Catholic Univ. of P. R., Ponce, P.R. 00731, Francisco J. Carreras, president	$218,000	376
	Col. of the Sacred Heart, Santurce, P.R. 00914, Rafael Enrique Garcia Bottari, president	29,307	51
	Inter American Univ. of Puerto Rico, San German, P.R. P.R. 00753, Sol Luis Descartes, president	319,044	550
	Puerto Rico Jr. College, Rio Piedras, P.R. 00928, Ana G. Mendez, chancellor	72,065	124
	Univ. of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R. 00931, Iamie Benitez, president	790,654	1,363
	VIRGIN ISLANDS (NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 1)		
	Total	5,900	10
4	College of the Virgin Is., St. Thomas, V.I. 00801, Lawrence C. Wanlass, president	5,900	10
	U.S. total (2,163)	$165,646,310	285,616

[1] Congressional district at large.

WHAT IS A TRUE PATRIOT?

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to begin talking about the youth of America in a positive manner. Each day the papers are filled with discouraging accounts of youngsters getting into trouble, not respecting their parents, and downgrading their country.

We should start talking about the multitudes of young American boys and girls—the vast, overwhelming majority—who are an asset to their community and live clean, wholesome lives.

Such a young man is 15-year-old Robert Beatson of Upper Marlboro. Robert, who attends Frederick Douglass Junior-Senior High School, recently won first place in the American Legion essay contest. His essay, entitled "What Is a True Patriot?" is full of the youthful enthusiasm that has made this country great. For this reason, I submit Robert's essay for inclusion in the RECORD:

WHAT IS A TRUE PATRIOT?

(By Robert Beatson)

What is a true patriot? A true patriot, in my opinion, is a person who shows pride in his country by his love and loyalty to that country. These two factors are intangible aspects about patriotism which could mean different things to different people as the case may be. A true patriot must love his country. This love can be shown externally and internally. A few ways it can be shown are: (1) The doing of anything possible for the good of the country. (2) The obeying and living up to the laws and standards in the country. (3) The support given to the government and the life, liberty, and freedom this government stands for. There may be other ways to show love for a country but these three points, I believe, are the most important.

A second factor that is just as important is loyalty to the country. As in the first factor, there are many possible points that could possibly be included but the following three points, I believe, are the most pertinent ones. They are: (1) Service in the military for the required time. (2) The nonbetrayal of the country in military and other affairs of that country. (3) The faith shown in the country even in times of stress. All of these points, I think, go into the making of a true patriot.

There, because of the above points, a true patriot is a person who shows pride in his country by his love for the country and his loyalty to that country. While there can be many arguments as to the choice of factors, I feel that these two factors are the best possible choices. In other words, a person who loves his country and is loyal to it is a true patriot because after everything is considered these are the best factors for a patriot.

UTAH STARS—CHAMPIONS OF THE ABA

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Utah is noted worldwide for its great athletic attainments, its facilities for skiing, its spectacular natural beauty. Today we add another honor—home of the Utah Stars, champions of the American Basketball Association.

The Stars moved from Los Angeles to the Salt Palace in Salt Lake City only a year ago, and they have been immensely successful in their new home. Not only have they won the ABA title, they drew more fans in their first year in Salt Lake City than any other new franchise in the history of the league.

I congratulate team owner Bill Daniels, coach Bill Sharman, and the players for this great honor they have so well and fully earned.

I ask that the account from the Washington Post of last night's victory over the Kentucky Colonels in the championship game be printed at this point in the RECORD:

BEATY LEADS UTAH STARS TO ABA CROWN

SALT LAKE CITY, May 18.—The Utah Stars, behind the 36-point shooting of Zelmo Beaty, swamped the Kentucky Colonels, 131–121, tonight to win the American Basketball Association championship.

The Stars, who lost in the ABA finals to Indiana last year, broke the game open early in the fourth quarter, stretching their lead to as much as 14 points. The Colonels came within five points twice at 99–94 and 112–107.

Before a screaming crowd of 13,260, Utah iced the game in the closing minute as Mike Butler came off the bench to hit a three-pointer and two free throws.

Kentucky, which had come back in the series after being down 2–0 and 3–2, stayed in the game on the shooting of Dan Issel, who finished with 41. The winning team splits $48,000 while Kentucky splits $40,000.

TRIBUTE TO STANLEY GRIGANAVICIUS

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 16 of this year, tribute was paid by the members of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens' Association to Stanley Griganavicius, a distinguished South Boston businessman, an outstanding public relations principal and recently retired as manager of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizen's Association.

Mr. Griganavicius was born in Lithuania in 1902 and grew up on the farmlands of the Baltic country, served in the Lithuanian army between the years 1922–25 before being honorably discharged with service distinction.

His strong desire to come to the United States in spite of a great need of his farming capabilities finally ended in success when he arrived in the Boston area in 1928. Although the depression years proved a tremendous challenge, he progressed in work and education with English language studies accomplished at night time classes.

Patriotic activities for Lithuania and America absorbed much of his free time and he was a member of numerous civic organizations. He was especially involved in the functions of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizen's Association, serving many years as a director and treasurer.

Starting in 1936, Stanley Griganavicius worked for the Darbininkas newspaper in South Boston for a period of 14 years, remaining in Boston when the publication moved to New York in 1950.

Nearly 1,400 individuals make up the membership of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizen's Association and they credit Stanley Griganavicius with an outstanding 5-year period of management.

HOW TO MEASURE RADIOACTIVITY

HON. JOHN G. DOW
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 16, 1971, I received your permission to insert a letter that I wrote to Chairman Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission. In the letter I expressed my own confusion about the many and puzzling terms used by writers in describing radioactivity and its magnitude. The obfuscation is amplified when the layman involve themselves in describing some of the alarming conditions that are often associated with atomic energy installations.

Chairman Seaborg has been good enough to secure an AEC staff study directed specifically to the questions raised in my letter. I think it will be helpful to all of those who are, in my case, striving to attain an appreciation of the issues raised by radioactivity, if I publish the AEC staff study.

The AEC staff study appears below:

AEC STAFF STUDY PERTAINING TO LETTER FROM CONGRESSMAN JOHN G. DOW DATED MARCH 15, 1971

GENERAL COMMENTS

A. Definitions

Different units are used in everyday life to express different entities, e.g., miles per hour for speed, calories for energy, etc. Likewise, different units are used in expressing nuclear energy concepts. In brief, the *curie* indicates how rapidly a given amount of a radionuclide disintegrates. As these atoms disintegrate, they emit radiations which may be absorbed, in whole or in part, by living tissue. The amount of absorbed energy is expressed in *rads*. Finally, since different types of radiations may produce different degrees of biological effects for the same amount of energy absorbed by living tissue, it is necessary to use the unit *rem*. Thus, the *rem* probably is the best single indicator of potential biological effects.

In attempting to clarify the meanings and uses of different radiation units, definitions of three key units will be given followed by some explanatory statements.

Curie—the basic unit used to describe the rate at which atoms decay (disintegrate). One curie equals 37 billion disintegrations per second, or approximately the radioactivity of 1 gram of radium. A *"picocurie"* is a trillionth of a curie, i.e., 0.037 disintegrations per second.

Rad—an acronym for "radiation absorbed dose". The basic unit of absorbed dose of ionizing radiation. By definition, one rad is equal to the absorption of 100 ergs of radiation energy per gram of absorbing material. (An "erg" is a unit of energy. It is a small quantity. For example, a 100 watt electric light bulb utilizes a billion ergs of energy every second.)

Rem—an acronym for "roentgen equivalent man". A unit of absorbed radiation dose in biological matter. It is equal to the absorbed dose in rads multiplied by what is known as a "modifying factor" (which will be explained later). Another commonly used unit is the *millirem*. One rem is equal to 1000 millirem; it is like changing a one thousand dollar bill (rem) into 1000 one dollar bills (millirems).

The *curie* is a useful unit to describe certain physical characteristics of radioactive substances (called radionuclides), but it provides no direct measurement of the effects the radiation emitted will have on people or things. The reason is largely that different kinds and strengths of radiation are given off by different radioactive materials. While by definition, a curie of one material will be disintegrating at the same rate as a curie of another, the radiations emanating as a result of those disintegrations may vary markedly.

The units used as a measure of radiation effects are the *rad* and the *rem*. The term *rad* is generally used for comparing the *non-biological* effects of different radiation exposure doses such as the effects on steel or insulating materials, for example. The *rad*, however, is not an effective measure of the effects of radiation on *biological* material since different forms of radiation [1] cause different amounts of biological damage for the same amount of energy absorbed. For example, the energy absorbed in living tissues from one type of radiation (alpha particles [1]) may produce a greater degree of biological effects than the same amount of energy absorbed from other types (beta particles or gamma radiation [1]). Thus, there are in accepted use "modifying factors" for different radiations which when multiplied by "rad" (radiation absorbed dose) gives "rem" (roentgen equivalent man).

There are three principal types of radiations (alpha, beta and gamma) that emanate from atoms when they disintegrate. Alpha particles are like the nuclei of helium and have very limited range, i.e., even an ordinary piece of paper will stop them. Thus, radionuclides that emit alpha particles, such as plutonium-239, are of no significant health consideration when they are outside of the body (since the horny layer of the skin will stop essentially all of them). Beta particles are merely high speed electrons. They are more penetrating than alpha particles and, if present in large number outside the body, can produce biological effects on the skin, "skin-burns". However, this potential effect is encountered only in exceptional situations such as handling high radioactive materials with the barehands. Both alpha and beta particles may be a health hazard if they are emitted in sufficient quantities from radionuclides within the body. The energies of gamma rays vary depending upon what radionuclide is their source but, in general, are considered to irradiate the whole body even when the radionuclide is outside of the body.

B. Radionuclides and biological effects

Each radionuclide is specific as to the type or types of emissions emitted and to its "half-life", the time for one-half of the remaining atoms to disintegrate. These "half-lives" for different radionuclides range from millionths of a second to over billions of years.

Different radionuclides not only have wide ranges of values for their radioactive "half-lives" but also for the amounts that may be deposited in different organs of the body, if ingested or inhaled, and for their rates of elimination from the body. To determine biological effects requires not only knowledge about the curie quantities of the specific radionuclide involved but also the type of radiation emitted as the atoms disintegrate, the total amount of radiation energy absorbed, the rate at which it was absorbed and the specific biological tissue involved. Very precise data are known for the physical and chemical characteristics of all of the key radionuclides and for their production rates in nuclear reactors and other nuclear activities. Less precise information is available on biological behavior and effects of radionuclides as would be expected when dealing with living organisms owing to their complexity and variability. However, a very great fund of knowledge on the biological effects of radiation has been accumulated over more than a half century of research. In fact, even back in 1960 the National Academy of Sciences stated:

"Despite the existing gaps in our knowledge, it is abundantly clear that radiation is by far the best understood environmental hazard. The increasing contamination of the atmosphere with potential carcinogens, the widespread use of many new and powerful drugs in medicine and chemical agents in industry, emphasize the need for vigilance over the entire environment. Only with regard to radiation has there been determination to minimize the risk at almost any cost."

C. Natural radiation

Definitions for the "rad" and "rem" have been given, but it is recognized that these may lead to little understanding for the layman. There are two alternate courses that may be followed to explain their meaning: one, a detailed technical discussion [2] or two, a comparison with naturally occurring phenomena. The second course will be followed here.

Man has always been subjected to radiation from natural sources—cosmic rays, radioactive materials in the ground, in the air we breathe and the food and water we ingest.

As far as known, man always has and always will live in an environment filled with nuclear radiation from natural causes. To these natural radiations will be added those from man-made nuclear activities such as nuclear energy programs—but these radiations are no different in kind from those emanating from natural sources. Nor is there any evidence they produce any fundamentally different biological effects. Nuclear energy programs will not introduce a new and strange agent into our environment with completely unpredictable results.

In short, man-made nuclear activities will produce only more of the same types of radiation to which man has been subjected ever since he first appeared on this earth.

But how much more?

First, let us take a look at the radiation exposure man receives from natural sources. In round figures, persons in the United States receive about 125 millirems of radiation each and every year from natural sources—broken down approximately as follows:

	Millirems
Terrestrial sources	60
Cosmic rays	40
Radioactive materials within our bodies	25

But the amount of radiation exposure can vary depending upon where we live. Living in Denver, for example, about doubles the yearly exposure over that at the seashore because the cosmic rays are more intense at higher altitudes and there are larger amounts of radioactive materials naturally in the ground. In fact, the amounts in the ground are so great in parts of the world that the radiation levels have remained ten to a hundred times higher than the 125 millirems per year. Incidentally, there have been no demonstrably harmful biological effects to the population who have lived for generations in these areas of high background radiation. But one does not have to look far to find greater concentrations of naturally occurring radioactive materials than the average. Granite, bricks, concrete, etc., are examples; living in buildings constructed of these materials can increase the radiation levels over those found in wooden structures from 10 percent to more than 200 percent.

[1] Types of radiations.

[2] Further information is available in AEC "Understanding the Atom" booklets entitled "Your Body and Radiation" by Norman Frigerio and "The Natural Radiation Environment" by Jacob Kastner.

D. Medical exposures

Medical irradiation accounts for the major portion of the average dose received by persons in the United States from man-made radiation. The National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements has stated that the average genetically significant radiation dose to persons in the United States from medical uses is probably 50 to 70 millirems per year.

E. Radiation exposures from nuclear power-plants

How do such numbers compare with the radiation exposure that persons might receive if they lived near a typical nuclear power plant? Experience with licensed power reactors to date shows that it is possible to design and operate reactors such that the public living in the vicinity of these plants will not be exposed to radioactivity from plant effluents which will be much more than a few percent of the natural background. Extrapolating to the year 2000, it has been estimated that the effluents from all of the nuclear power plants, even without any further reduction in effluents from present day practices, would result in an average radiation exposure to the general population of less than one millirem per year.

It may be seen that these radiation exposures are quite small compared with those from natural sources and medical uses. They are indeed small when compared with the *variations* only of background radiation from locality to locality in the United States. It has been estimated, for example, that the gamma radiation dose from igneous rock on the island of Manhattan exposes people to about 15 millirem/yr. more than they would receive from the sandy terrain of Brooklyn, another borough of the city of New York.

F. Radiation exposure standards

In addition to comparing potential radiation exposures from nuclear power programs with natural radiation, another comparison may be made with radiation protection standards. The framework for controlling levels of radioactivity in effluents from nuclear power plants is set forth in regulations Part 20 and Part 50 published under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Part 20 sets the general standards for protection against radiation, including limits on levels of radioactivity released to the environment. Part 50 establishes general design, construction and operating requirements for nuclear power plants. These standards are based on guidance from the International Commission on Radiological Protection, the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements and the Federal Radiation Council (whose functions now have been assumed by the Environmental Protection Agency).

In brief, the radiation protection standards for whole body exposure (exclusive of natural background radiation and medical uses) are:

1. Individual in the general population should not exceed 500 millirems per year.
2. General population (average) should not exceed 170 millirems per year.
3. The radiation dose to persons should be kept as low as practicable.

G. Regulation of releases from nuclear power reactors

Thus, the objectives of the regulations and the regulatory program are not only to keep effluent releases within the protection standards but also to see that appropriate efforts are made to keep releases of radioactive materials in effluents to unrestricted areas as far below limits specified in the regulations as practicable.

Experience has shown that the radioactivity in water and air effluents from licensed power reactors has generally been kept at less than a few percent of the limits specified in Part 20. Measurements of radioactivity in the environs of nuclear power plants have in most cases revealed little or no increase in environmental radioactivity resulting from plant operations. In cases where increases were measured, the levels were barely detectable above background. This observation is supported by unusually detailed studies of the environs of three power reactors that have operated from eight to ten years. The Bureau of Radiological Health of the U.S. Public Health Service jointly with the Atomic Energy Commission conducted an investigation at the Yankee Atomic Power Reactor in Rowe, Massachusetts, and the Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit I in Illinois. Indian Point Unit I on the Hudson River has been studied extensively by a team from the Institute of Environmental Medicine at New York University Medical Center. Periodic surveys have also been made by the New York State Health Department. (Reports of these studies can be attained direct from these agencies.)

The AEC has published amendments to regulations set forth in Part 50 that will help to assure that radioactivity in effluent releases is indeed maintained as low as practicable with available waste treatment equipment and procedure technology. These revisions give added assurances that radiation doses from nuclear power plant effluents will continue to be only small percentages of the dose from background radiation.

RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC STATEMENTS

Statement: "I am frightened when I read some of the data recently published on this subject. For instance, Senator Gravel last year said in the Senate: 'Each 1,000 megawatt nuclear power-plant will produce, every year that it operates at 75 percent capacity, as much radioactivity as the explosion of several hundred Hiroshima-size bombs. That could mean the equivalent of 250,000 bombs every year, if there were 500 plants operating'."

Response: Although nuclear reactors do produce in their operation very large quantities of radioactive material, this should not be taken to imply that large quantities of such materials are released, or are available for release, to the environment. On the contrary, great care is taken to assure that the great bulk of radioactive materials produced in nuclear fission (called fission products) are retained within the nuclear reactor fuel elements. Further, the structural characteristics of nuclear reactors, which include several inherent or specially provided steel or concrete barriers, assure there will be no untoward release of fission products outside the plant. During normal operation, it is true that very small amounts of radioactive materials are released from nuclear power plants under carefully controlled and monitored conditions. However, the effect of these small releases represents only a few percent of natural background radiation, and current designs are further reducing this very low level.

Statement: "Does this mean that so much radioactivity will be contained within the power-plant, will it be released into the air, or will it be captured and deposited somewhere as waste? Can that amount of radioactivity be contained permanently in a burial ground?"

Response: In the process of generating electricity in a nuclear power plant, large quantities of radioactivity are safely contained within the uranium fuel elements by a high-integrity cladding. After a certain operating time, the reactor fuel, still protected by the metal cladding, is removed from the reactor. Because there remains valuable unused uranium in the spent fuel, the fuel is shipped intact in a shielded cask to a chemical reprocessing plant. During the chemical processing operation to recover unused uranium, high concentrations of radioactivity are produced in a liquid form.

These highly radioactive liquid wastes are not released to the environment but are safely contained in specially designed underground tanks. Recognizing, however, that this method is not a final solution to handling these wastes for long periods of time, extensive research and development programs have been supported for many years. During the past 15 years, with the advice and guidance of the National Academy of Sciences, practical systems have been developed for converting these wastes to a solid form with storage in a suitable dry geologic formation, such as salt. The AEC is seeking Congressional authorization of a project in FY 1972 to store radioactive wastes in a salt repository near Lyons, Kansas. In this manner, large quantities of radioactive waste materials can be contained permanently in a salt burial repository, which is completely isolated from man's biological environment.

Statement: "Senator Gravel's statement includes the following: 'It should be remembered . . . that a single "hot particle" of radioactive plutonium lodged in the lung is capable of causing a lethal 'cancer.' What is a single 'hot particle' of radioactive plutonium like? Is it a cinder that one can see? Is it an invisible atom or molecule floating through the air? Can it penetrate the body unbeknownst to us? How many would be released by a Hiroshima bomb?

"Dr. Edward A. Martell, another authority, who is cited in the December 15, 1970 issue of Look magazine, is quoted as saying, 'The estimated total plutonium deposited in off-site areas which we have examined so far is in the range from curies to tens of curies.' He was speaking of soil samples near the Dow Rocky Flats plant where plutonium triggers are made for hydrogen bombs. So my questions include these: Is a curie a lot or a little? What is its relation by measure to Senator Gravel's 'hot particle' of radoactive plutonium? How many curies are lethal? If they are in the soil, how many curies were found in a cubic foot of soil? What would be their life there? Are the curies floating from the Dow Rocky Flats smokestack dangerous when in the air and how many parts are found in a cubic foot of air? Is that number lethal and how is it lethal after the smokestack shuts down for any reason?"

General comments

Response: Plutonium-239 is found in soils throughout the country as a result of fallout from past atmospheric nuclear explosive tests. About 500,000 curies of plutonium-239 have been released to the atmosphere from these tests. Based on assumptions that maximize the estimations, it has been calculated that, as an upper limit a total of about five to six additional curies of plutonium-239 are present in the soils around the Rocky Flats Plant as a result of the plant's operations. The sector showing the highest concentrations is downwind (east southeast) from the area where there has been a leakage from storage drums of plutonium-contaminated oil over a period of time, 1955–67. Following this leakage, the plutonium was resuspended from the soil and carried off-site by the winds. The storage area has now been covered with asphalt to preclude any further movement of the plutonium from the plant site.

After extensive monitoring around the plant in 1970, the Colorado State Department of Health stated "It is our conclusion that no public health hazard now exists from past releases from the Rocky Flats Plant."

When metallic plutonium reaches the air, it quickly oxidizes forming insoluble oxide. Plutonium oxide is of very little consequence while in the soil since it is very poorly taken up by plants. If ingested in small amounts, plutonium also is of little significance since its absorption through the gastro-intestinal tract is exceedingly low, i.e., it is merely eliminated from the tract in the feces. Potential health problems for the public are thus limited essentially to inhalation of plutonium

oxide. If inhaled, plutonium oxide may be deposited in the lungs (if the particles are of appropriate size) and is then eliminated with a half-time of about one year, i.e., half of the remaining particles in lungs will be moved up from the lung by natural body processes then swallowed. Most of these particles are eliminated from the body through the gastro-intestinal tract and some may be translocated to other organs of the body such as the lymph nodes, bone and liver.

Particles of plutonium most likely to find entry into the lungs by inhalation can range from few microns (a millionth of a meter) in diameter to small fractions of a micron. Such particles are too small to be seen by the naked eye. A curie of plutonium activity represents about 3 trillion particles whose diameters are one micron.

During the time that any plutonium remains in the lung, it will, of course, irradiate the lung tissue. Naturally occurring radioactive nuclides in the air also irradiate the lungs. So to evaluate the potential hazard from plutonium in the air, it is necessary to compare the concentrations observed to the established radiation protection standards. For plutonium oxide the standard for the general population is 0.33 picocuries per cubic meter of air. This standard is based on the assumption that one breathes the air containing this concentration of plutonium for a lifetime—although for control purposes the averaging of concentration data is limited to a period of one year.

Specific comments

Single highly radioactive particles of plutonium oxide placed in the lungs of rodents and rats during research studies have not produced lung cancer, nor is there any evidence that a single particle in the human lung would produce cancer. In fact, no biological effects have been observed in human subjects who accidently inhaled substantial quantities of plutonium particles more than 24 years ago. The exact numbers of particles in the lungs were, of course, not known but based on the total plutonium activity inhaled; the numbers probably were many millions. Incidently, measurements have been made of the amount of plutonium (in terms of total radioactivity) in the lungs of several hundred persons in the United States as a result of inhalation of fallout from past atmospheric nuclear explosive tests. If this amount of plutonium were in particles one micron in diameter, then we have on an average about one particle in our lungs. If the particles are smaller than one micron, which is more likely, then the estimated number of particles increases. For example, if the particles are one-tenth of a micron in diameter, then the number of particles in our lungs would be about 1,000.

The precise amount of plutonium, either in curies or number of particles, that may be lethal to man is not known since there have been no deaths from this radionuclide. Relatively large amounts of plutonium have been inhaled and ingested during animal experiments that have led to cancer production. Extrapolation from animal research suggests that 1–10 millionths of a curie of plutonium in the lungs may produce deleterious effects at some time in the life-span of man, although, on a statistical basis, the possibility cannot be ruled out that lesser amounts of plutonium may produce deleterious effects. This corresponds to about 3 million to 30 million particles assuming they are all 1 micron in diameter. The most likely size would be less than 1 micron in which event the number of particles would be correspondingly greater.

As indicated before, there are at most about five to six curies of plutonium in the soils around the Rocky Flats Plant resulting from plant operations. In addition, there are about three curies of plutonium in the same areas from fallout from past atmospheric nuclear explosive tests. Since these nine curies are spread over many square miles, the average number of curies per cubic foot of soil is very small. There may be some translocation of the plutonium in the soil owing principally to winds but, in general, the material will remain in place indefinitely. Plutonium-239 has a radiological half-life of 24,400 years.

A curie of plutonium has a mass of about 16 grams. Thus, in terms of mass, a curie is small; in terms of radioactivity, it represents 37 billion disintegrations per second; and by definition, any radionuclide that disintegrates at this rate represents a curie of radioactivity. In terms of the radiation protection standard, a curie of plutonium-239 is very large compared to the amount in the lungs that would be a health hazard. It would not be a valid analysis, however, to relate a curie of plutonium in the soil to that in the lungs for an evaluation of health consequences anymore than it would be to, in imagination, sweep up either the naturally occurring radionuclides or the non-radioactive chemicals in the soil and place them into the lungs.

Specifically, the most meaningful way to evaluate the potential health hazard of plutonium oxide is to analyze the data on concentrations in the air as a result of resuspension from the soil into the air or from releases of plutonium into the air from ongoing operations. Monitoring programs have shown average levels of plutonium in the air in the sector most likely to have the highest concentration away from the Rocky Flats Plant site to be about 0.003 picocuries per cubic meter. This is about 100 times less than the radiation protection standard for the general population. A major factor in keeping the concentrations of plutonium in the air to low values is the several banks of high efficiency air filters, which remove almost all of the plutonium from the exhaust air. Periodically, these filters are packaged in special containers and shipped to a Federal repository for permanent and safe storage.

Some plutonium-239 from fallout from past atmospheric nuclear explosive tests and from the Rocky Flats Plant operations finds its way into water supplies and vegetation. The highest measured concentration of plutonium-239 (for 1970) in the water was in a pond on Walnut Creek, where the average (off-site) value was about 0.9 picocuries per liter. The highest measured concentration of plutonium-239 in a municipal water supply for 1970 was at Thornton, Colorado, where the average value was about 0.16 picocuries per liter. The average concentration of plutonium in vegetation around the Rocky Flats Plant was about 0.02 picocuries per gram. The health standard for the general population is 1670 picocuries of plutonium-239 per liter of water and when applied to foodstuffs represents 1.7 picocuries per gram.

The quantities of plutonium that may be associated with any single nuclear bomb are classified information. If you so desire, we will be pleased to arrange a classified briefing for you on this subject.

Statement: "The Look article speaking about uranium says, '. . . the Animas River below uranium mills in Durango, Colorado contained almost 300 percent of the maximum daily intake for radium.' What is the maximum daily intake? What is the measure that is? Is it stated in curies or rems? How much water would one have to drink from the Animas River in order to equal the maximum daily intake? Could one acquire equal exposure by swimming in the Animas River?"

Response: In the late fifties, there were high concentrations of radioactivity in the Animas River below Durango, Colorado. These were primarily due to suspended solids discharged with liquid effluents from milling operations rather than from erosion or leaching of tailings. Corrective steps were taken to eliminate this problem in 1959; and since 1960, the Animas River has been well below the previous levels and well within the radioactivity standards. The mill ceased operations in March 1963. The Colorado River Basin Water Quality Control Project, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA), reported in 1968 that the radium-226 content of the Animas River averaged 0.07 picocuries per liter. The radiation protection standard for the general population is 10 picocuries per liter.

The daily intake of water by an average adult is assumed to be 2.2 liters. At a concentration of 0.07 picocuries per liter the daily intake of radium-226 would be about 0.15 picocuries. If the concentration were as high as the radiation protection standard, the daily intake would be 22 picocuries. Thus, one would have to drink about 140 liters (more than 140 quarts) per day—a physical impossibility—at a concentration of 0.07 picocuries per liter to equal the maximum daily intake. Further, the radiation protection standards of concentrations of radioactivity in water are established on the basis that there will be no detectable biological damage even if that water were consumed for a lifetime.

Swimming in the water containing radium-226 would result in very little exposure when compared to drinking water at the same concentrations. This because most of the biologically significant radiation energy from radium-226 is emitted in the form of alpha particles which have an extremely short range and generally cannot penetrate the outer layers of skin.

Statement: "Further along in the Look article it is said, 'El Paso Natural Gas Company uranium tailings in Tuba City, Arizona on Navaho land, showed radium radiation levels up to 1,000 times the average background. Gamma radiation was 12 times the level . . . Tailings at the empty A-Z Minerals Corporation mill in Mexican Hat, Utah, in May, 1968, also Navaho land, had radon-gas concentrations around the pile up to five times the maximum level.'

"This sounds very fearsome, and undoubtedly it is. Yet it has no significance under any scale of cognition that the normal layman is used to—or Congressman, either."

Response: The Atomic Energy Commission does not have regulatory jurisdiction over uranium tailings piles containing less than 0.05% uranium at mills that are closed down, which would include both those at Tuba City, Arizona, and Mexican Hat, Utah. The Arizona State Atomic Energy Commission has jurisdiction over the piles at Tuba City, Arizona, and the Utah State Division of Health at Salt Lake City has jurisdiction over those at Mexican Hat, Utah. In cognizance of the radioactive content of these tailings piles, however, surveillances have been made and the results are summarized below.

The data on concentrations of radium-226 in air *on and near* the uranium tailings piles at the Tuba City mill do show some measurements up to 1000 times average background. The same U.S. Public Health Service Report [3] that contains these data goes on to say: "The average radium-226 concentration for samplers 2, 3, and 4, located in the *housing area* was 0.02 pCi/m^3. This represents a level equal to 1/100 of the recommended concentration guide." (emphasis added)

The report states:

"External gamma radiation on the tailings area averaged 0.7 mR/h at 3 feet above the surface, which calculates to an average dose of 6.0 rem/a (year) for continuous whole body exposure to individuals in the general population. These findings serve to preclude the release of the tailings area for public use. Action which would permit release of said area would be to cover the tailings with uncontaminated dirt to an extent that would

[3] Radiological Health Data and Reports, November 1969.

diminish the external radiation to an acceptable level and to stabilize the covering against wind erosion. Otherwise, the area should be fenced and controlled as a radiation area. (emphasis added)

"The average radiation exposure [rate] at 3 feet above the surface *around* the mill area was 0.1 mR/h. . . . The average dose to an individual having a 24-hour per day residency in this area, on the basis of the average value of 0.1 mR/h is 0.9 rem/a (year). Although this dose is approximately twice the RPG[4] of 0.5 rem/a (year), it represents a highly unlikely condition of continuous occupancy. *With reasonable occupancy assumptions it would not be expected that an annual dose in excess of 0.5 rem would occur.*" (emphasis added)

Finally, the same U.S. Public Health Service Report stated:

"The recommendations herein were presented to the Navajo tribe and to the State of Arizona in October 1967. In November 1967, the State of Arizona directed the El Paso Natural Gas Company to stabilize the pile against wind erosion and to fence and post the property to prevent access by unauthorized people.

"El Paso Natural Gas Company, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Mines' Metallurgy Research Center, regraded, fenced and chemically stabilized the pile against wind erosion in May 1968. The housing area was released to the Navajo tribe and is presently occupied.

"An inspection of the tailings area in May 1969 indicated that the chemical binder had maintained its integrity."

As to radon gas concentrations at the A–Z Minerals Corporation mill in Mexican Hat, Utah, the U.S. Public Health Service Report[5] on the study made in May 1968 at the request of the Navajo Tribal Council states:

"Radon gas concentrations *on and about the tailings area* . . . exceed the concentration guide. . . . It should be pointed out, however, that this guide is applicable to radon-222 and its daughters 'as they occur in unfiltered air.' This may be interpreted as meaning radon in equilibrium with its daughter products in air. Since it was demonstrated that equilibrium did not exist between radon and its progeny, at least at the time of daughter product sampling, *it does not appear that the concentration guide has been exceeded. Levels of radon-222 in the mill area and housing area are substantially below the recommended guide.*" (emphasis added)

The report states that the housing area, located approximately 0.5 mile southwest of the tailings area, showed essentially background levels of radon-222. The surrounding land is unpopulated, and at present is not used either for farming or grazing. The nearest community, Mexican Hat, Utah, is about one mile to the northeast.

The recommendations contained in the report are as follows:

"On the basis of the data gathered in this survey, it is recommended that the mill tailings be properly stabilized against wind erosion. This action would preclude further transport of tailings material into the surrounding environment and would minimize the potential long-term hazard to anyone inhabiting the area downwind from the mill property. If the tailings area is not stabilized, periodic surveillance will be necessary to insure that significant wind carriage does not occur.

"As a result of the external radiation levels on the tailings area itself, this area should not be released for public use in its present state. Action which would permit release of the area would be to cover the tailings with uncontaminated dirt to an extent that would diminish the external radiation to an acceptable level and to stabilize the covering against wind erosion."

In March 1970, A–Z Minerals and the Navajo Tribal Council terminated the company's lease on the Mexican Hat property, returning it to the Tribal Council.

Statement: "A 1957 AEC study predicted that an explosion in a nuclear reactor would kill 3,400 people up to 15 miles away, injure 43,000 up to 45 miles, contaminate up to 150,000 square miles—about the size of California—and damage property up to $7 billion. Since I live within 20 miles of the three Indian Point plants that the Consolidated Edison Company of New York is building on the Hudson River—and thousands of my constituents live closer to it than I do—I am opposed to the building and operation of those plants.

Response: The study referred to (known as performed for the Atomic Energy Commission by the Brookhaven National Laboratory in early 1957 at a time when the technology of central station power reactors was in its infancy and even before the Shippingport reactor, which was the first central station power reactor, went into operation. WASH–740 reports the results of a study done by Brookhaven National Laboratory in which the completely hypothetical assumption was made that large amounts of fission products were released from a reactor in some unspecified manner into the atmosphere in a highly dispersible form. This study was made at the Commission's request in order to establish an upper limit on potential consequences in connection with consideration of the Price-Anderson indemnity legislation. Since that report was written, many power reactors have been designed, built, and operated, and in this process the technology of reactor design and nuclear power plant construction, and provisions on engineered safety features, have made very great advances.

In 1965, the AEC staff, in consultation with some of the Brookhaven staff members, reconsidered WASH–740 at the time the extension of Price-Anderson indemnification was being considered. With complete disregard of the greatly improved safety precaution system, it was concluded that, with current reactors being substantially larger than those considered in the Brookhaven study, and assuming the same type of hypothetical releases of fission products as those in the 1957 study, the theoretical damages would not be less and under some circumstances would be more than those assumed in the earlier study; however, it was further concluded that the positive safety factors that had developed during the ensuing years were sufficient to support the firm conviction that the likelihood of major accidents such as posed in the Brookhaven study is extremely low—in fact, even lower than the remote probability that had been estimated in the 1957 study. These factors include the favorable safe operating experience accumulated by power reactors as shown by the safety record since 1957, the substantial advances in reactor technology since that time, the safety incorporated in the design of each vital component and system, and the successive defenses built into safety features designed both to prevent accidents and to limit the consequences in the highly unlikely event that they should occur. These conclusions were communicated in a letter to Congressman Holifield which in turn were published in the record of the JCAE hearings in July 1965.

There has never been an "accident or near accident" at any licensed power reactor where the consequences even remotely approached the situation postulated in WASH–740. The significant factor from the viewpoint of public safety is that a "defense-in-depth" concept has been built into licensed nuclear power plants, which assures in the event of a malfunction of a system or component which is important to safety that alternate systems or components will meet the safety requirements, and that backup containment barriers are provided. As a result of this "defense-in-depth" approach, no malfunctions, misoperations, or equipment failures at licensed facilities have constituted a public safety problem in the United States. We know of no instance where their operations have resulted in exposure of any member of the public to radiation exceeding annual limits specified in nationally and internationally recognized standards for protection of public health and safety.

[4] Radiation Protection Guide.

[5] Radiological Health Data and Reports, January 1971. SWRHL–68 Environmental Survey of Uranium Mill Tailings Pile, Mexican Hat, Utah, October 1969.

HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIMENTS ON LIVE ANIMALS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to H.R. 3855. This bill was drafted by me in hopes of alleviating the torture of helpless animals under the guise of scientific experimentation by high school students.

The performance of heart transplants, brain surgery, and other radical experiments is a growing fad among students in many high schools. A New York Times editorial noted that:

> They frequently end by torturing the helpless monkey or bird or rabbit, or inadvertently sending it to a slow lingering death.

The editorial deplored the fact that science fairs at the local, State, and national level awarded prizes to students "whose only real achievement has been the deliberate or inadvertent torture of animals." Other unsavory acts entail injecting animals with drugs, chemicals, viruses, or cancer-causing chemicals in the production of disease, injury, or death.

Many of the experiments are conducted without anesthetics. This is particularly true of the neurological ones where it is important that a pain reaction be observed. A series of such horrible experiments was written up in a book recently by a Dr. Crile, who took 100 healthy dogs, soaked some of them with gasoline and set fire to them and ripped open the bellies of others and poured in boiling water. He smashed their paws and testicles with a heavy instrument. In others, he tore out the eyes and scraped the orbits with a steel instrument. This he did in the name of science to prove the fact of surgical shock.

A recent issue of the Vegetarian Hygienist called attention to a vivisection kit complete with live animals being offered as an educational toy by a leading publishing company.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with those thoughtful individuals who feel that this kind of influence on our youth, and the cruel treatment of animals in this manner is deplorable.

If H.R. 3855 is enacted it will prohibit Federal assistance for State or local educational agencies which permit primary or secondary students within their jurisdiction to conduct experiments with live animals.

THE NEED TO END DISSENSION IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the May 17, 1971, issue of U.S. News & World Report there appeared an editorial entitled "A Time for Unity."

The dissension existing in America today has not had the effect of hastening an end to the Vietnam war. Rather, this internal conflict has helped to lengthen the war. If America would present a united front to the world, then chances for immediate peace would undoubtedly be enhanced.

The North Vietnamese news media endlessly exploit the strife within the United States. They are overjoyed because they feel this will cause the United States to withdraw from its position without concern to U.S. commitments.

This disunity has further caused some of the "younger generation" to be led astray in their assessment of the Federal Government. Editor David Lawrence poses some questions that members of these demonstrating groups and radical factions must eventually face.

Do these demonstrators really believe that disruptive and destructive actions, such as those tried in Washington, D.C., can force Government officials into changing their policies on Vietnam? Further, do our youth have the belief that the U.S. Government is not sincerely trying to end U.S. involvement in Vietnam? The Vietnam situation is not a simple one, but adoption of a policy of isolationism is no answer, as history has proven. This feature editorial deserves the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "A Time for Unity," which appeared in the May 17, 1971, issue of U.S. News & World Report be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A TIME FOR UNITY

(By David Lawrence)

Never in American history have acts of rebellion directed against our Government received such encouragement by organized groups within our midst. To deliberately mobilize in the nation's capital, several thousand individuals with the purpose of halting traffic and attempting to "close down the Government" still seems an incredible plot.

By the use of police and Marines and Army units, the bridges leading into Washington from Virginia were largely protected from disruption. But a series of malevolent acts had been planned which, if they had been completely successful, would have paralyzed the Government itself. More than 10,000 arrests were made as 4,000 federal troops patrolled the streets and highways, along with nearly all of the city's 5,100-man police force and 1,400 D.C. National Guardsmen.

Is it possible that the young people who took part in the demonstrations really thought that any reforms could be obtained by such violent behavior—that government officials would be scared and would promptly change their policies on the war? Was it the belief of the youth that the Government isn't sincere in trying to end the war although it has already diminished the number of our troops in Vietnam to about half of what it was under the previous Administration?

Have these activists at schools and colleges learned the fundamentals of the constitutional system in the United States? Do they realize how public opinion is formed? Why have they ignored the entire process by which our democracy functions?

Unfortunately, many members of Congress, who ought to know better, have been making speeches which give the impression that the President is irresponsible and that present American foreign policy will bring on wars despite the wishes of the people. Seldom is it noted that Congress, after all, has the power—by its appropriation of funds or its refusal to do so—to continue or discontinue any military operations. The American people thus can always express themselves through their Representatives and Senators.

The Vietnam war, however, is not a simple problem, and withdrawal by the United States involves many risks which could lead to other wars in Asia or even the Middle East. The American Government has been endeavoring in Vietnam to defend a small nation against aggression and to allow it to determine its own form of government.

If the young people do not understand the implications of these matters, they should read American history. They would learn how we were compelled to enter two world wars because totalitarian regimes abroad felt sure that the United States had adopted a policy of isolation and would not assist free countries of the world which were victims of aggression.

Lots of the men in Congress who are denouncing the Vietnam war are paying little attention to the responsibilities which America has assumed under the North Atlantic Treaty and under the Southeast Asia Treaty. Both of these documents were ratified by the Senate. If these pledges are to be repealed and America is to isolate itself and refuse to cooperate with the free countries of the world, such notification will have to be given to our allies abroad.

The time has come for unity inside the United States. The presidential election is just a year and a half away. By presenting to the world a unified America, much can be done to bring the Vietnam war to an earlier end. Day after day, the North Vietnamese newspapers and radio rejoice over the dissension within our land. They point out that America is divided, and they feel we will eventually pull out of Southeast Asia without being concerned as to whether South Vietnam will be taken over by the Communists.

This is the moment for the men who are aspiring to the Presidency of the United States to join together and support the program of peace that is being urged by the man who now is President. Harmony within this country would undoubtedly hasten the end of the war. It could mean the early release of American prisoners and a cease-fire that at least would stop the fighting while efforts to reconcile the differences between the North and South Vietnamese are undertaken by neutral countries.

Unity inside the United States has never been more important than it is today. Disunity in this country has already helped to lengthen the conflict in Vietnam. But worst of all, it has encouraged some of the younger generation to come to Washington in support of leaders who boldly announce an intention to "close down the Government."

When law-enforcement agencies and troops are brought into action to quell such disorders, the cry is that "repressive" measures are being taken. But the American people know what is happening, and they are in favor of the moves by Government to put down rebellion. The recent outbreak will long be remembered as a disgraceful chapter in American history.

This, therefore, is a time to strive for unity.

BILL TO REVISE WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has just reported a bill that is described as one that will revise the present welfare system drastically. We do not know yet exactly what the bill does for copies are not yet available to the Members.

There has been a lot of nonsense and misinformation about welfare in the past few years. There is a lot of loose talk about people being on welfare who can work and should work and so forth. Even the President has said people on the welfare rolls should be helped to get on the pay rolls. The implication is plain.

But before we form hasty and unwarranted conclusions, let us examine the facts. The greatest number of persons on the AFDC—aid to families with dependent children—are children and women. The plans advanced have talked glibly about the employment of the persons on these rolls.

Two most valuable articles on this question have been published recently. The first is one by the distinguished Irene Cox in a valuable publication put out by HEW, the November–December 1970 issue of Welfare in Review, and the other by the famous anthropologist Margaret Mead, appearing in Social Service Outlook, March 1971 issue, volume 6, No. 3.

I ask my colleagues to read both, especially the one by Irene Cox. The articles follow:

THE EMPLOYMENT OF MOTHERS AS A MEANS OF FAMILY SUPPORT

(By Irene Cox)

Present legislation emphasizes self-support, self-sufficiency, and independence as the goals of the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) program, as does the Administration's proposal for a Family Assistance Plan (FAP). But does the employment of the family head automatically mean economic self-sufficiency? FAP, the recommendations of the President's Commission on Income Maintenance, and much that is published on the problem of poverty in an affluent society are responses to the recognition that the income of a family head, including an employed family head, may be too low for family support. For this reason, discussions centered on AFDC are concerned not only with the question of potential for employment but also with the question of potential for family support through the employment of the family head. In the AFDC program the family head is usually a woman.

The question of the relationship of work to family support seems difficult to discuss rationally when the AFDC program is the focal point. The arguments presented are either critical or defensive—AFDC mothers should or should not work; they should or should not have a free choice while working taxpayers foot the bill; and children are better or worse off when their mothers work—

and are primarily concerned with value considerations—the values of employment are in self-respect, good example for the children, opportunity to join in the mainstream of American life, and the like rather than in the mother's earning capacity. Pointing out that 60 percent of AFDC mothers have children under 6 years old in their care and that the median educational level and occupational skill are lower for AFDC mothers than for the general population is an unsatisfactory response to the common knowledge that women do work, that women with young children work, and that a number of women work in low-skilled occupations.

It is not possible to assess the family support potential of AFDC mothers by looking only at the AFDC program; rather, it is necessary to consider the experience of women in general in the labor market, as a woman's potential for family support is, of course, related to her experience in the labor market. Knowledge of the participation of women in the labor force, therefore, should provide a basis for testing several assumptions about the potential for family support through employment of women in AFDC families. One assumption that is often implicit in discussions of the desirability of employment is that AFDC mothers can do as well as women in the general population in obtaining employment and providing family support. But this question follows that assumption: Who are working women and how well are they doing in attaining income sufficient for family support?

Much data are available in U.S. Department of Labor reports (particularly those of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Women's Bureau) on the experience of women in the labor force. They tell us how many women are working and a great deal about their personal and family characteristics—age; education; marital status; children's ages; occupations; whether they work full time, part time, or part of the year; and income from wages and salaries. Labor statistics for 1967 are used here, together with data from the 1967 study of the characteristics of AFDC recipients conducted by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service.

MAJOR FINDINGS FROM LABOR FORCE DATA

Most women work for wages outside the home at some time during their lives, but only 40 percent of all women were in the labor force on a monthly average in 1967. The number of working women, age 16 and over, almost doubled between 1947 and 1967—rising from 16 million to almost 30 million—and the proportion of women in the labor force increased from 30 percent to 40 percent of the adult population of women. The question, then, is not so much a matter of which women work as it is of when women work, for the life patterns of most of them include marriage and the bearing and rearing of children. The personal and family characteristics of working women, therefore, describe conditions under which women are most likely or least likely to be employed. The data show that the labor force participation of women is to a large extent related to age, marital status, presence and ages of children, and education.

The median age of women workers increased from 32 years in 1940 to 40 years in 1967. During the same period, the percentage of married women in the labor force with husbands at home increased markedly, from 30 to 60; but the percentage of single women dropped from 50 to 20, and the percentage of women who were divorced, widowed, or separated from their husbands remained the same (20 percent). Although the increase in the number of working women was largely due to the employment of married women with husbands at home, such women were less likely to be employed than other women. In 1967, 37 percent of married women with husbands at home, 53 percent of the women who were separated from their husbands, and 71 percent of those who were divorced were in the labor market.

In the same year half of all mothers with children under 18 years old were in the labor force when the youngest children in the home were between 6 and 17 years of age. This proportion dropped sharply when there were younger children at home: only 29 percent of those with children under 6 in the home were in the labor force and only 25 percent of those with children under 3.

Evidently, the increasing median age of women workers was related to their entry or reentry into the labor force when their children reached school age: the highest labor force participation rates in 1967 occured for women between the ages of 45 and 54. About 50 percent of the women in that age group were employed in 1967—54 percent of those with husbands at home and 70 percent of those without husbands at home. The lowest labor force participation rate for women under age 65 was among those from 25 to 34 years old—35 percent for women with husbands at home and 62 percent for those without husbands at home. A married woman was most likely to work when her husband's income was less than $7,000, but at all income levels labor force participation rates for women dropped when there were preschool children in the home.

As women responded to labor market demands and opportunities for employment, their labor force participation increased with their educational levels; therefore, the years of schooling attained by a woman were related to whether she was employed as well as to when. In 1967, 25 percent of the women with 8 years of schooling or less were employed, 40 percent of those with 1 to 3 years of high school, 47 percent of those with 4 years of high school, and 54 percent of those with 4 years of college. The labor force participation of women with low educational attainment also increased with age and was highest among those from 45 to 54 years old; but at all age levels women with less schooling were less likely to be employed than others. Women in the labor force, therefore, had a higher educational level than women who were not employed. Fully 65 percent of all working women had at least a high school education, in contrast to 55 percent of the women in the general population who had that much education.

Women's occupations and their earnings in relation to those occupations are of major importance in assessing employment potential for family support. Although women are moving toward more diversified types of employment, in 1967 they were concentrated in relatively low-paying occupations—40 percent in clerical and sales work; 25 percent in service occupations, including 7 percent in private household work; and 15 percent as machine operators. A total of 82 percent of employed women were in occupations producing median earnings for women of $3,700 per year or less; only 15 percent were in professional or technical occupations paying a median of $5,000 a year or more for women.

The median wage for all women workers in 1967 was $2,295. Fully 75 percent of the women who worked some time in 1967 earned less than $4,000, and 31 percent earned less than $1,000 (only 7 percent earned more than $7,000). Their annual wages were low because many worked only part of the year or only part time, but even if they worked full time, the occupations in which they were concentrated provided low full-time wages. The median full-time year-round wages of women clerical workers in 1967 was $4,500; sales-workers $3,300; machine operators $3,600; service workers $3,000; and private household workers $1,300. The median wages or salary income of women working full time year round was $4,150; the median earnings of fully employed men were $7,182.

Part-time or part-year employment may be preferred by some women—married women not completely dependent on their own earnings or mothers of young children, for instance—and such employment accommodates the needs of industries subject to seasonal and other periodic peak loads. In 1967 only 42 percent of employed women worked full time the year round, but as many as 30 percent worked part time all or part of the year. The rest worked full time part of the year.

Whether women worked full time is related to the same conditions as affected their labor force participation. About 41 percent of employed women with husbands and 52 percent of employed women without husbands worked full time the year round. The presence of children affected full-time employment: 39 percent of all working mothers with children from age 6 to 17 were employed full time the year round, 25 percent of those with children under 6, and 16 percent of those with children under 3 in the home. This means that a very low proportion (about 7 percent) of mothers with children under 6 were working full time the year round.

The effects of the presence of children on the mother's full-time year-round employment is also reflected in the increasing rate of full-time employment with the increasing age of women workers, to the high point of 50 percent of women workers between the ages of 45 and 54 working full time the year round. Consequently, the income of women also increased with age: women between the ages of 45 and 54 had a median income from all sources of $3,081 in 1967, as compared with a median income of $2,616 for women age 25 to 34. The income and the proportions of those working full time also increased with education. The median income of women with 8 years of education in 1967 was $1,379; with 4 years of high school $2,909; and with 4 years of college $4,426. The proportion working full time increased from 23.5 percent for the women with 8 years of schooling to 44 percent for those with 4 years of high school and 48 percent for those with 4 years of college.

When the work experience of white women is compared with that of women of other races, it is evident that nonwhite women try harder but earn less. Except for teenage nonwhite girls, who had very high rates of unemployment, nonwhite women were more likely to be employed than white women under all of the conditions noted that affect the participation of women in the labor force. See table 1.

The educational attainment of nonwhite women is increasing, but it is still lower than for white women: in 1967, 37 percent of nonwhite women had a high school education or more, as compared with 57 percent of white women. However, nonwhite women at all educational levels were more likely to have been employed than white women, although they were less likely to have been employed full time the year round, as they were more generally employed in seasonal and part-time occupations.

Nonwhite women were highly concentrated in service occupations: 51 percent were in this type work, as compared with 19 percent of white women workers; and 26 percent were in the private household work, as compared with 4 percent of the white women workers. The median earnings of nonwhite women workers in 1967 was $1,635; for those employed full time the year round it was $3,194.

From these data it appears that a woman's decision to work was based on a combination of circumstances: possession of personal qualifications to meet labor market demands; personal satisfaction; no family members, especially children, requiring special care; and need for higher family income. Most working women were married and, although they were working to add

to family income, most were supplementing the earnings of their husbands and were not fully responsible for family support. In fact, few of the working women could have supported an average family (four persons) from their earnings alone. Less than half of them worked full time the year round and half of those working full time had earnings sufficient to support a family of four at slightly above the poverty level, which in 1967 was considered to be about $3,500 a year. If, therefore, AFDC mothers do as well as all women in the population, about half of them would be working some time during the year, 20 percent would be working full time year round, and about two-thirds would have earnings below the poverty level for a family of four.

WOMEN HEADING FAMILIES

As most working women are married women with husbands at home and are not fully responsible for family support, aggregate data from the Department of Labor may not fairly reflect their ability to support families when they must. The data from the Labor Department on labor force participation rates and marital status indicate that women without husbands are more likely to be employed than those with husbands. More specific data about the experience of women heading families in supporting their dependents that identify the characteristics of the poor and prosperous segments of the population are available from special census reports, studies supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the work of Mollie Orshansky and others. These data are particularly useful in assessing the performance of women family heads in providing family support, as they show the incidence of family poverty in relation to various aspects and identify conditions under which women are most likely or least likely to be supporting themselves and their dependents.

The data indicate that women heading families did respond to family need by seeking employment at higher rates than married women with husbands at home. About 53 percent were in the labor force in March 1967, as compared with 37 percent of married women with husbands at home. About 60 percent had worked at some time during the year, as compared with 48 percent of married women with husbands at home. However, they were restricted from working by the same conditions as women in general—age, education, presence and ages of children—with similar results. They were more likely to work than wives under all conditions, but their work experience and income decreased when there were children at home, especially children under 6.

The incidence of poverty is much higher when there are children under 18 dependent on the woman family head: only 17 percent of childless families headed by women had incomes below the poverty level (the Census Bureau defines a family as two or more related persons living in a household; about 40 percent of families headed by women include no children). About 60 percent (3,193,000 families) of the families headed by women included minor children, and 45 percent of these families were poor in 1967. More than half (55 percent) of the children in families headed by women were in families with total income below the poverty level.

Many of the women with children in their care were working, but a large proportion of the families they headed were still poor. In 1967 about 60 percent of the children in families headed by women were in families in which the mother worked at some time during the year, but 41 percent were in poor families even though the mother worked. Children under 6 in families headed by women were particularly likely to be in poor families: 72 percent of children under 6 were in families with incomes below the poverty level. Though half the women heads of families with children under 6 worked at some time during the year, 55 percent of the children with working mothers were poor. Full employment of the mother did not prevent poverty. Almost a third of children under 6 with mothers working full time year round were in poor families.

TABLE 1.—PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN EMPLOYED IN 1967, BY RACE

[In percent]

Status	Race	
	White	Other
Women 16 and over	40	50
Married with husbands at home	36	48
Mothers with children:		
Ages 6–17	48	58
Under 6	26	44

As with other women in the population, family income increased with the age of the woman heading the family. The median income of families with the woman head under 25 years of age was $2,166. The median family income increased with the age of the head to a high point of $5,378 for families headed by women from 55 to 64 years of age. Median family income was much less when there were children in the home. Childless families headed by women between the ages of 24 and 44 had median incomes of $6,066. When children under 18 were present, the median family income was $3,636. The situation was worse when children under 6 were present. When all children in the home were under 6, the median income was $2,532; when some were under 6, it was $3,078; and when all were 6 or over it was $4,349. Consequently, the incidence of poverty among families headed by women decreased with the increasing age of the family head up to age 65. See table 2.

TABLE 2.—PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES HEADED BY WOMEN WITH INCOME BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL, BY AGE OF WOMAN, 1967

Age of woman:	Percentage of familes with income below poverty level
Under 25	62
25–34	52
35–44	36
45–44	24
55–64	21
65 and over	26

As noted, the level of educational attainment is related to labor force participation and income. In 1967 women heading families had a lower educational level in general than all women in the population. About 42 percent of women heading families had 12 years or more of schooling, as compared with 55 percent for women age 18 and over in the general population. This difference is not due to the higher proportion of older women among families headed by women than in the general population. The difference was even greater between women heads under 45 and women this age in the general population. Half of the women under 45 who were family heads had at least a high school education, as compared with 68 percent of the women from 18 to 45 years old in the general population.

Although the educational level of women heads of families was generally lower, the occupational distribution for women heading families and women in the general population was not markedly different: 12 percent fewer family heads were in professional, clerical, and sales occupations, and 9 percent more were working as service workers or machine operators. See table 3.

TABLE 3.—OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN HEADING FAMILIES AND WOMEN IN THE GENERAL POPULATION, 1967

[In percent]

Occupation	All women	Women heading families
Professional and technical	14.1	11.1
Clerical and sales	40.0	31.1
Machine operators	15.7	18.5
Private household	7.0	9.5
Other services	15.9	19.4
Other	7.3	10.4

One reason for this is that women with more education are more likely to be employed and, with greater pressure to work, more women heading families with qualifications that meet labor market demands are employed. This is illustrated by labor force data on all women who were divorced or separated from their husbands or were widows in 1967. Among married women with husbands at home, those in the labor force had a median educational attainment of 12.3 years; those not in the labor force, a median of 12.1 years. Comparable medians for previously married women without husbands were 12 for those in the labor force and 8.8 for those not working. The difference is largely due to the preponderance of widows and older women in the group, but younger women also differed. Married women with husbands at home who were under 35 years old and not in the labor market had 12.4 median years of schooling, previously married women (that is, widowed, divorced, or separated) or that age not in the labor force had a median of 11.5 years; and those employed had a median of 12.3 years.

As was true in the general population, nonwhite women heading families were more likely to work; to have children in their care, including children other than their own; to have less schooling; to be more concentrated in poorly paid occupations; and to be poor. About 62 percent of nonwhite women heading families worked in 1967, but 64 percent of all such families with children were poor, as compared with 35 percent of white families with children. About 75 percent of the children in nonwhite families headed by women were in families with incomes below the poverty level. About 65 percent were in poor families even though the mother worked some or all of the time during the year.

For families with income below the poverty line, the characteristics of the women who head them and of the families themselves reflect the conditions under which women are likely to be excluded from the labor force or which result in low occupational status and low incomes. This was true even though the women family heads were in the labor force at a rate equivalent to that of all women in the population.

About 39 percent of women heading poor families were in the labor force in March 1967, as compared with 40 percent of all women in the population. Their families included a higher proportion of young women and a higher proportion of children under 6. About 36 percent of the heads of poor families were under 35, as compared with 22 percent of all women heads in this age group. About 53 percent had children under 6 in the home, and 36 percent of all families headed by women included children that young.

A half of the employed poor women heading families were in service occupations, as compared with only 29 percent of all women heading families and 23 percent of all working women in the general population. Two out of 10 were in professional, technical, clerical, and sales occupations, as compared with four out of 10 of all women family heads and more than half (54 percent) of all working women in the population.

It appears that many women heading families were not providing adequate support for their families in 1967. A prescription for success in family support would have included such ingredients as these: be middle-aged; have no children under 6; have a high school or, preferably, a college education; work full time in a professional, technical, or upper level clerical occupation; and be white. Few of these ingredients are subject to choice and none guarantees 100 percent success, including the last. About 60 percent of all poor families headed by women were white, as were 53 percent of poor families with children whose heads were women. Although nonwhite families headed by women were more likely to be poor, white families headed by women were also poor when affected by the conditions restricting the employment of women.

Another ingredient in the prescription for adequate family support is to acquire or retain a husband. (Among women heading families whose members include their own children, 38 percent were separated from their husbands, 26 percent were widowed, 29 percent were divorced, and 7 percent were single.) Only 8.4 percent of families with children headed by men were poor in 1967, as compared with 44.5 percent of those with children headed by women. When both parents were employed, only 5 percent of the families headed by the father were poor.

AFDC MOTHERS

But how do these conditions affect AFDC recipients? First, although a high proportion of AFDC families are headed by women, they are not completely congruent with all families with children headed by women or even with poor families with children headed by women. Neither group is permanent or stable: a husband is acquired or lost; a woman acquires or loses dependents; family status as poor or as above the poverty line changes as family circumstances change; and status as AFDC recipients changes as a family enters or leaves the program.

As to the last point, there is a turnover rate of more than a third of AFDC recipients each year, and in 1967 the median length of time families received AFDC continuously was a little more than 2 years. The status of AFDC families as families headed by women is also subject to change. In 1967, 13 percent of the AFDC cases closed were closed because of the return of the father to the home or the marriage of the mother. Therefore, a study of the characteristics of recipient families provides data about families at a particular point in time—that is, when they are receiving assistance—rather than describes the characteristics of a permanent, unchanging group of families.

Data about AFDC families include all families, whether headed by the mother or the father. In 9 percent of the families, the children were living with relatives other than the mother or father. About 75 percent of AFDC families in 1967 were families in which the mother or stepmother but no father or stepfather was present, and as in most of the other families in which the mother was present, her potential as a wage earner would have been important in considering the family's potential for self-support.

The 1967 data about the characteristics of AFDC families describe the extent to which conditions are present that increase or deter labor force participation and affect earnings at the time assistance was received. They also provide a further test of the assumption that AFDC mothers can do as well in employment as women in the general population or women in general who head families. Although the data indicates that women in general are not doing well as family providers, it is not reasonable to assume that AFDC recipients could do as well as women in the general population unless the characteristics that affect the labor market participation of both groups are comparable.

An examination of the characteristics of AFDC mothers and families shows that they live under the major conditions that deter a woman from working or that bring her only low wages when she does. This fact is not very surprising because the program generally requires that children under 18 be in the family and most State eligibility standards and payment levels are well below the poverty line. In addition, AFDC mothers are concentrated in the lower age group; have a high proportion of children under 6 years of age; have less education than women in the general population; and have worked for the most part in occupations bringing little income. See table 4.

TABLE 4.—SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF AFDC MOTHERS AND WOMEN HEADING FAMILIES, 1967

Characteristic	Percentage with selected characteristics		
	AFDC mothers	Women heading poor families	All women heading families
Age:			
Under 45	83	58	43
Under 35	55	36	22
With children:			
Under 18	[1] 100	80	60
Under 6	60	53	36
Education:			
12 years or more	20	[2]	42
8 years or less	43	[2]	[3] 36
Occupation:			
All services	60	50	29
Private household	29	21	10
Clerical and sales	14	18	31
Nonwhite	47	42	25

[1] About 9.4 percent of AFDC families include children 18 to 20 attending school, but less than 1 percent had children in this age group only.
[2] Not available.
[3] Only 19 percent of women heads under 45 had 8 years or less of schooling. This figure is more nearly comparable with that for AFDC mothers, 83 percent of whom were under 45 years of age.

AFDC mothers are acquainted with work. The 1967 survey of AFDC recipient characteristics reported that 70 percent of AFDC mothers had some work experience, and other studies have found that most mothers had worked before receipt of assistance. About 15 percent were employed at the time of the survey (November-December 1967), and 7 percent were looking for work. On this basis the labor force participation rate would be 22 percent, as compared with 39 percent for women heading poor families in March 1967. Data for work experience in 1967 are not available, but a study of closed cases in 1963 found that 40 percent of the children in AFDC families had mothers who worked while receiving assistance. A 1969 study found that 52 percent of a sample of 7,000 AFDC mothers in 10 States had worked some or all of the time during the previous 3 years.

Although the proportion of AFDC mothers employed in November-December 1967 was only 15 percent as a national average, considerably higher rates of employment were found in States in which the mother could retain all or part of her earnings.

In most States in 1967, the amount of the AFDC payment to a family was reduced by the recipients' net earnings, with some allowance for work expenses. Therefore, a woman did not improve the economic situation of the family unless she could earn more than the amount of the assistance payment. However, 20 States limited the amount of the AFDC payment by meeting only a percentage of the family's need or by setting a maximum on the amount that could be paid but allowed other family income to supplement the AFDC payment up to the total amount of the family's need as determined by the State's standards.

These States, therefore, offered money incentives for employment, and higher proportions of AFDC mothers were employed in them. The median proportion employed in States in which earnings increased family income was 28.3 percent, as compared with a median of 10.5 percent of mothers employed in States with a 100 percent tax rate on earnings. More than 30 percent of AFDC mothers were employed in nine States, and one State reported a 52 percent rate of employment of mothers in recipient families. These were generally States with relatively low AFDC payments; consequently, economic pressure to acquire additional income was considerable. However, even with the combined incentives of economic need and the possibility of adding to family income through employment, and even though more mothers worked when working helped the family, most mothers in those States were not employed. This is consistent with the finding that conditions deterring employment are prevalent among AFDC recipients.

The earnings of AFDC mothers, when they were employed, were much lower than the median earnings of employed women in the general population. About half of the AFDC mothers employed were working full time, but earnings were not high enough to make the family ineligible for assistance. The average monthly earnings of all AFDC employed mothers was $135. The average was less than $100 in 12 States and more than $200 in only four States.

As with other women in the population, nonwhite AFDC mothers were more likely to be employed: 19 percent of the nonwhite and 12.5 percent of the white AFDC mothers were working in November-December 1967. The racial characteristics of AFDC families were comparable to that of poor families headed by women with children in the general population: 53 percent were white and 47 percent were nonwhite, including 45 percent who were Negro.

Other studies of AFDC families estimated that from 45 to 55 percent of AFDC mothers are potentially employable because of age, education, and work experience but that barriers to employment are present such as poor health, residence in a poor labor market area, and the presence of young children. They also indicate that most would not earn more than the AFDC payment if employed in occupations for which they could qualify.

Changes in earnings and other income are major reasons for the high turnover of AFDC recipient families. In 1967, 528,000 families left the AFDC program and 703,000 were added. Of the families added, 80 percent had had a reduction in income or resources in the 6 months preceding the application. In almost half of the families, this was due to the loss of or reduction in the earnings of persons in the family—25 percent because of illness, injury, or other impairment and 22 percent because of layoff, discharge, or other loss of employment. These figures include families receiving assistance because of the unemployment or incapacity of the father. The income of 31 percent of the remaining families had been lowered because of the mother's loss of employment or a reduction in her wages.

Half the cases closed in 1967 were closed because of increased family income or resources. A third were closed because the parent obtained employment or his earnings increased. Excluding those families whose cases were closed because of the employment of the father, 15 percent of the remaining cases were closed because of the employment of the mother or an increase in her earnings.

ISSUES

Two major conditions are prominent as deterrents to the employment and the earning capacity of women: the presence of young children in the home and low levels of education and training. It is reasonable, therefore, to emphasize the need to provide occupational training and day care to assist fam-

ilies in becoming self-supporting. However, in view of the experience of working women in providing family support, it is important to set reasonable goals for the training programs. If through training a woman is expected to obtain employment that will bring enough earnings for family support, she will also have to be free to work full time and be able to attain levels of earnings comparable to the median for all women now in the labor force. Because AFDC recipients represent the group most likely to be excluded from employment or to earn low wages when employed, it is not likely that training will make that much difference for a substantial number of recipients, especially if such results are expected in a short time.

Training programs assist women in acquiring the kinds of skill needed for entry into occupations with potential for advancement and for wages above those offered by the low-skill occupations that typify the AFDC mother's work experience. Increasing occupational skill is an essential first step in assisting women to pick up their earning capacity, but progression to the point of full family support for a substantial number of AFDC mothers implies long-term rather than short-term planning and goals.

This observation is not a criticism of training programs or of the abilities of AFDC mothers, and it is not intended to detract from the value of training programs. The national investment in manpower development and training programs in the past few years has been considerable in response to the need for adult training and retraining as technological advances made some occupations obsolete and job demands change. Training programs are needed to meet the needs of a changing and growing economy and as opportunity for men and women to advance economically. AFDC recipients should have the same opportunity as others to develop ability that will enable them to increase their earning capacity, but many will still require income supplementation for adequate family support.

The provision of adequate day care facilities will enable more mothers to work but, of course, will not in itself provide them with jobs and income adequate for family support. If more day care is available, women heading families will still be competing with married women with husbands at home who represent the largest source of woman power. In 1967 there were 20 million married women (with husbands at home) under age 54 not in the labor force and, as pointed out, they had more education than unemployed previously married women. Also, as pointed out, the growth in the number of women in the labor force was largely due to the employment of married women with husbands at home who could meet labor market demands for education and training who could arrange for the care of children or who worked when their children were beyond preschool age.

Training and day care programs are important in providing opportunities for individual recipients to maintain an attachment to the labor force, increase their earning capacities and acquire the satisfaction of achievement. We can expect a substantial number of the potentially employable AFDC mothers to seek employment to add to family income. Their increased earning capacity will benefit their families and will reduce the amount of the supplement needed for family support. However, emphasis on such programs as a prime means of decreasing assistance costs should not detract from considering basic issues that determine the costs of a family assistance program costs that, in turn, are related to all the goals of such a program, whether it is AFDC or the broader FAP. This proposal reflects the changing conception of the relationships between poverty and dependency, work and poverty, and work and public assistance programs.

More and more Americans are concerned over the existence of poverty, about the poor quality of living implied by the term, and about the personal and social consequences of continuing poverty for many families. The public is becoming more aware that many families are poor even though a parent is fully employed; that work and poverty are not mutually exclusive; and that work and public assistance cannot be mutually exclusive if the objective is family support at a socially acceptable level.

The cost of a program of family support is necessarily related to the level of living selected as socially acceptable and economically feasible. This level will define the number of families potentially eligible for supplementation and the amount necessary, when added to other family income, to bring the family up to the selected level. Total program costs will decrease as earning capacity increases and as the number of families in the population below the selected level decreases.

This process can be expected to be slower for families headed by women than for families headed by men because of the lower earning capacity for women and the presence of conditions making it more difficult for women to support families. Between 1959 and 1968 the number of families headed by men having children under 18 and with incomes below the poverty line decreased by 52 percent, but the number of families headed by women that were below the poverty line decreased by only 4.3 percent. The total number of such families actually increased in 1967 and 1968.

If the goal of an income maintenance program is an acceptable minimum level of living for all families, planning requires an interlacing of employment with supporting programs, most of which require long-term development and can be expected to have long-term rather than short-term results such as programs that increase family stability; provide basic education for children, occupational preparation for young people, and retraining for adults; improve health and physical environment; and provide more jobs at higher pay. A program of income supplementation is needed that insures basic family support for persons excluded from employment, encourages employment and offers opportunity for advancement, and at the same time increases family well-being by supplementing the income of persons who, in the present labor market, do not earn wages sufficient for family support.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Administration of Aid to Families With Dependent Children in New York City, November 1968–February 1969: Report of a Joint Review Carried Out by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and New York State Department of Social Services, Washington: the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Sept. 1969.

Burgess, M. Elaine, and Daniel O. Price, An American Dependency Challenge, Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1963.

Carter, Genevieve W., "The Employment Potential of AFDC Mothers," Welfare in Review, July–Aug. 1968.

"Educational Attainment, March 1967," Current Population Reports, Series P–20, No. 169, Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1968.

"Educational Attainment of Workers, March 1967," Special Labor Force Report No. 92, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1968.

"Findings of the 1967 AFDC Study: Selected Characteristics by State and Census Division," Washington, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, Mar. 1970.

Handbook on Women Workers, 1968, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1970.

"Household and Family Characteristics, March 1968," Current Population Reports, Series P–20, No. 191, Washintgon: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1969.

"Income in 1967 of Persons in the United States," Current Population Reports, Series P–60, No. 60, Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1969.

Levinson, Perry, "The Employability Potential of AFDC Women," Report to the U.S. House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Jan. 1970.

Manpower Report to the President and Statistics on Manpower: Supplement to the Manpower Reports to the President, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Mar. 1969.

Manpower Report to the President, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Apr. 1968.

"Marital and Family Characteristics of Workers, March 1967," Special Labor Force Report No. 94, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1968.

Meyers, Samuel M., and Jennie McIntyre, Welfare Policy and Its Consequences for the Recipient Population: A Study of the AFDC Program, Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Dec. 1969.

"1967 AFDC Study, Preliminary Report of Findings From Mail Questionnaire," NCSS Report AFDC–2 (67), Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, Jan. 1969.

Orshansky, Mollie, "The Shape of Poverty in 1966," Social Security Bulletin, Mar. 1968. Also articles in the Social Security Bulletin, Jan. and July 1965 and Apr., May, and Dec. 1966.

"The Potential for Work Among Welfare Parents," Manpower Research Monograph No. 12, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1969.

"Poverty in the United States, 1959 to 1968," Current Population Reports, Series P–60, No. 68, Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1969.

"Preliminary Report of Findings—1967 AFDC Study," NCSS Report AFDC–1 (67), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, Oct. 1968.

"Reasons for Opening and Closing Public Assistance Cases, January-June 1967 and July-December 1967," NCSS Report A–5 (7-12-67), Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics, July 1967.

"Supplementary Report on Income in 1967 of Families and Persons in the United States," Current Population Reports, Series P–60, No. 64, Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1969.

"Work Experience of the Population in 1967," Special Labor Force Report No. 107, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1965.

[From Social Service Outlook, Mar. 1971]

WORKING MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN

(By Margaret Mead)

(NOTE.—Dr. Mead, curator emeritus of ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History, is the author of numerous books and articles on anthropology and social issues.)

As more women have entered the public working world, more children become the children of working mothers. Controversy on the advisability of mothers of young children working echoes from Stockholm to Moscow, from Paris to Chicago. Most discussions start with the bare fact that many mothers are working, that many of them

have to work, and move from there. I shall try, instead, to start with children, from birth, and consider what they need and how their needs can be filled. This may bring us closer to the solution of the problem. As long as we are bemused with statistics that show that the children of working mothers are, by and large, healthier than those of non-working mothers, or that they do as well in school, we will not get very far.

A little baby needs continuity of care; all our studies suggest that too frequent changes of the mothering person are hard on children. If a woman works full time, it is very difficult for her to provide this continuity. A small child also needs someone who is intensely interested in him or her, who will spend endless hours responding and initiating, repeating sounds, noting nuances of expression, reinforcing new skills, bolstering self-confidence and a sense of self. Children who are reared in institutions, while receiving perfectly adequate physical care, fail to develop and often sicken and die.

Mothers, by definition, and more often than not by individual choice, enjoy spending time watching and playing with their own babies, and with other peoples' babies. Fathers on the whole, when they do enjoy young children, prefer their own. This constant attentiveness to a young child, which we habitually rely on a mother to give, is an essential part of the whole educational system which is characteristic of our society. What the mother does in the preschool years is essential to what the teacher can do in school. When the discrepancy between what the mother can do at home and what the teacher can follow up in school is too great, then the school ceases to function as it is expected to.

Statistics for 1969 show that there were nearly 2 million separated, widowed, or divorced working mothers living in families without fathers and that there were more than 4 million working mothers with children under six. There were only 641,000 children in licensed day-care centers and family homes. Yet there is extraordinarily little discussion of the care of infants, beyond suggestions that they be adequately cared for. It is perhaps in the relationship of the young child to the mother who has to work—and who is least able to afford paid help or paid day-center care—that discussion should begin.

An infant who is given satisfactory continuity of care, day after day, for the sensitive period between eight months and about two years, develops a feeling of trust and can survive a great many changes of place and person later. Continuity of care means a single person who is there, part of the time, day after day, either always to put the baby to bed, or always to bathe it, and most of all, to feed it. We have ample evidence that without such continuity children have less capacity to trust the world, to leave home happily, and to form wider and more intense relationships with other people later.

So a basic question is how can we develop institutions that will permit mothers who have to work to establish sufficient continuity of care for their children, either by making it possible for the mother to spend the necessary time with the child, or by providing some other person who can do so—a grandparent, a neighbor, a married sister or friend, or a father whose working schedule allows him to spend some time every day with his child. Paid, well-trained nurses who are trustworthy, intelligent, and have the character appropriate for the continuous care of an infant are almost nonexistent today. And no state-supported child-care center can afford enough well-trained, nurturing persons.

THE ISRAELI EXPERIENCE

The Israeli kibbutz experience, recently vividly reported by Dr. Bruno Bettelheim in *The Children of the Dream*, shows that the nurse who must divide her time and strength among several babies of the same age is not loved, and is later rejected. The mother whose care for the child is limited to early breast feeding at stated intervals and a daily visit to the children's house also fails to provide a stable point of reference. Kibbutz children turn to each other for the kind of warmth and continuous support given elsewhere by adults, and in adult life they continue to be dependent upon their peer group and to remain enclosed in a kibbutz style of peer group living.

Furthermore, in our economy, it would be quite impracticable to employ competent infant and child-care workers on three eight-hour shifts a day. Even if the additional child-care centers we need were available, and accessible in price and transportation to the mother who works through sheer economic need, they would not be staffed so that each infant would get its sense of continuity from being placed in one for perhaps 10 hours a day. Such centers would be safer than many present day-care arrangements, and they should be provided. But the real problem of the development of the young child of the working mother will not be solved by such arrangements.

Meanwhile, the pressures on women to work, even while their children are very young, increase. More and more women, some with an infant plus two or three or more older children, are desperately trying to solve their economic problems by entering the labor market. To those who must work, there is now added the pressure to work (in the name of self-fulfillment) on the middle class mother—a thinly disguised social statement of society's need for educated workers. A relatively new source of pressure stems from the emphasis of current women's liberation movements on individuals achievement rather than upon women's traditional roles.

Can we devise and implement rapidly enough new institutions which will make possible continuity of care for children under three whose mothers work? (For three-year-olds and older, adequate nursery schools, staffed either by professional nursery school teachers, cooperating mothers, or paraprofessionals from the neighborhood, are all realizable possibilities.)

PUBLIC OPINION IS CHANGING

In asking this question I am making certain assumptions: First, that the drive for lower birth rates, smaller families, and more widespread use of contraception will continue and accelerate; second, that the policy which permitted the mother without male support to receive minimal economic assistance from municipal, state, or federal funds, will continue to be challenged and attempts to make mothers receiving welfare or aid for dependent children go to work will increase. (It has been wryly remarked that the same people who disapprove of a woman who has a husband to help her going to work also disapprove of a woman without a husband not working.)

The response to the population explosion, combined with traditional fears of the poor outbreeding the rich, or some socially disadvantaged group increasing in ratio to the advantaged—whether these be American minorities or Indian untouchables—is bringing about a change in the climate of opinion. In the 1940's social workers emphasized and defended the superiority of the home, any home, over institutional care. They advocated legislation forbidding a mother without a husband to work and giving her a subsidy so she could stay home with her children.

A generation's experience with giving public housing to families of mothers and children with absent fathers has been grimly disappointing. It has been clear that the unsuccessful, unemployed, or uninterested husband and father can square his absence with his conscience very easily if the mother of his children is financially better off without him. It has also been shown that the cycle of deserting father tends to repeat itself; the husbandless woman leans on a son, who in time, escapes from these demands and, although he may marry, leaves his wife as his father did. It has been found that these homes, presided over by mothers bogged down in poverty, with several children, often by different fathers, do not provide the kind of love and care which we envision as necessary for children.

The need to turn against large families—and this must be done if we are to stand with the rest of the world in an effort to check disastrous population growth—is begetting a hostility to children. People say "unwanted babies constitute an epidemic" or "unwanted pregnancy is a disease." In the massive effort to readjust our sights from the premium of the 1950's on large families to the premium in the 1970's on small families there is bound to be a good deal of this kind of compensatory bitterness. The crisis in our inner cities, where so many of the poor are also black, only intensifies a kind of revulsion against social legislation which protects the prolific, poverty-ridden homes of the poor.

In the face of these changes what hope have we of establishing a climate of opinion which will somehow permit the woman who at present has to work—in addition to the 2 million women in broken homes, and the 2.8 million with husbands earning less than $5,000 a year—to provide continuity for her infants and young children? In time, perhaps 10 years, we will develop a national consensus which will hold that the quality of care given each child is a major value especially in an affluent country like ours, which is badly in need of a highly educated, highly skilled, emotionally stable population. But this will take time to establish in the face of other pressures in society.

Meanwhile, what other routes are open to us? When I speak of open routes, I speak of style setting, both by the mass magazines and the professional agencies, which will be sufficient to support enabling legislation, changes in working practices, and new housing styles. The average working mother today is heavily dependent on such changes. She has neither the knowledge nor the leverage to work out the extremely complex childcare arrangements which are so highly publicized when developed by young women with Ph.Ds. Whether she can provide her child with the continuity it needs will depend almost entirely on what society does, on the city and state in which she lives, and on the ways agencies of the Federal Government find to encourage, match, underwrite, and change outdated styles of local governmental and industry behavior.

A simple but not immediately obvious first step would be a return to breast feeding, already sufficiently returned to popularity among the affluent and educated so that one of the ingredients of a change of style is present. Breast feeding was given up slowly, as class after class imitated the practices of the wealthy and aristocratic, as they turned from the wet nurse of the past to the modern hygenic bottle feeding of the present.

While the emphasis for the educated middle-class women who have returned to breast feeding is on the individual advantages for mother and infant of the closeness of the breast feeding experience, it has another great advantage for the working mother. If accepted as necessary and usual practice by government and employers, then arrangements must be made for a woman's baby to be near her for the first six months or so of life. Whether it is Soviet women working in factories with attached creches, or kibbutz dogmatism about abolishing family ties collapsing before the belief that breast feeding is natural, experience has shown that suitable arrangements can be made to

accommodate working mothers who want to breast-feed their children.

In the United States, breast feeding might become a mainstay for the economic underwriting of a home in which there is an infant. As the child grows older, day care, with a meal given the child in the day-care center and breast feeding continued at night, could still assure a desirable continuity for the child. Industry could either provide day nurseries, or specially staggered hours, as is sometimes done now when workers are scarce, and employers turn to women workers.

THE NEED FOR ATTENTION

But this meets only the needs of the infant during the period when the capacity to trust is being established. There is a second need of the child which is closely related to the development of speech and motor skills. This is the need for at least one individual who interacts with it every day, recognizes a new skill, encourages progress, or, sometimes takes alarm at a sudden lack of progress. It is this close attention of a single person—parent, grandparent, nurse—which has distinguished the development of children who reach their full capacity from those who do not; it is such attention that establishes a higher ability to use innate gifts and to master new situations.

We have instances of children who do not survive two years in an institution where there is no one to relate to them individually, however high the general standards of care. Only individual attention can turn a child into a full human being, capable of growth. In the large households and closely knit neighborhoods of the past, it was recognized that each baby needed to have someone who knew it, understood its first stumbling efforts at speech, its private language, and idiosyncratic expectation.

But changes have come with modernization. The nuclear family, with its appropriate quota of two adults of opposite sex and minor children under puberty, has replaced the large household. Great mobility has separated these nuclear families from their neighbors and kin. Technical developments have made it less necessary for the child to be continuously in the care of some nurturing person.

We have the baby carriage, the play pen, and the feeding bottle, and now the plastic bottle which means that the child can be very early left alone with a thing, rather than a watchful person, without danger of broken glass. When the baby is separated from the mother because she no longer breast-feeds it, it also can be separated in all these other ways. Paradoxically, this makes it easier to leave the child with another person, but also easier for that other person to neglect it, leave it lying for hours in a crib; or listlessly waving a piece of old rag back and forth, or rocking, or banging its head.

These same aids, the baby carriage, the bottle, the play pen, should make it easier to involve neighbors or relatives of the mother in the continuing care of toddlers. Fathers, grandmothers, grandfathers—who with early retirement are becoming increasingly important assets for the working mother—older children, neighbors with children, can all be involved. If these human resources are to be used, however, we have to encourage working mothers without husbands to live with or near their own relatives, or form joint households with other husbandless women so they can share the care of the children.

We have to encourage the kind of housing and the kind of social expectation that keep grandmothers and grandfathers nearby. We have to emphasize stability of neigborhood association over the appeal of moving the household, with or without a father, to a cheaper place near the mother's job. Stable residence means a known neighborhood, habitual interchange of baby sitting and baby tending among neighbors.

MOTHER SUBSTITUTES SUGGESTED

We may need to make an invention halfway between the licensed home for day care and the PTA "block mother" of World War II days, when mothers took turns being home for a week. This would be a place where a baby could be parked in an emergency, a school child who becomes ill could be sent, telephone messages could be taken, and little hungry children eager for bread and jelly could come after school. These chores once were handled by the extra aunt in an extended family. In today's society they might be performed by neighborhood women, including suburban neighborhoods where child-care problems are becoming acute. And government funds might be made available for this purpose just as poverty program funds are provided for baby sitting to permit indigenous women to function more effectively in their own neighborhoods.

These suggestions are all directed toward stabilizing more auxiliary and familiar contacts for the working mother and her children. The cooperative nursery school, and communal clusters where working and nonworking women share household tasks and child care, are another emerging style of living. With enough people close by, working at different hours and different tasks, some unmarried, some retired, it is possible to establish a flexible regime within which young children, who have had a warm, trusting early infancy, can maintain continuity with their mothers and expand and grow.

Such situations become even more important for school-age children who should not have to come home to an empty house, but can perfectly well come home to a house next door, or to somebody's grandfather down the street.

But at present all the guidelines in the field, including the very useful new book by Alice Skelsey, *The Working Mother's Guide to Her Home, Her Family and Herself*, emphasize how the working mother can become better organized, and do more, inside the nuclear family, by planning her time better and making more efficient arrangements for cooperation with husband and children. The husband's participation in the home responsibilities of the working wife is one of the trends in Sweden, where there is a movement for recognizing that home demands are a legitimate reason for a husband's absenting himself from work. But such moves, while simplifying the demands on the working mother, still treat each isolated nuclear family as an autonomous unit and reinforce the tendency towards independence rather than interdependence.

Tendencies towards the independence and autonomy of each family unit, with the wife who contributes to its financial support often cutting outside ties because she no longer has time for them, and the older children organized as part of a familial enterprise, all increase the isolation of American families. An alternative is the development of more cooperation and more noncommercial, quasi-governmental forms of help. I would classify a state-supported day-care center as governmental, and a private enterprise day-care center as commercial. Neither is satisfactory.

Commercialized baby-tending always verges on the old horrors of the "baby farms" of the beginning of the century; it is impossible to provide really adequate services for infants and small children at a cost that the ordinary working mother can pay. Similarly, governmentally-supported centers, which reach ideal standards, are ruinously expensive for the taxpayer.

Alternative solutions include: Universal national service in which young adults of both sexes would have the option of serving in various forms of community agencies—including day-care centers—instead of with the Armed Forces. Another approach would be to give various indirect governmental subsidies for community living—including housing—so that nuclear families would no longer be isolated and substantial numbers of imaginative, responsible, dedicated, voluntary helpers would be available. Especially if we had some form of guaranteed annual income—or negative income tax—which would make it possible for individuals to choose their form of residential living more freely than they can now, community solutions would seem to be the most viable.

There would still be a need for community day-care services for the stranger, the isolated, and for various sorts of emergencies. But such services would not be the standard solution for children under three, for whom stability and continuity of care are crucial.

A LETTER IN PRAISE OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our institutions are under continual attack, it is refreshing to see testimonies or praise for a belief in public service. I want to share with you the thoughts expressed by the sheriff of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, Mr. A. J. Young, and I am including a copy of his letter to the President of the United States in the RECORD:

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF,
New Philadelphia, Ohio, May 3, 1971.

President NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of writing to you because I feel the circumstances, relating to the recent criticism of J. Edgar Hoover, justifies it.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is a great man who has dedicated 50 yrs. of his life to serving his fellowman by upholding and enforcing Law and Order. He possesses the courage of his convictions and a broad minded attitude towards those whose opinions differ from his. Since I first became aware of this man, I have followed his high moral and ethical standards. When I see anyone as great as this man ridiculed it makes me wonder if some people are tired of reading or perhaps jealous of the accomplishments of great men. My grandfather once told me that to fail to recognize and honor a great man is the same as neglecting to honor and offer prayer and taps for one who has died for his country. A coward may live but never has music to dance by.

Recently I saw on television the burning of our great American Flag. I have heard the chant "God is Dead". I have seen great men harassed and mocked. These things I can not and will not condone. I cannot and will not change my belief of what is right and wrong. I stand on the side of J. Edgar Hoover and what he stands for.

I wish I could speak for my great State of Ohio and its people who I am sure would back me in saluting a great American and showing our appreciation for 50 yrs. of service above and beyond the call of duty. May he continue to guide us as he has in the past. It is important to have confidence in your leaders whether it be President of the United States or Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It used to be said "Old soldiers never die" now some are saying "A great policeman never lived".

As an after thought I believe Law Week 1971 should be dedicated to America's Outstanding Law Man, J. Edgar Hoover.

Your very truly

A. J. YOUNG,
Sheriff of Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

OUTLINE OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE ACTIVITIES

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of Dr. Harrison Brown, Foreign Secretary of the National Academy of Science before the Subcommittee on International Cooperation in Science and Space of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on Wednesday, May 19, 1971.

Dr. Brown received his B.S. from the University of California and a Ph. D. from Johns Hopkins. As a chemist and educator Dr. Brown's background is outstanding. He has served as instructor in chemistry at Johns Hopkins, and has also held teaching positions in chemistry and nuclear studies at California Institute of Technology, Institute for Nuclear Studies and served as assistant director of chemistry, Clinton Labs, Oak Ridge, Tenn. He received the Lasker Foundation Award in 1967; the University of Michigan sesquicentennial award, 1967; the American Chemistry Society Award in pure chemistry, 1952 and many other recognitions of his ability and dedication.

Dr. Brown's statement provides an authoritative source of international activities in science, research, and development, as well as knowledge of the U.S. and international agencies operating in these fields.

The statement follows:

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND THE ROLE OF NONGOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS

(By Harrison Brown, Foreign Secretary, National Academy of Sciences)

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, it is a privilege to discuss with you the subject of international cooperation in science and space. In a way my appearance here is symbolic of the interest Congress takes in the vitality and the strength of the private nongovernmental world of science and engineering and I must stress that my remarks will convey only a fraction of the rich variety and unique intellectual resources of that world. I hope in the future you will invite others from academic, corporate and private organizations to share their thoughts on this subject with you.

I would like to set the stage by placing international scientific cooperation in historical perspective. The major impetus came with the founding of the great scientific societies and the organized sharing of empirical data via the learned journals whose earliest authors and editors began the tradition of subjecting manuscripts to scientific criticism.

We have come a long way in the last century or so, but the foundation of international scientific cooperation is still man's wonder about his universe, his desire to investigate its mysteries and share that knowledge with others and his willingness to subject his findings to rigorous objective examinations.

In a sense this is why we more or less unquestioningly accept international scientific cooperation as a force for positive cultural advancement. We recognize it as a powerful instrument in the liberation of men's minds from the constraints of dogma, political cant, superstition and ignorance. We instinctively know that much of our strength as a nation lies in our intellectual freedom, the openness of our society, and our social mobility. We perceive international scientific cooperation as a means of helping to create a comparable international society.

Let it not be thought, however, that the cultural and intellectual elegance of international scientific cooperation is its only—or in some cases its principal, justification. There are equally strong past and present threads of tangible benefit running through the fabric of this common enterprise. We share with others that they may share with us and our complex, technically structured world would hardly be the place it is if this were not so. To those who say, "Yes, and that's why we are in the mess we are in," I can only point out that man's most scientifically and technically complex processes, devices and ideas are subject always to his fundamental humanity and his sensitivity of spirit.

Moving now from this somewhat cosmic rationale for international scientific cooperation let me provide some concrete examples of the way it really works. This is a selective sample drawn from my pragmatic experiences as Foreign Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences and should not in any way be considered the full inventory of the National Academy of Sciences activities much less the gamut of nongovernmental cooperation.

INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS

The National Academy of Sciences exercises membership in approximately thirty international scientific organizations to facilitate the cooperation of the U.S. scientific community with similar groups in other countries. Sixteen of these organizations are joined together in the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). As the world's leading federation of nongovernmental scientific organizations with membership of over sixty countries, ICSU has close working relations with UNESCO, the World Meteorological Organization, and other U.N. agencies, and it has been prominent in initiating and coordinating some of the most important international scientific programs undertaken in the last two decades. Since these programs provide such clear illustrations of the good results produced by international scientific cooperation, it would be worthwhile to spend some time describing a few of those now in progress.

SOME EXAMPLES OF CURRENT INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS

The purpose of the Global Atmospheric Research Program (GARP) is to improve mankind's understanding of the circulation of the atmosphere. This is one of the most challenging phenomena of our planet because of both its inherent complexity and its completely global character. Indeed, it would not be possible to progress very far in the absence of broad international cooperation. Better understanding of the general circulation of the atmophere is expected to lead to the capability of predicting weather for relatively long periods of time, say, a few weeks. This will obviously be of great practical importance. This program is being planned jointly by the World Meteorological Organization and ICSU. The first large-scale experiment in the field will take place in the tropical Atlantic in 1974, and the first global experiment may be possible late in this decade.

The International Biological Program (IBP) is a worldwide study of biological productivity and human adaptability. The U.S. participants in this program here organized interdisciplinary teams to undertake integrated studies of ecosystems. The purpose of this research is to develop a predictive capacity by the construction of ecosystem models. Studies are underway of grasslands, deciduous forest, coniferous forests, and tundra.

Valid ecosystem models can predict the environmental impact of man's activities and make possible a quantitative evaluation of trade-offs that previously have been largely intuitive. For example, in choosing the best location for a major dam, in planning the diversion of a river, or in contemplating a land-use change from forest to agricultural or industrial use, more useful cost/benefit evaluations will become possible. Proposed uses of our natural and renewable resources can therefore be more carefully weighed and the consequences of these uses reliably anticipated.

The International Hydrological Decade (IHD), a worldwide program of coordinated international activities related to water problems, has acted as a catalyst to bring the United States and Canada much closer together than before in their study of the Great Lakes. The National Committees for the IHD of both countries jointly initiated the International Field Year for the Great Lakes; a program of coordinated studies to improve the capabilities of the two countries to manage the Great Lakes. Lake Ontario and its basin will be the subject of synoptic and comprehensive observations of the energy balance, the terrestrial water balance, the atmospheric water balance, circulation and water movement within the Lake, and the biological and chemical elements of the Lake's nutrient cycle. In effect, Lake Ontario will be studied as if it were a small or model ocean. The data integrated through systems analyses and mathematical models, will provide information of importance to planners, managers and developers, as well as to scientists. The Field Year will provide a frame of reference for future investigations and the experience necessary to improve similar studies on the other Great Lakes and large lakes everywhere. This is the first effort of this magnitude to study any body of fresh water the size of Lake Ontario, and the program could be mounted only through international cooperation at all levels.

One of the most important activities of the Committee on Space Research (COSPAR) of ICSU is that of holding large annual meetings which enable scientists of the United States, the Soviet Union, France and 32 other countries to meet under nongovernmental auspices and to discuss, not as government representatives but as professional colleagues, the results of research conducted in space. This represents a unique channel for informal exchange of experience and views between those responsible for the U.S. and Soviet space programs. The Committee is divided into seven working groups: (I) Tracking, Telemetry and Dynamics of Artificial Bodies in Space; (II) Experiments in Interplanetary Space and in the Magnetosphere; (III) Space Techniques as Applied to Astrophysical Programs; (IV) Experiments in the Upper Atmosphere; (V) Space Biology; (VI) Applications of Space Techniques to Meteorology and Earth Survey; (VII) Space Programs for the Study of the Moon and Planets. This year's meeting will take place in June at Seattle, and about 250 to 300 foreign scientists and an equal number of Americans are expected to participate.

Science has long cherished its traditions of free interchange of scientific information between and among the many fields of research, and among the scientists of all coun-

tries. The proliferation of scientific publication in all languages has been matched in recent years by the development of sophisticated electronic retrieval systems which alone can keep pace. ICSU and UNESCO, working cooperatively, have just completed a study of the feasibility of linking such systems to form a cooperative global science information network. Representatives of some fifty governments, including the U.S., will review the study this fall and will recommend that such a network, based on voluntary cooperation and involving both developing and industrialized nations, be established.

The United States leads the world in the development of such systems but even the United States, with all its resources, cannot afford alone to maintain the large scientific information systems established for such fields as chemistry, medicine, and biology. The same is true of the Soviet Union, of Germany, France, the United Kingdom. Cooperation in the provisions of information services for science is essential if science is to continue to thrive, and I have great hopes that this cooperative international venture, known as UNISIST, will help to check the trend toward giantism and make the continuation of the long tradition of open scientific communication possible.

SOME PROBLEMS AFFECTING INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

Last November 7, the UNESCO General Conference passed a resolution requiring UNESCO to break off relations by the end of this year with all international nongovernmental organizations which have affiliates in South Africa, Rhodesia and Portuguese Africa and which cannot prove to the satisfaction of the UNESCO Executive Board that these affiliates neither practice racial discrimination nor cooperate with the policy of apartheid. One of the many nongovernmental organizations affected by this resolution is ICSU. Two others are the Red Cross and the World Council of Churches. ICSU has a long and outstanding record of defending the right of scientists everywhere to take part in international scientific activities without regard to race, religion or political philosophy, and it long ago articulated this principle in a resolution adopted by all its members. In view of this principle, it is most unlikely that the Council will bar South African scientists, on the basis of their nationality, from the Council's activities, even if it means a rupture with UNESCO and the loss of very substantial and important financial support. The loss to UNESCO, however, will be far greater. Because some of its members put politics first, the U.N. agency which has primary responsibility for the international advancement of education, science and culture may find itself in the illogical position of cutting itself off from the world's principal international nongovernmental organization dealing with education, science and culture.

Another problem which seems to be perennial is the difficulty scientists of certain nationalities experience when they apply for visas to attend meetings in countries with which their own is on poor terms. Israelis, South Africans, Portuguese, and Taiwanese all find it difficult to get to meetings in the Communist countries. Likewise, Israelis are excluded from meetings in the Moslem countries, and South Africans and Portuguese from meetings in India. It still seems open to question whether Cuban scientists can get visas to come to meetings in our own country. Scientists working in Rhodesia, even noncitizens and temporary researchers, apparently have trouble getting visas to take part in meetings anywhere because of a U.N. resolution outlawing the government of Rhodesia. I would like to make it clear that scientists recognize the prerogative of a government to refuse a visa to an applicant because of something seriously objectionable in his personal history. On the other hand, they regard the refusal to issue a visa on the basis of nationality alone as clearly discriminatory, and a country in which the government consistently bars the entry of persons of certain nationalities becomes an undesirable place to hold international scientific meetings. The National Academy of Sciences encourages leading international scientific organizations to hold meetings in our country because such meetings give large numbers of our sicentists, including young ones who ordinarily have less opportunity to travel abroad, the stimulating experience of trading ideas and sharpening wits with the most eminent members of their disciplines from all over the world. On the other hand, we know from experience that the willingness of an international body to accept our invitation to hold a meeting here is heavily influenced by the anticipated ability of all eligible scientists to take part.

FUTURE AREAS OF INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

The Arctic is a rapidly developing region of our world which calls for international cooperation not only to promote scientific research but to protect the natural environment for the future. Such cooperation does exist in the Antarctic, where it has been quite successful but the geopolitical significance of the Arctic and Antarctic differ greatly and so the methods for cooperation in the South are not readily adaptable to the North. Even so, an attempt was made last year in this direction: It was suggested to the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research of ICSU (SCAR) that it extend its purview to include the Arctic. The organization, which represents seven international scientific unions, the World Meteorological Organization, and the twelve original signatory nations of the Treaty on Antarctic Research, declined for the reasons suggested. In view of this negative decision, there has been strong sentiment among scientists concerned with the Arctic to create a new coordinating body and is proposed that a meeting of interested parties be held in Norway. Scientific cooperation in the Arctic seems destined to be with us soon.

The environment is another area in which there is urgent need for more effective international cooperation. Hopefully, the grand design for such cooperation will be established at the U.N. Conference on the Environment to be held in Stockholm in 1972. Meanwhile, it is encouraging that useful work is already in progress. There is, for example, the Special Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE), formed by ICSU which is already engaged in several projects. Two of these are studies of possibly harmful matter that is being introduced into the natural environment. The third is a study of man-made or man-modified lakes: the problems arising from their creation and ways of coping with them. The fourth will be a report on the most important environmental problems of developing countries, as seen by scientists living in those areas. The fifth and perhaps the most ambitious project is the design of a global system for monitoring environmental change.

SCOPE is cooperating fully with the Secretary of the U.N. Environmental Conference to determine how international nongovernmental organizations can best complement the efforts of intergovernmental organizations in seeking the solution of our environmental problems. It is hoped that SCOPE will eventually be supported by a research center which will have a computer for environmental modeling, conduct policy research, and serve as an information resource center. It would have links with institutions in developing countries, and its staff, governance and financing would be international. This general concept was endorsed last fall by the Senate in Resolution 399.

EXCHANGE PROGRAMS WITH SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES

The National Academy of Sciences, at the request of the Department of State, in 1959 negotiated an exchange agreement with the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and has continued the exchange program uninterruptedly since that time. The commencement of the program marked the first real opening in US-Soviet scientific relations since before World War II, and it coincided with the opening of the USSR through the intergovernmental cultural exchanges program as well as through the establishment of private tourism by foreigners in the Soviet Union. The interacademy exchange program has been and continues to be virtually the only means whereby American scientists are able to visit and, more significantly, to conduct research within institutes of the Soviet Academy, which is the focus of basic research in the USSR. The program has also enabled Soviet scientists to come to the United States, visiting mainly university research laboratories, so that they have been exposed to our system of science, and large numbers of our scientists have thereby been able to come to know them.

It is hard to recall in 1971 how little most of our scientists—with the notable exception of mathematicians and astronomers—knew about work going on in their fields in the USSR in the year ending in 1959. The Soviets, of course, were better informed about American science through the scientific literature, if not through personal contact. In the wake of the Cold War our first Soviet guests often arrived evidently experiencing the terror of the hostile unknown. If our scientists embarked with greater bravado, they learned that visas might be issued later than the last minute and that plans to go to the USSR might even fail completely to be realized. The American and Soviet exchange scientists of today would hardly recognize their counterparts of a decade earlier, so much have important segments of each society become familiar with the science and society of the other country.

The interacademy exchange commenced with provision for 44 scientists of each country to visit the other country for a total of 70 months over a period of two years, an extremely modest beginning which stressed short visits of one month. In 1962 when the program was renegotiated, the NAS took the initiative to adjust the balance away from the short survey visits in the direction of the longer research visits, for which Americans at least took their families along to participate in the new experience. In 1962 a new pattern of the program was established which has continued more or less up to the present: 30 lecture/survey visits of one month; 26 research visits totaling 160 months. These figures describe the agreed level of exchange in each direction for the two years of the exchange agreement. Our present agreement is at the total level of 180 months for the biennium, with even more emphasis placed on the longer research visits. From the program's inception in 1959 through 1970, 224 American scientists have gone to the USSR for visits totaling 666 months, and 234 Soviet scientists have come here for a total of 696 months.

In addition to the individual visits, the exchange agreements with the Soviet Academy have provided for joint scientific symposia, the first of which was organized in the United States in the field of radio astronomy in 1961. The second, on the initiative of the Soviet Academy, in the field of partial differential equations, was held in Novosibirsk in 1963. A third, on the electron theory of metals, suggested by our Academy to be held in the United States, was finally held in Moscow at the Soviet Academy's request in 1968. I might add that this symposium generated such enthusiasm in a rapidly moving field

that the participants decided to hold a successor meeting on the same topic a year and a half later; that was done in New York in early 1970. We are now in the organizational phase of the next in the series, which is to be on the subject of extraterrestrial intelligence and held at the Byurakan Astrophysical Observatory in the Armenian SSR next September.

Our exchange agreement also provides for meetings of members of the two Academies to discuss exchange matters broadly at the policy level and related matters of mutual interest. Only one such meeting has been held, in Moscow in spring 1967, but a second is anticipated this year in the United States. This forum offers the opportunity for frank exchange of views out of the public limelight in an effort to convey to each other our estimates of values and needs as regards scientific cooperation, whether within the formal exchange program or more broadly. The structure of these meetings, engaging officers and other senior members of the Academies, is designed to bring together those individuals most likely to participate in establishing policy. In a situation where such occasions are extremely limited, we feel that these meetings could serve an important communications function and perhaps also affect directions of scientific cooperation. On our side, the exchange program has been overseen by an advisory committee which was first headed by Professor Paul Doty of Harvard University and subsequently by Dr. Robert Marshak, now President of CCNY, by Provost David R. Goddard of the University of Pennsylvania, by Rockefeller University Vice President Carl Pfaffmann, and currently by Notre Dame Vice President Frederick Rossini. In the past year or two the committee has been joined by younger alumni of the exchange program who lived in the Soviet Union for an academic year and bring their experience to the committee's judgments.

The effectiveness of the program is difficult to judge in any quantitative sense. There are clearly identifiable products such as scientific articles jointly written by American and Soviet researchers. There are the less clearly identifiable professional and personal relations established between a limited number of scientists of the two countries. There are the extrascientific insights which the exchange participants have gained into wide areas of the other's society. To the extent that Soviet political leaders look to Soviet intellectuals for advice in foreign affairs, they are able to draw on a far more real picture of the world abroad now than earlier, a development toward which the scientific exchange has made its contribution.

The main problems which our Academy has experienced in its exchange program with the Soviet Academy stem from problems in the political sphere. Thus, much of our effort seeks to meet special administrative requirements or overcome bureaucratic impediments, American as well as Soviet. As of this date, the Soviets, are ahead of us in the ease with which they issue visas, while we are ahead in the openness of our laboratories and our country in general. However, the situation varies from one problem area to another. We would like to look forward to the time when American and Soviet scientists might travel freely to each other's country in the light of their mutual professional interests, as has been customary among scholars in the West, but frankly we do not see that amelioration in the near future. Meanwhile the formal exchange program serves as an adaptive mechanism to benefit the scientists of the two countries, enabling two basically incompatible systems to mesh at one small interface.

Happily our programs with the academies of sciences of other Eastern European countries are less beset with problems. These programs have been established on the basis of the mutual interests of the respective academies and on their initiatives rather than on governmental initiatives. They, like the Soviet program, facilitate contact between American scientists and their colleagues in countries where scientists are subject, in varying degrees, to controls from above—controls derived from political considerations, lack of foreign exchange, and other considerations. The National Academy of Sciences commenced exchanges with the academies of Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Romania in 1966 and with the academies of Bulgaria and Hungary in 1970. All but the Bulgarian program are at the level of 40 months of visits in each direction annually; that with the Bulgarians began in the first year at 10 months and in the second year is set at 20.

Scientific relations with Eastern Europe did not have to overcome the intense isolation of a generation as with the Soviet Union, but of course, there were limitations on travel to and from those countries in the postwar era. We consider our relations with the East European academies to be relatively easy and fruitful; and if one judges again by the joint publication of articles by American and East European scientists they are reasonably productive.

Surveying both the USSR and East European programs of the National Academy of Sciences, we believe that they are responsive to the desire of American scientists to visit and conduct research in those countries. In some cases the demand on the part of qualified American applicants far exceeds the quota available to us in our exchange agreements, most notably in the case of the USSR and Czechoslovakia, in which programs we hope for increases. We have been fortunate in obtaining the necessary funding for all of these programs over the years from the National Science Foundation, but we must recognize the contributions made also by the host universities in this country which have received our foreign guests largely on their own fiscal accounts.

In considering the benefits derived from the exchange programs with the Soviet and East European academies, one should go beyond the profit to the individual scientists who participate. We find that the very existence of a day-to-day working relationship between our own Academy and the individual ones in the USSR and Eastern Europe has developed a kind of familiarity and rapport which is useful in other ways. For one thing, we find that we are able to obtain the good offices of our partner academies on behalf of American scientists traveling privately to those countries, so that they are able to enjoy access to scientists and institutions which might otherwise not be readily available to them. The relationships are useful and effective also in our international nongovernmental scientific organizations and activities. In short, our interacademy working relationships have broken down cultural and other barriers and engendered trust on all our parts, so that we are able to conduct our international business with greater assurance and effectiveness. We all know with whom we are dealing.

We would like to see the procedures in which we are involved in these programs simplified. For the most part this would mean a relaxation of administrative regulations both here and abroad rather than changes in law, and on our own side we maintain a continuing dialogue with the Executive Branch on administrative complexities which seem excessive. In the realm of law, we would be pleased to see an amendment to our income tax law which would reduce the liability of our foreign guests to income tax. The amount of taxes to which they are subject are negligible, but our bookkeeping for income tax purposes is time-consuming and expensive. Also it would be desirable to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove the requirement of a waiver of inadmissibility for scientists and scholars received in the United States through formal exchange programs where American institutions assume responsibility for the visitors. Such a change in law would reduce bureaucratic red tape and perhaps even hasten American visa-issuing capabilities without sacrificing legitimate considerations of national security.

Looking to the future, we do not see the prospect of revolutionary changes in our exchange programs with the Soviet and East European academies, because we do not foresee marked changes in the political relationships which determine the ground rules for scientific contacts. Therefore, we believe that our best interests are served by seeking as normal and fruitful scientific relations in this region as are possible within the broader framework, expanding programs gradually in accord with needs and desires of our scientists and those of the USSR and Eastern Europe.

PROGRAMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Within the last two or three years there has occurred a sharp change of thought concerning the relevance of science and technology to economic development. Within the development community the conviction is now more widely shared that science and technology constitute important keys to economic and social progress deserving a priority of attention and resources heretofore reserved to such conventional inputs as capital investment and manpower development. There is unprecedented receptivity to innovative action in this sector—paradoxically, at a time when over-all aid resources are declining.

For a number of years the National Academy of Sciences has been involved in bilateral programs with developing countries aimed at accelerating their development through the creation and strengthening of scientific-technological institutions and through the formulation and stimulation of programs for the development of science in these countries. These efforts have often, but not always, been conducted in cooperation with the Agency for International Development. The programs have been based upon the premise that the growth of local scientific-technological competence is essential to the process of economic and social development.

In recent years the bilateral programs have taken the form of workshops in which specialists from the two countries collaborate to inventory and analyze the research needs and opportunities of the developing country in terms of its resource base and its development goals. The joint group then attempts to map out a series of recommendations as to how the research needs can most expeditiously be met through the strengthening or creation of governmental mechanisms, institutions for training of the necessary technical manpower, research institutions, and mechanisms for research coordination and planning. Often the workshops lead to the formation of special groups charged with the responsibility of studying specific problems in detail and making policy and program recommendations.

The bilateral programs are truly collaborative in the sense that the scientists, engineers, research administrators, educators, planners and government officials from the two countries work together analyzing problems and attempting to arrive at common opinions concerning solutions. Whenever possible, programs are jointly funded, thus placing emphasis upon services of value to the less-developed country and accentuating the genuinely cooperative nature of the effort; taking it out of the "gift" category. Although workshops tend to consider a broad range of issues, such as national science policy, research financing, manpower requirements and educational policies, some have been conducted in fields such as the

organization and management of industrial R&D, marine sciences and oceanography, and food and nutrition. To date, workshops have been held in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Taiwan and Thailand. Plans are underway to hold workshops in the Congo/Kinshasa and in Central America (our first regional effort) in the next few months.

The Academy's strength in these efforts lies in its ability to call upon the scientific and technical community to participate in its activities. Natural and social scientists, government planners and policy makers, challenged by a recognition of the importance of the problems of development and the potential role of science and technology in their solution, join together for short periods of time to focus their attention in a multidisciplinary way. The financial investment in these programs is relatively small yet the investment in professional talent and experience is significant. The payoffs from these investments seem to be substantial although often difficult to measure in the short term; it is in the nature of scientific and technical development that the time frame for concrete results is relatively long. Let me give some examples.

One of the areas of concern in many of our programs is that of the development of industrial research capabilities in developing countries. Several workshops and studies in Asia and Latin America have been devoted to this subject. One of our earliest efforts in industrial research was in Brazil. Beyond the rather general recognition that this was an important area of concern, almost no systematic attention had been devoted to it. As a result of our first general Workshop on Science and Brazilian Development a joint study group was found, composed of representatives from Brazilian and U.S. industry, engineering schools and universities. Within a year the efforts of the study group resulted in the creation of an advisory group on industrial research within the Brazilian Research Council to advise that body on planning for research and training. Significant consideration was also given to industrial research in the Research Council's Five Year Plan for Brazilian Scientific and Technical Development. Within the last three years Brazil has introduced advanced engineering curricula in a number of universities and technical schools, established an information journal on new developments in technology for industry and brought together representatives from Brazilian industries, universities, and technical schools for discussions of mutual interests, opportunities, and problems. Finally, legislation has been enacted which will provide incentives for industry to conduct research in Brazil. All of these results were stimulated by the recommendations and work of the joint study group.

Another area of concentration in our workshops has been that of food and agriculture. At the request of the Indonesian Research Council a few years ago, the NAS organized a workshop on food. This workshop presented a number of recommendations which subsequently were incorporated into Indonesia's Five Year Development Plan. A workshop was convened in Thailand this past year on the subject of protein food promotion. Recommendations for policy on high-protein feeding programs and stimulation of private industry involvement were submitted to and accepted by the Thai Cabinet. Problems relating to the establishment of priorities in the area of agricultural research and to the development of programs in agricultural economics have figured prominently in nearly all of our workshop efforts.

Perhaps the area most often considered in our bilateral programs is that of science policy with particular emphasis on the development or strengthening key elements of science policy infrastructure. Thus, in Colombia, our program resulted in a continuing cooperative effort which has led to the establishment, of a science advisory council and a foundation for support of scientific and technical research. In Peru the joint discussions and subsequent efforts led to the establishment of a Peruvian Association for the Advancement of Science and contributed to the establishment of a Peruvian Research Council. Most recently in Ghana a joint study group has been formed to look into the creation of a mechanism for establishment of research priorities in Ghana.

Yet another type of activity is exemplified by our program with the Academia Sinica in Taiwan. This program which began in 1963 contributed to the establishment of six institutes for graduate study which have turned out over a hundred MA degrees and this year awarded their first three PhD's. Moreover, these institutes and the improved environment for teaching and research in Taiwan have led to a situation in which highly trained Chinese scientists are beginning to return from abroad to Taiwan to teach and do research.

In some instances recommendations made in workshops lead to cooperative projects in research and education. In an experimental program with the Brazilian National Research Council our Academy is testing the feasibility of transplanting advanced research capabilities in several fields of chemistry, selected by our Brazilian colleagues as particularly important to the country's scientific and technological development. Its principal aim is to expand the number of doctoral-level chemists in Brazilian universities. Young American PhD chemists—designated NAS Overseas Research Fellows—help organize advanced doctoral programs in chemistry by offering tutorships, graduate courses, and seminars while continuing their own research. Each Fellow works under the direction of an American professor and a Brazilian counterpart to the U.S. professor for a period of two to three years at a Brazilian institution. Brazilian graduate students are admitted for one year to a cooperating U.S. university for special, advanced course work or research collaboration. Responsibilities for the program—financial and administrative—are shared by both countries. Brazil has committed some $700,000 of the estimated $2 million needed for the five-year program.

In addition to the bilateral programs described above, the National Academy of Sciences has also initiated a program of advisory studies which focus on such specific problems as: Intensive technologies for developing nations; development of an integrated approach to agricultural research in Africa; potential uses of solar energy by developing nations; the role of U.S. engineering schools in technical assistance; scientific and technical information needs in developing countries; and the role of U.S. firms in the development of R. & D. capabilities in developing countries.

We have just initiated an experiment to identify data, processes, products, and techniques which may be of unique value to developing countries. We intend to set up a special mechanism for evaluating ideas for innovative applications of science and technology to development problems and for achieving action on proposals of exceptional promise. It is hoped that by spotlighting new technical developments in this manner their transfer, adaptation, and utilization within developing countries can be significantly accelerated.

In all of these programs we work in close cooperation with the National Academy of Engineering. Clearly, much of this exciting activity would not be possible without the recognition by the Agency for International Development that science and technology are essential elements of the development process.

INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

There are numerous instances of institutional cooperation in science, but I would like to concentrate on what I think are some trend-setting examples: I use the term institutional cooperation to mean voluntary association of both private and public scientific organizations. Thus, our Academy may join with that of another country plus the governmentally operated research council of a third to collaborate with a nongovernmental institution such as ICSU and an intergovernmental organization like Unesco to undertake a project of mutual interest and international concern. Curiously enough, this sometimes works!

For example, about three years ago the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences joined to assist in the creation of a new international research center. You probably recall hearing from Professor Thomas Odhiambo, Director of the International Center for Insect Physiology and Ecology in Nairobi, at the Twelfth Meeting of the Panel on Science and Technology of your parent Committee. Since Dr. Odhiambo's initial proposal was first taken up by our Academies, more than a dozen other Academies and a like number of private foundations, several national aid agencies and one international intergovernmental organization have joined in the project.

This is a project to conduct both pure and applied research and has as its core an exciting combination of scientists and institutions from both the developed and developing worlds. I should stress that African scientific and institutional cooperation is an essential ingredient of this particular project.

Another example, in this instance of a prospective institutions, was noted by President Nixon in his Second Annual Report on U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's—when he cited the National Academy of Sciences as being engaged in conversations with a number of like institutions—most notably in the Soviet Union—leading, it is hoped, to the formation of an International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis. This is an experiment in East-West cooperation to find scientific ways to approach some of the more intractable problems common to the more industrially advanced societies. As a consequence it is not only scientifically experimental but sociologically innovative as well. We hope the private and nongovernmental aspect of this project augurs well for a flexible and avant garde institution capable of making a real contribution to societal needs.

Finally, among the few examples to which I invite your attention, I would like to review the prospects for a proposed International Foundation for Science. Here again a group of Academies and like bodies have joined, in this instance with Unesco, to explore the possibility of creating a device to help support the research of young scientists in developing countries. The concept revolves about the distribution of small sums that will be used to enable young scientists to conduct research not otherwise possible. The two principle criteria suggested for applicants will be that their home country institution verify that the research proposed is relevant to the needs of the country and that a group of internationally recognized scholars verify that the proposed research is of "international calibre."

To date this proposal is very much in the talking stage, but it is receiving increasing adherence and particularly it has the support of the Swedish Academy of Engineering Sciences and the Swedish Academy of Sciences along with that of both the National Academy and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

These manifestations of institutional cooperation are but few among many and are

illustrative of what I believe is a new trend in international nongovernmental cooperation to attack the problems of society and to make venerable scientific institutions effective instruments of contemporary intellectual interchange.

THE FUTURE

To a new Subcommittee of Congress the future must be far more interesting than the past. Your fresh capacity to create and to build for that future is unencumbered with the baggage of past mistakes. Let me speculate with you while you are feeling young, vigorous and enthusiastic for I think the challenge you face is enormous.

When we sort out some of the world's most pressing problems and give them shorthand titles it comes to the following:

(1) War—can we control our armaments before the apocalypse?

(2) Food—can we eliminate starvation?

(3) Health—can we eliminate premature death?

(4) Things—can people worldwide be provided with adequate housing, clothes and other material possessions which will permit them to live in dignity?

(5) Knowledge—can we use what we know and discover what we neec' to know to make life on this planet possible?

(6) Population—can we help people limit their fertility and protect the environment in which they and their children live?

Not one of these problems is detached from an international context. Each can be given greater impetus toward solution through international cooperation; each requires a solution compounded of science and technology emerged in a political framework. You, as legislators, and we, as scholars, and as technical administrators, are inexorably linked. What tasks can we effectively undertake together?

At the Twelfth Meeting of the Panel on Science and Technology three closely related suggestions struck me as having remarkable potential: Mr. Daddario proposed the creation of an International Science Policy Committee. Senator Grosart from Canada proposed the formation of an international parliamentary association of legislators interested in science. Professor Long urged the formation of a joint House-Senate Committee on "national security" in its broadest sense—to study the relative risks of nonmilitary alternatives to continued increases in military research and development.

These three suggestions appear to us to be a signal that the time may be opportune for the establishment of some mechanism by which the international aspects of science policy are aired in a forum of executive and legislative decision makers. I personally find such a prospect attractive, but would like to see it established on a voluntary and essentially nongovernmental basis.

Professor Watson raised issues about the biological future of mankind and the ways and means by which that future is to be manipulated. He proposed an international agreement with respect to embryological research and human values. Clearly we do not today have the mechanisms or the institutions to examine such a proposal in all of its ramifications and to make recommendations that encompass the broad sweep of science and ethics, the wide range of legislative and administrative problems, and that simultaneously take into account the pace and character of change in today's world. The Daddario, Grosart, and Long proposals are the beginnings of an approach to this very central issue of our times.

Looking ahead in other areas, I and many others perceive a need for intellectual exchange with the People's Republic of China. The Congress can ready itself to facilitate such exchange, perhaps in a fashion not unlike that which was used to develop our ties with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The vital force of those eight hundred million Chinese can and doubtless will influence the course of history enormously. The potential for wise cooperation truly must not be enveloped in the myths of the past. The NAS, the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council have for several years collaborated in the maintenance of a Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China. We hope we have your support in our attempts to facilitate interchange with Chinese scholars.

I do not want to speculate on the almost endless list of practical technical advances visible in the future; for I believe that, as in the past, we will easily find ways to use all the technology we have. Rather I would like to speculate a bit about the ways in which international cooperation in science can prevent some of the abuses of technology. We are just beginning to discover how much we do not know about our global environment, how much we need to embrace in new knowledge, new institutions, and new concepts of conservation to preserve our world. It will be a challenge of extraordinary complexity for legislators and technical experts to design and make effective the international institutions needed. It is a challenge to the parliamentarians of the world to exercise the sort of statesmanship that will put the costs of stabilizing and conserving our environment in a framework acceptable to the people.

In summary, I find the creation of this Subcommittee a good omen for the future. Having worked with Chairman Miller for many years and knowing his dedication to the cause of international cooperation I can only say that the scientific community should be equally enthusiastic about the prospects for this group and will, I hope, be prepared, as am I, to offer it assistance and support.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the language of House Resolution 319, which I introduced on March 17, 1971. I was hoping it might catch the attention of the administration:

H. RES. 319

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madam Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on September 17, 1970, that the policy of her government is "In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussion on:

"—the question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Vietnam of United States troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp.

"—the question of releasing captured military men."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: *Provided,* That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

POLITICS IN NEW POSTAL CORPORATION

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, former Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien recently issued a statement about the postal service which I feel should be read by all my colleagues. O'Brien, who authored the concept of a postal corporation, expressed concern that the attitudes and policies of postal officials will seriously impair the corporation before it can be put into effect.

His remarks are not partisan or political in effect. You will remember that he first proposed to make the Post Office Department a semi-independent corporation devoid from politics. Because of his efforts, legislation along that line was introduced and the law goes into final effect on July 1, 1971.

It was only natural for O'Brien to keep close tabs on the plan he developed and his comment that he is "quite frankly, deeply worried," should be carefully noted. He constructively points to partisan politics, which he tried to remove from the Department, the poor congressional and labor-management relations, service cutbacks, and financial ineptness as crippling effects on the new corporation. In his words:

The Nixon administration and postal management must stop playing politics with the new postal corporation.

His recommendations for achieving this end include the formation of a board of directors which meets with the spirit of the law, consultations with congressional committees and members, as well as with mailers and groups representing the public. I think we can take encouragement from O'Brien's confidence that the new corporation can succeed if good faith is cultivated between the Postal Service and the American public. Mr. O'Brien's statement is worthy of our consideration and I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

I include the statement, as follows:

MR. O'BRIEN'S STATEMENT

As the author and first public advocate of the concept of the postal corporation, and as co-chairman of the citizens' committee working arduously to secure congressional approval of the corporation plan, I can no longer remain silent in the face of my mounting concern over the future of the U.S. Postal Service.

I do not speak today for my party, as Democratic National Chairman. My efforts toward postal reform were conducted on a bi-partisan basis. I speak, therefore, as a former postmaster general who, as originator, became deeply involved in what was intended to be a movement to bring the postal service abreast of modern times and tech-

nology, to move the U.S. Mail in a competent, businesslike, and professional manner.

After closely following the transition period, however, I am, quite frankly, deeply worried. Now that postal reform has become law, my hopes—and those of millions of Americans who believe in the corporation concept—have been shaken by some disturbing events, some disquieting signs that could severely handicap the fledgling corporation before it even gets off the ground.

Let's look for a moment at what our hopes were when postal reform was first proposed in March, 1967—and what has happened to those hopes under the Nixon administration.

First, it was my intention that the postal service and its management be totally removed from the arena of partisan politics.

Today, the aura of political partisanship continues to engulf the postal service and make it virtually indistinguishable from its pre-August, 1970 status.

Not only did the postmaster general—a political appointee of President Nixon—secure appointment as the new postmaster general of the U.S. Postal Service, but he also became chairman of the board of directors of the new corporation—a board that supervises the activities of the postmaster general and other corporate officers. In other words, Mr. Blount is reporting to himself.

Furthermore, Mr. Blount recommended the appointment by President Nixon of a board of directors whose makeup violates the spirit of the new law in terms of bi-partisan representation by including the maximum number of Republican appointees, and only a minimum of Democrats—Democrats whose identification with the party has been minimal in terms of bipartisan representation.

Politics remains a significant factor in regional and headquarters personnel selection. Not only did the postmaster general dismiss all regional directors holding career appointments from past Democratic administrations, but he replaced them in virtually every case with non-career employees—with emphasis on mostly retired Republican business executives. He has not named one regional director who is a recognizable Democrat. And there are continuing reports that higher-level promotions (GS–13 and above) at headquarters still require clearance by Republican officials in the Bureau of Operations and the Office of the Postmaster General.

A second goal of our postal reform effort was to set the stage for a dramatic improvement in postal service to the public, free of the political and economic pressures of other agencies and political entities.

But instead of improving mail service, the trend of the past two years has been toward a drastic reduction in existing service. The postmaster general has introduced a series of plans and budget cuts that have made the past two years one of the bleakest periods in the history of the U.S. Mail.

Not only has the nationwide program of same-day delivery in downtown business districts been abandoned, but drastic and often unpublicized cuts have been made on a regional basis in collection services, business deliveries, forwarding service, special delivery, window, Saturday and other weekend services.

In 1967, we broke new ground by providing space-available air mail service to first class mail on an enormously extended basis. This has now been nullified in several areas with the restriction of its use to distances in excess of 600 miles.

Today, it seems to be commonplace for first class mail to take six to seven days to travel between cities, and four to five days within metropolitan areas. The Postal Service's own studies indicate a serious deterioration in service—even when measured against its own standards of performance a year ago. Undoubtedly, the fact that thousands of postmaster vacancies went unfilled for an unprecedented two years, while the incumbents remained in an "acting" status, has contributed greatly to the decline of service.

Most serious of all, in my view, is the apparent abandonment of our goal of ultimately eliminating air mail as a separate category, moving all first-class mail by the fastest available means of transportation, and giving special service to special delivery mail. This program appears to have been replaced by a low-quality substitute that would provide ordinary first-class service for air mail, and second class service for first-class mail—all at much higher rates.

All of these reductions in service have occurred before the corporation has officially gone into operation. But the signs are ominous. Unless this trend toward outdated service is given top-priority attention by a public service-minded board of directors, the corporation is headed for deep trouble. No amount of public relations gimmickry—such as special air mail service for congressmen—will help the new service in the eyes of its primary client—the public.

Thirdly, we had hoped to open a new era in postal-labor relations by providing unrestricted scope for good-faith bargaining, a neutral source for final appeal, and a chance to be innovative in postal labor-management relations.

First we witnessed a crippling strike of nationwide significance—the first in postal history. We also are seeing the development of the poorest relationships in memory between a postmatser general and hundreds of thousands of employees. The turnover of Mr. Blount's top labor relations personnel has been extraordinary. The general resentment generated by the so-called "Blount gag" order, barring postal personnel from communicating freely with Congress, has further worsened postal labor relations. Postal management's public statements and its attitude toward negotiations have exacerbated the problem.

The new corporation simply must not begin under a cloud of acrimony between management and labor over such issues as communicating with Members of Congress. The problem of proving management's overriding concern for the welfare of postal employees must be given urgent attention.

Fourth, we had envisioned a vastly improved method of obtaining urgently needed improvements in postal plants and equipment under more economical procedures.

Mr. Blount recently announced a much-needed $1.5 billion construction program to provide critically needed postal facilities. What was *not* announced was the hundreds of new facilities needlessly delayed or possibly dropped because of the nine months long freeze on new postal construction, imposed by the postmaster general in response to the President's inept battle against inflation. That freeze served only to increase the deficit in adequate facilities that must be borne by the new corporation.

Furthermore, the staggering cost overrun incurred in building a New York Bulk Handling Facility in Secaucus, New Jersey, has greatly shaken confidence in the ability of the same officials to undertake the enormous building programs needed in the postal system. Another such fiscal disaster could seriously inhibit the new corporation's ability to market its securities; the responsible officials should not be awarded positions of similar authority in the U.S. Postal Service.

Fifth, in the *financial* area, we had hoped to place the postal service on sound economic footing, with due regard to public service.

Mr. Blount has come up with the most staggering postal deficit in history—projected to reach more than $2.2 billion by June 30. This administration's failure to secure from the Congress any kind of a rate increase in the past two years has placed the new corporation at a disadvantage even before it opens its doors. Even more disturbing is the attitude of the management toward the legitimate requests of the new Postal Rate Commission for basic financial information and an opportunity to observe postal processing methods. So far, the Postal Service management has not even been able to agree on what the Rate Commission's mandate is.

Finally, we foresaw the opportunity through postal reform for a cooperative and constructive relationship with the Congress, with mail users, and the public, through frequent consultation and appropriate legislative oversight.

Unfortunately, the attitude of Mr. Blount and his colleagues toward Congress and the public has been one of disdain. They have indicated that they simply do not understand the legislative process and the proper role of legislative oversight. As a result, the postal service has reached an all-time low in congressional relations. It cost Mr. Blount a postal rate bill—and would have cost us postal reorganization. As it is, he and his top staff have cost the new corporation vital congressional, public, and employee good will at the outset.

The Nixon administration and postal management must stop playing politics with the new postal corporation. Mr. Blount should make non-partisanship the rule rather than a mere slogan. He should recommend a board of directors that meets the spirit of the law. He should consult fully with appropriate congressional committees and members, as well as with mailers and groups representing the public. He should stop playing stamp politics. He should give immediate attention to ending the deterioration of the quality of service. He should make every effort to restore favorable management-labor relations. As a construction expert, he should take special pains to see that future Secaucuses are averted through careful planning.

This corporation can succeed—and U.S. mail service can flourish—only with the most carefully cultivated good faith between the Postal Service and the American public. The most disquieting sign of all, to date, has been that Mr. Blount and his colleagues are taking the public for granted.

DIMINISHED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AFFORDED MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the May 4 edition of the Washington Post contained an Associated Press article describing the plight and isolation of our Nation's Mexican-Americans regarding educational opportunities. I would like to have this news story inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of the Members of Congress.

The article follows:

CHICANOS ISOLATED IN SCHOOLS, UNIT SAYS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights says a study of Mexican-Americans in the nation's schools reveals Chicano students are "severely isolated" in the Southwest.

The report, first of several assessing educational opportunities for Mexican-Americans in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas, was released here and in Austin, Tex., yesterday.

The commission reported that about 30 per cent of Chicano students in the South-

western area attend schools in predominantly Mexican-American districts while about 45 per cent go to predominantly Mexican-American schools.

It said more than 20 per cent of the pupils surveyed are in schools 80 to 100 per cent Mexican-American.

While geographic considerations may account for much of the isolation, the report said, many Mexican-American students are isolated in districts next to predominantly Anglo districts.

It said only 4 per cent of the teachers and 3 per cent of the school principals are Mexican-American while 10 per cent of Board of Education members are of the minority group.

Only California, the report said, has taken action to eliminate ethnic imbalance in its schools. However, it said ethnic imbalance still remains in that state, even though substantial progress has been made.

The most severe isolation of students by school and district was found in Texas, the commission said. Almost two-thirds of the Mexican-American students in the state are concentrated in 27 counties along the Mexican border or close to it. Nearly 60 per cent of the students attend schools in predominantly Chicano districts.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan agency created by Congress in 1957. Information for its report came from a mail survey of all 538 school districts with Spanish surnamed enrollments of more than 10 per cent in the five-state region.

SOVIET ANTISEMITISM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker. I recently obtained a copy of a publication printed in the Soviet Union entitled "Caution: Zionism!" which to my mind is the most vicious antisemitic piece of literature that I have seen since the Nazis were wiped out in Germany in World War II. This booklet written by Yuri Ivanov was printed by Progress Publishers, the official Soviet publishing house in Moscow in 1970.

Throughout the booklet, the term "Zionist and Jew" is used entertaintively. It is quite obvious that to the Soviets all Jews are Zionists and, therefore, subject within the Soviet Union to punishment.

The House Committee on Internal Security, of which I am the ranking minority member, has been holding hearings on persecutions within the Communist bloc since last year. Our predecessor committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities, held hearings on Soviet persecution of Jews, in 1968. It is quite apparent that all people are persecuted behind the Iron Curtain. All people are denied the right to the practice of their religion; the right to freedom of speech and of the press and of assembly; the right to leave their countries permanently to go to places that they would rather live in. But, it is also apparent that Jews suffer special persecutions in the Communist bloc and, particularly, in the Soviet Union. This booklet perhaps gives us an insight into the thinking of the Soviet leadership about the Jews that explains why they are subject to even more oppression than the rest of the people who live under the domination of the Communists.

The booklet accuses Jews throughout the world of being involved in some sort of synthesist conspiracy. A conspiracy, of course, in collaboration with "American imperialist" the usual target of Soviet vilification.

Perhaps the most grotesque material in the booklet appears on pages 146 and 147 where after the claim is made that the French Christian working class has the "money earned by their labor" transferred "by Rothschild, Pierre Dreyfus, and other financiers and businessmen" to Israel. The workers were then advised by the Soviet Communist that the Roman Catholic Church is controlled by secret Jews named in particular as Cardinal Augustin Bea who the booklet says:

> Long ago abandoned his Jewish faith to embrace Catholicism in order to help cement the alliance between the Catholic Church and the Jewish Church by means of the Second Vatican Council Declaration of November 20, 1964, and a cheque in favor of the Vatican . . .

This booklet is available in English and it has also been published in other languages and disseminated throughout the world by the Soviet Union. It is insulting to both our Jewish and our Catholic citizens in this country and it is available from the official Soviet Distributing Agency in New York for Confidence Book Corp., which is registered as a Soviet agency.

A confidential publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A., entitled "Party Affairs" and dated April 18, 1969, contains a statement that is interesting and the context of the Soviet anti-Semitic campaign. According to the Communist Party "a fear has arisen in this country about the Jewish question; a 'dirty word' has been created—'anti-Semi.'" Many of our members and followers fear to speak out what they know is the truth unless they be labeled "anti-Semi." It is about time to look this situation in the face. Apparently the Communist Party, U.S.A., is embarrassed about the anti-Semitism of the Soviet Union and the anti-Semitism implicit in their own activities here in the United States and its many members are upset by the Soviet anti-Semitic campaign and by the anti-Semitism within the Communist Party. But the fact remains that the Communist Party, U.S.A., a wielding tool of the Soviet Union, is as guilty of anti-Semitism because of its support for the Soviet Union as the German-American Bund was guilty of because of its support for Nazi Germany before World War II.

The Soviet booklet Caution: Zionism! shows the depths to which the Soviet leadership has sunk in this anti-Semitic campaign. A man such as Cardinal Bea is considered Jewish, because he was born Jewish, even though he now embraces the Roman Catholic Church. This was the Nazi definition of a Jew—anyone who is born of Jewish parents regardless of his religion was eligible for extermination in the gas chambers of Nazi Germany. The old Nazi fantasies about the international Jewish bankers and about the Jewish control of everything in sight are now repeated by the Communists because it serves the needs in the Soviet Union. The spread of these Nazi-style fantasies against the Jews provides the excuse for the continued persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is always sad for me to note that some Americans who call themselves anti-Communist or conservative fall into the anti-Semitic trap. I am one who has never said that all of the un-Americans are on the left. Unfortunately, many on the American right are pure and simple anti-Semitic. They are helping communism, not Americanism, when they preach hatred or contempt of any race. They should read Caution: Zionism! and beware of those Americans who spread this same hatred on our shores.

THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER HIGHWAY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing legislation today to designate certain segments of the Interstate Highway System as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Highway."

It was just 15 years ago that President Eisenhower signed the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. That act initiated the vast network of safe and convenient interstate highways which criss-cross our Nation today. It is entirely fitting, then, that we designate a portion of this system to his memory.

The route I have chosen in this bill is the same as that suggested last week by Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe. Secretary Volpe, coincidentally, served President Eisenhower as the first Federal Highway Administrator.

The proposed Dwight D. Eisenhower Highway would follow the existing routes as follows:

I–70 from Washington, D.C., to Denver, Colo.;

I–25 from Denver to Cheyenne, Wyo.; and

I–80 from Cheyenne to San Francisco, Calif.

This route spans the country and passes very near the Eisenhower family home and the former President's final resting place in Abilene, Kans. It also passes through Mrs. Eisenhower's hometown of Denver.

I was interested to learn that this proposed route is essentially the same as the one taken in 1919 by then Lieutenant Colonel Eisenhower, then second in command of the Army's first transcontinental truck convoy. The Department of Transportation points out that the purpose of that trip over 50 years ago was to demonstrate the possibility of intercontinental truck travel and to promote governmental support of highways.

Mr. Speaker, it has been over 2 years now since the death of this great American soldier and leader. No permanent fitting national memorial has been established other than the presidential library

and museum at Abilene. It is time for Congress to act to honor his memory in this very appropriate way. I urge prompt and favorable consideration for the designation of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Highway.

POOR ATTENDANCE AT DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being suspect in demonstrating concern and with the knowledge that many of my constituents in Massachusetts will react with mild surprise over this concern, I raise the question of attendance at today's Democratic caucus.

Once again the Democratic monthly caucus was adjourned without business because of lack of quorum. It seems to be characteristic of Democratic members that they cannot muster sufficient of their numbers to deal with the wide range of issues scheduled for consideration. These issues are significant: they extend from the war in Vietnam to the chairmanship of a District subcommittee.

The consistent failure to obtain a quorum—this was the third failure in 3 months—suggests that the very anonymity which caucus rules normally guarantee contributes to the evident lack of interest. It is for that reason that I undertook today to keep a record of those who were not present at today's meeting.

I place this list in the RECORD with mixed feelings. I apologize to those who had legitimate reasons for being unable to attend, and I also acknowledge that my compilation may be less accurate than an official record would have been. Of course, I would have preferred such an official listing but regrettably, the benefits of public disclosure of our activities still seems to elude too many of our Members.

Finally, I would be the last—my own record as testimony—to argue that attendance of itself contributes more than minimally to government. But if we can not even raise a quorum for matters of critical policy, our potential as an effective instrument is too sharply curtailed.

LIST OF THOSE MEMBERS ABSENT

Abbitt, Watkins M., 4th Va.; Abernethy, Thomas G., 1st Miss.; Anderson, Glenn M., 17th Calif.; Anderson, William R., 6th Tenn.; Andrews, George W., 3d Ala.; Ashley, Thomas L., 9th Ohio.

Baring, Walter S., AL Nev.; Bevill, Tom, 7th Ala.; Blanton, Ray, 7th Tenn.; Blatnik, John A., 8th Minn.; Brooks, Jack, 9th Tex.; Burleson, Omar, 17th Tex.; Burlison, Bill D., 10th Mo.; Byrne, James A., 3d Pa.; Byron, Goodloe E., 6th Md.

Cabell, Earle, 5th Tex.; Caffery, Patrick T., 3d La.; Casey, Bob, 22d Tex.; Chappell, Bill, Jr., 4th Fla.; Clark, Frank M., 25th Pa.; Collins, George W., 6th Ill.; Colmer, William M., 5th Miss.; Conyers, John, Jr., 1st Mich.; Corman, James C., 22d Calif.; Daniel, W. C. (Dan), 5th Va.

Daniels, Dominick V., 14th N.J.; Danielson, George E., 29th Calif.; Davis, John W., 7th Ga.; Davis, Mendel J., 1st S.C.; de la Garza, Eligio, 15th Tex.; Delaney, James J., 9th N.Y.; Dellums, Ronald V., 7th Calif.; Denholm, Frank E, 1st S. Dak.; Dent, John H., 21st Pa.; Dingell, John D., 16th Mich.; Dorn, Wm. Jennings Bryan, 3d S.C.; Dow, John G., 27th N.Y.; Dowdy, John, 2d Tex.; Downing, Thomas N., 1st Va.; Dulski, Thaddeus J., 41st N.Y.

Edwards, Edwin W., 7th La.; Eilberg, Joshua, 4th Pa.; Evins, Joe L., 4th Tenn.

Fascell, Dante B., 12th Fla.; Fisher, O. C., 21st Tex.; Flood, Daniel J., 11th Pa.; Flowers, Walter, 5th Ala.; Flynt, John J., Jr., 6th Ga.; Foley, Thomas S., 5th Wash.; Fountain, L. H., 2d N.C.; Fulton, Richard H., 5th Tenn.; Fuqua, Don, 2d Fla.

Galifianakis, Nick, 4th N.C.; Gaydos, Joseph M., 20th Pa.; Gettys, Tom S., 5th S.C.; Giaimo, Robert N., 3d Conn.; Gibbons, Sam, 6th Fla.; Gonzalez, Henry B., 20th Tex.; Gray, Kenneth J., 21st Ill.; Green, Edith, 3d Oreg.; Green, William J., 5th Pa.; Griffin, Charles H., 3d Mass.; Griffiths, Martha W., 17th Mich.

Hagan, G. Elliott, 1st Ga.; Hanley, James M., 35th N.Y.; Hanna, Richard T., 34th Calif.; Hansen, Julia Butler, 3d Wash.; Hawkins, Augustus F., 21st Calif.; Hébert, F. Edward, 1st La.; Hechler, Ken, 4th W. Va.; Henderson, David N., 3d N.C.; Howard, James, J. 3d N.J.

Ichord, Richard H., 8th Mo.

Jarman, John, 5th Okla.; Jones, Ed., 8th Tenn.; Jones, Walter B., 1st N.C.

Kazen, Abraham, Jr., 23d Tex.; Kee, James, 5th W. Va.; Kyros, Peter, 1st Maine.

Landrum, Phil M., 9th Ga.; Leggett, Robert L., 4th Calif.; Lennon, Alton, 7th N.C.; Link, Arthur A., 2d N. Dak.; Long, Speedy O., 8th La.

McKay, K. Gunn, 1st Utah; McMillan, John L., 6th S.C.; Macdonald, Torbert H., 7th Mass.; Mahon, George H., 19th Tex.; Mann, James R., 4th S.C.; Matsunaga, Spark M., 1st Hawaii; Mills, Wilbur D., 2d Ark.; Minish, Joseph G., 11th N.J.; Mollohan, Robert H. (Bob), 1st W. Va.; Monagan, John S., 5th Conn.; Montgomery, G. V. (Sonny), 4th Miss.; Moorhead, William S., 14th Pa.; Morgan, Thomas E., 26th Pa.

Natcher, William H., 2d Ky.; Nichols, Bill, 4th Ala.; Nix, Robert N. C., 2d Pa.

O'Hara, James G., 12th Mich.

Passman, Otto E., 5th La.; Patman, Wright, 1st Tex.; Patten, Edward J., 15th N.J.; Perkins, Carl D., 7th Ky.; Pickle, J. J., 10th Tex.; Poage, W. R., 11th Tex.; Podell, Bertram L., 13th N.Y.; Pryor, David, 4th Ark.; Purcell, Graham, 13th Tex.

Randall, Wm. J., 4th Mo.; Rangel, Charles B., 18th N.Y.; Rarick, John R., 6th La.; Roberts, Ray, 4th Tex.; Rodino, Peter W., Jr., 10th N.J.; Roe, Robert A., 8th N.J.; Rogers, Paul G., 9th Fla.; Rooney, Fred B., 15th Pa.; Rooney, John J., 14th N.Y.; Rostenkowski, Dan, 8th Ill.; Roy, William R., 2d Kans.; Runnels, Harold Lowell, 2d N. Mex.

St German, Fernand J., 1st R.I.; Satterfield, David E., III, 3d Va.; Shipley, George E., 23d Ill.; Sikes, Robert L. F., 1st Fla.; Sisk, B. F., 16th Calif.; Slack, John M., 3d W. Va.; Staggers, Harley O., 2d W. Va.; Steed, Tom, 4th Okla.; Stephens, Robert G., Jr., 10th Ga.; Stokes, Louis, 21st Ohio; Stubblefield, Frank A., 1st Ky.; Stuckey, W. S. (Bill), 8th Ga.

Taylor, Roy A., 11th N.C.; Tiernan, Robert O., 2d R.I.

Udall, Morris K., 2d Ariz.; Ullman, Al, 2d Oreg.

Waggonner, Joe D., Jr., 4th La.; Watts, John C., 6th Ky.; White, Richard C., 16th Tex.; Whitten, Jamie L., 2d Miss.; Wilson, Charles H., 31st Calif.

Yatron, Gus, 6th Pa.; Young, John, 14th Tex.

MEMBERS PRESENT AT CAUCAS

Abourezk, James, 2d S. Dak.; Abzug, Bella S., 19th N.Y.; Adams, Brock, 7th Wash.; Addabbo, Joseph P., 7th N.Y.; Albert, Carl, 3d Okla.; Alexander, Bill, 1st Ark.; Annunzio, Frank, 7th Ill.; Aspin, Les, 1st Wis.; Aspinall, Wayne N., 4th Colo.

Badillo, Herman, 21st N.Y.; Barrett, William A., 1st Pa.; Begich, N.J., AL Alaska; Bennett, Charles E., 3d Fla.; Bergland, Bob, 7th Minn.; Biaggi, Mario, 24th N.Y.; Bingham, Jonathan B., 23d N.Y.; Boggs, Hale, 2d La.; Boland, Edward P., 2d Mass.; Bolling, Richard, 5th Mo.; Brademas, John, 3d Ind.; Brasco, Frank J., 11th N.Y.; Brinkley, Jack, 3d Ga.; Burke, James A., 11th Mass.; Burton, Phillip, 5th Calif.

Carey, Hugh L., 15th N.Y.; Carney, Charles J., 19th Ohio; Celler, Emanuel, 10th N.Y.; Chisholm, Shirley, 12th N.Y.; Clay, William (Bill), 1st Mo.; Cotter, William R., 1st Conn.; Culver, John C., 2d Iowa.

Diggs, Charles C., Jr., 13th Mich.; Donohue, Harold D., 4th Mass.; Drinan, Robert F., 3d Mass.

Eckhardt, Bob, 8th Tex.; Edmondson, Ed, 2d Okla.; Edwards, Don, 9th Calif.; Evans, Frank E., 3d Colo.

Fauntroy, Walter E., D.C.; Ford, William D., 15th Mich.; Fraser, Donald M., 5th Minn.

Garmatz, Edward A., 3d Md; Grasso, Ella T., 6th Conn.

Hamilton, Lee H., 9th Ind.; Harrington, Michael, 6th Mass.; Hathaway, William D., 2d Maine; Hays, Wayne L., 18th Ohio; Helstoski, Henry, 9th N.J.; Hicks, Floyd V., 6th Wash.; Hicks, Louise Day, 9th Mass.; Holifield, Chet, 19th Calif.; Hull, W. R., Jr., 6th Mo.; Hungate, William L., 9th Mo.

Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., 11th Ind.; Johnson, Harold T., 2d Calif.; Jones, Robert E., 8th Ala.

Karth, Joseph E., 4th Minn.; Kastenmeier, Robert W., 2d Wis.; Kluczynski, John C., 5th Ill.; Koch, Edward I., 17th N.Y.

Long, Clarence D., 2d Md.; McCormack, Mike, 4th Wash.; McFall, John J., 15th Calif.; Madden, Ray J., 1st Ind.; Mathis, Dawson, 2d Ga.; Mazzoli, Romano L., 3d Ky.; Meeds, Lloyd, 2d Wash.; Melcher, John, 2d Mont.; Metcalfe, Ralph H., 1st Ill.; Mikva, Abner J., 2d Ill.; Miller, George P., 8th Calif.; Mink, Patsy T., 2d Hawaii; Mitchell, Parren J., 7th Md.; Moss, John E., 3d Calif.; Murphy, John M., 16th N.Y.; Murphy, Morgan F., 3d Ill.

Natcher, William H., 2d Ky.; Nedzi, Lucien N., 14th Mich.

Obey, David R., 7th Wis.; O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., 8th Mass.

Pepper, Claude, 11th Fla.; Pike, Otis G., 1st N.Y.; Preyer, Richardson, 6th N.C.; Price, Melvin, 24th Ill.; Pucinski, Roman C., 11th Ill.

Rees, Thomas M., 26th Calif.; Reuss, Henry S., 5th Wis.; Roncalio, Teno, AL, Wyo.; Rosenthal, Benjamin S., 8th N.Y.; Roush, J. Edward, 4th Ind.; Roybal, Edward R., 30th Calif.; Ryan, William F., 20th N.Y.

Sarbanes, Paul S., 4th Md.; Scheuer, James H., 22d N.Y.; Seiberling, John F., Jr., 14th Ohio; Smith, Neal, 5th Iowa; Stanton, James V., 20th Ohio; Stratton, Samuel S., 29th N.Y.; Sullivan, Leonor, 3d Mo.; Symington, James W., 2d Mo.

Teague, Olin E., 6th Tex.; Thompson, Frank, Jr., 4th N.J.

Van Deerlin, Lionel, 37th Calif.; Vanik, Charles A., 22d Ohio; Vigorito, Joseph P., 24th Pa.

Waldie, Jerome R., 14th Calif.; Wolff, Lester L., 3d N.Y.; Wright, Jim, 12th Tex.

Yates, Sidney A., 9th Ill.

Zablocki, Clement J., 4th Wis.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, this week has been designated "Small Business Week" by President Nixon. How appro-

priate it is that the mainstay of private enterprise be so honored.

Not enough consideration has been given to small business. Our country was not founded by the efforts of the giant corporations and conglomerates that seem to receive all the attention and publicity from the media and legislators. America was founded on the strength of individual shopowners, farmers, and traders who gave careful and personalized attention to their patrons.

The work force of small business—which comprises 98 percent of all U.S. businesses—is made up of nearly 50 million people. As a matter of fact, small businesses employ more individuals than do the larger corporations.

While providing a livelihood for so many Americans, small business is the first to feel the pangs of an economic plunge and the last to reap the benefits from an upswing in the economy.

Few realize the tremendous part that small business plays in our capitalistic society. Large industries may assemble the finished product, but the various parts of that product have, in all probability, been made by small businesses. Likewise, distribution of the product will also be handled by other small businesses.

We must support the backbone of our private enterprise—small business—and thus insure freedom for American capitalism.

LOCKHEED LOAN GUARANTEE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Economist—which knows most closely the situation with Rolls-Royce and the RB 211 engine, slated for installation in the Lockheed Tristar—has raised some significant questions regarding the current loan guarantee effort. These questions must, to my mind, be answered before we act on this matter.

I include the following article:

[From the Economist, Apr. 24, 1971]

TREE YOUR POSSUMS, DAN

The advice of the American Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John Connally, speaking as one southerner to another, was succinct: "Tree your possums all at once, Dan." Just what Mr. Haughton, who had been trying to knock them off singly, will do now is a nice question. But Mr. Connally showed what he meant by letting it be known that he was advising the President to seek a guarantee from Congress for new bank loans to Lockheed. Lockheed had just emerged from one round of talks with the banks and was about to start another with the airlines, and Mr. Connally's intervention was intended to drive at least two of Mr. Haughton's possums up a tree together, and possibly the British Government along with them. It was a friendly gesture and intended to be helpful, but Congress may not, in the end, take a blind bit of notice of it, and if Congress refuses so may Mr. Heath. The Prime Minister repeated to Parliament on Tuesday: "We consider it essential to have guarantees about the future of the aircraft [Lockheed's Tristar] if we are to go ahead with the engine."

Up to the present time, Lockheed has got the British Government to retreat nearly all the way from the stand that it originally took on February 4th, when Rolls-Royce asked for a receiver. The Government has agreed to bear all the cost of research and development for the RB 211 engine, now estimated to be running at £220 million. It has agreed to bear most of the extra manufacturing cost of the engine, which is estimated almost to have doubled since the original contract was signed in 1968. Over a contract valued at around £150 million, the price has been raised, in round terms, by £50 million. This brings the price for each engine up from £350,000 to a bit under £450,000, against a manufacturing cost that might run as high as £590,000 apiece.

The British taxpayer is therefore being committed to a big loss on every engine sold to Lockheed, something the Government originally promised would not be allowed to happen. The picture may in the end not be quite as black as the figures suggest because the estimates themselves may be exaggerated; Cooper Brothers' auditors made several errors in their first run through Rolls-Royce's books. But there would still be a loss on the production of RB 211 engines if the contract were proceeded with on this basis, and, with no other customer in sight but Lockheed, the Government is understandably reluctant to persist with the RB 211 unless Lockheed looks like staying in business. Its insistence on formal guarantees continues to be the biggest stumbling block, holding up all the other arrangements on which Lockheed's survival depends.

Lockheed has come to the end of its funds. It is not clear quite how much extra it needs to complete the Tristar but some expert New York estimates run as high as an additional $500 million. This would bring the cost of developing the aircraft to around $900 million, a far from improbable sum. The banks making up the 24-strong consortium financing Lockheed are, however, asking themselves whether this will be all the money the company will need. New aircraft usually meet technical trouble at some stage which takes money to put right, and the Tristar has done little actual flying yet.

Lockheed was in financial straits at least a year before Rolls-Royce went bankrupt. Orders were not coming in as expected and funds were suffering accordingly. The down payments that customers make when they sign an order, and the further payments they make at intervals between order and delivery, are two of the aircraft industy's main sources of working capital; something like half the purchase price will have been paid before delivery. Tristar orders rushed in during 1968 and then dried up. New down payments ceased to come in. By the start of this year, Lockheed needed, and had just arranged to borrow, a further $600 million. Then Rolls-Royce went bankrupt and all agreements were void.

Had the Tristar gone according to schedule, later this year Lockheed would have begun to deliver and to get paid for the first Tristars and the money would have flowed in again. But now airlines are saying they do not want Tristars until 1973, which makes a bad joke of Lockheed's and Britain's efforts to minimise the delay on RB 211 delivery. For all some airlines care, the Tristar can be a year or more late, not the bare five or six months everyone has been aiming for, during which time the customers will not have to find the outstanding 50 per cent of the purchase price for jets they cannot fill and Lockheed will have to find another year's bridging finance. This exacerbates Mr. Haughton's problems cruelly.

The airlines have yet to make the expected protests over the higher price they will be asked for Tristars in order to recoup the higher cost of the RB 211. Their silence has become disturbing. It suggests that price could be an issue held in reserve if Lockheed surmounts all of its other difficulties and confronts them with new contract proposals that they would otherwise have no reason to turn down. At the end of it all, the Tristar ought not to cost more than the competing DC 10 built by McDonnell-Douglas. But airlines bought Tristars largely because they expected to get a cheaper aircraft than the DC 10, cheaper because the Rolls-Royce engines were priced something like 10 percent below the DC 10's.

They are now being asked to buy engines that weigh more, cost more and give less power than was promised. It is not an easy bill of goods for Lockheed to sell and Mr. Connally, by his intervention, has not necessarily made the task easier. By speaking out, instead of pulling strings privately as Lockheed had hoped the White House would do, he has alerted all those members of Congress, Senators Proxmire and Mansfield among them, who dislike official aid to private industry in any form and who particularly dislike the Lockheed company. Loud in its protests will also be McDonnell-Douglas, complaining at the unfairness of subsidising an aircraft built by its closest competitor. McDonnell-Douglas has been hit just as badly as Lockheed by the sales recession.

Another British mission leaves for Burbank this week, but many Americans would feel happier if they could see the British Government visibly exerting itself to put Rolls-Royce to rights at home. Where is the new management that will do the job? American pressure for a British European Airways order for Tristars is not put on to boost numbers, but to have someone in Britain with a commercial stake in seeing Rolls-Royce get on with the job.

Mr. Heath's Government is still giving the impression that it, too, is waiting to see what happens to Lockheed before deciding how much effort to put into salvaging Rolls-Royce. If Mr. Heath should suddenly drop his insistence on an official American guarantee of Lockheed's survival, as he has dropped so many of his other original conditions for saving the RB 211, how many of all those other promises of help made to Mr. Haughton would stand? It is easy to act generously while you know someone else is holding out for the tough conditions. Britain has possums of its own to tree.

DR. WILLIAM CULBERTSON, PRESIDENT OF MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE NAMED CHANCELLOR

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my colleague from the Fourth District of Kentucky, Hon. M. GENE SNYDER, in paying tribute today to Dr. William Culbertson, who has served as president of the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago since 1948. I am also happy to note that Dr. Culbertson's dedicated and devoted service to the institute will be acknowledged on August 1 of this year when he will become its chancellor.

During his 29 years at the Moody Bible Institute, Dr. Culbertson has proved himself a leader not only of his own institution but of Christian evangelism throughout the United States. It is worthy of note that nearly 10 percent of all American missionaries throughout

the world today have been trained at the Moody Institute.

Prior to his affiliation with the institute in 1942 as dean of education, Dr. Culbertson had served as a bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church in New York, a position to which he had been elected at the age of 31. Through his own ministry and years of service at Moody, he has made an invaluable contribution to the spiritual life and moral fiber of our Nation.

It is particularly noteworthy that at a time when disrespect and dissent are rampant on many of our campuses that the students and faculty of the Moody Bible Institute should wish to take this opportunity to express their love, respect, and devotion to Dr. Culbertson, who has served them so loyally and capably. I am happy to join with the many others in extending my commendation to Dr. Culbertson for a job well done and extend my best wishes for his continuing success in the future.

REFORM OF FOREIGN SERVICE THROUGH APPEALS PROCEDURES SAFEGUARDS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 13 I inserted in the RECORD two items on the experiences of two former Foreign Service officers and their efforts to vindicate themselves after having been selected out or "retired" by the Foreign Service. One item, a column by Willard Edwards in the Chicago Tribune, described the present efforts of John Hemenway in his appeals fight with the State Department. The other item, by Clark Mollenhoff of the Cowles publications, described at length the pathetic story of Charles Thomas, who committed suicide on April 12 after a 2-year fight to have his service record reviewed by the State Department to show that his long service had been meritorious and that his selection out had been a gross injustice.

Yesterday I introduced H.R. 8523, a proposal which would provide an appeals procedure for all FSO's. This bill is a revised version of H.R. 16408 which I had introduced on April 2, 1968. The suggested appeals procedure contained in both bills had been endorsed by the American Federation of Government Employees, the Nation's largest union of Government employees, in testimony before a House subcommittee in May 1968.

The state of inequity and demoralization in the Foreign Service has been with us too long. For 25 years, since the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, the public has been exposed to incredible accounts of violations of law and due process by the administrators of personnel of the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the United States Information Agency. The most recent facts of the cruel and inhuman treatment of a Foreign Service Officer, Charles W. Thomas, are making headlines today because he committed suicide.

During the last three sessions of Congress I have repeatedly called for a reform of the personnel system of both the State Department and the Foreign Service. In support of my proposals I had inserted into the RECORD during these years the cases of Stephen Koczak, John Hemenway and, most recently, Charles Thomas.

As you will recall, Stephen Koczak enjoyed a brilliant career prior to the insertion into his personnel files of documents containing false allegations, supported by backdated forgeries. In Berlin, he had correctly warned that the Soviets and their East German puppets would build the Berlin Wall. He appears also to have been the first officer outside of Warsaw itself who had discovered the spread of the tentacles of the infamous "Warsaw Sex and Spy Scandals" to Berlin, implicating his immediate superior. When he indicated his fears about his superior to the chief of mission, he became the victim of a campaign of mendacious efficiency reports and slurs to have him selected out. Despite all his efforts to obtain access to the prevarications concocted against him and to confront and cross-examine his superiors under oath, the State Department repeatedly denied him this opportunity. The Department has also avoided giving any forthright answers to congressional inquiries regarding his case.

The situation of Foreign Service Officer John Hemenway resembles that of Koczak. A brilliant officer serving in Moscow and eventually the Berlin desk officer at the State Department, Hemenway claims he was selected out principally because of his adamant insistence on preserving American security policies. Denied access to direct confrontation with his detractors, Hemenway has involved a grievance procedure to seek to uncover the facts. A three-member grievance board, headed by Paul A. Touissant, was set up to consider Hemenway's charges that he was dismissed on the basis of false and malicious accusations. Up to the present time, the Department of State has refused to provide the board with the document which the board requested to render its judgment. Board Chairman Touissant reported to the press that at the State Department "they keep telling me it is an internal document and the property of Mr. Rusk. The Department's refusal is arbitrary. I don't see how we can rule without seeing it."

The inhuman treatment of Charles Thomas, leading to the tragedy of his suicide, is known to all of us. A brilliant officer, who had accepted every assignment given to him, Thomas was cast out without any consideration of equity. The fact that highly commendable reports had been misplaced into other files during his rating periods was disregarded by the State Department. His attempts after his dismissal from the Foreign Service to obtain other jobs in private life were frustrated by the State Department, which he had to give as a reference to potential employers. Although a lawyer admitted to practice before the courts of his own State by the Supreme Court of the United States, he was victimized unto death by the gossip which the Department spread regarding his selection out.

As all of us know from the public record developed in the Otto F. Otepka case, the State Department is prepared to go to any lengths to vilify any employee who dares to defend himself or to seek due process. The Department has resorted to wiretapping, false statements, and denial of access to records, and it has even permitted its henchmen to commit perjury before a Senate committee investigating the facts.

As evidence of the need for a bill such as H.R. 8523, three recent articles are of special interest. The March 20, 1971, issue of Tactics, published by Edward Hunter, a former member of several Government intelligence agencies, a witness before both Senate and House committees, and, incidentally, the author of the term "brainwashing," reported the state of demoralization and disorganization now rampant in the State Department, leading even to "scenes of turmoil," to "wrestling matches," and to "pandemonium" at a public meeting on February 8 of Foreign Service officers. The article reported that "observers recalled nothing in the history of the Foreign Service approaching this scene in passion and violence."

The second article, appearing in the April 20, 1971, issue of Tactics, was the first public account to appear giving the reasons behind the suicide of Charles Thomas. That article stated that:

> Investigative reporting would have shown that Thomas was a brilliant class 4 Foreign Service officer who had correctly reported on subversive and Communist intrigues. He was the type of officer the United States cannot afford to lose.

The third item, appearing on May 17, 1971, in the Washington Daily News, with a front page headline stating that "State Dept. Hires Widow of Diplomat It Drove to Suicide," reports the latest State Department efforts to minimize public outcry over its inhuman treatment of Charles Thomas.

The text of H.R. 8523 along with the three above-mentioned items follow:

H.R. 8523

A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system of the Department of State and of the United States Information Agency; through the establishment of an appeals procedure for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service information officers; and through the extension of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the Foreign Service Officer Corps and the Foreign Service Staff Officer Corps

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is the sense of Congress that a permanent career service for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service information officers must be based on the career principle of an appeals procedure in personnel matters allowing a review outside the agency involved;

It is the further sense of Congress that veterans of the military services should have access to the Foreign Service under the same

conditions as they have access to the classified and competitive service of the United States.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the purposes of this Act are—

(a) to provide an appeals procedure to Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service information officers in matters of promotions and "selections out," thereby assuring them that the stringent judgments of performance are carried out uniformly, equitably, and without discrimination; and

(b) to incorporate the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act into the standards and conduct of the Foreign Service personnel systems of the Department of State and United States Information Agency.

APPOINTMENT

SEC. 3. The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 shall apply to all career appointments and assignments under the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended, except for appointment to career ministers and career ambassadors.

PROMOTION

SEC. 4. The promotion of Foreign Service officers and information officers under the provisions of sections 621 through 623, and 626 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall also conform with the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

SEPARATION AND RETIREMENT

SEC. 5. The separation and retirement of Foreign Service officers and information officers in accordance with sections 631 through 637 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall also conform with the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

APPEALS AGAINST RATINGS USED BY SELECTION PANELS

SEC. 6. "Selection-out" shall be construed as an adverse personnel action. No "selection out" of a Foreign Service officer or of a Foreign Service information officer shall be carried out without the prior provision of an appeals procedure under which the rated officer can challenge any individual efficiency report and the accuracy of any documents submitted to a selection panel. No document may be submitted to a selection panel without first having been shown to the officer being rated who shall signify that he has seen the document by signing each page of the document involved.

Appeals against individual ratings by officers, against the inclusion of contested documents, and against selection board rankings shall be permitted to an appeals board composed of one representative each of the Foreign Service, and one further representative of the Department of State not in the Foreign Service; and one representative each of the United States Information Agency and of the Civil Service Commission.

In the event of a recommendation for "selection out," an appeal, outside the United States Information Agency and Department of State, shall be permitted to a board of appeals and review empowered to reverse "selections out," composed of one of the Civil Service Commissioners or his designee, acting as chairman, and one person each nominated respectively by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and appointed to serve on call for periods of not more than two years. This appeal may be filed immediately upon notification of "selection out" to the officer but in no case later than one year from the date of actual termination of service or retirement.

PROLONGATION OF APPEAL RIGHT

SEC. 7. Any Foreign Service officer "selected out" prior to the effective date of this Bill under Sections 631 through 637 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall have the right to avail himself of the provisions of this Act, notwithstanding any other statutes of limitations, for one additional year subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

In the event of the death of the "selected out" officer prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the appeal may be filed on his behalf by a surviving dependent or annuitant.

REMEDIES PROVIDED BY APPEALS BOARD

SEC. 8. If the "selected out" officer, or survivor, wins the appeal, restitution shall include back pay, if any is due; and return to the last rank or, if equity requires, advancement to the putative rank the officer would have reached if he had not been "selected out."

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3320 of title 5 of the United States Code, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 shall apply to Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service information officers. The fact that any person who is either an applicant for or already holds, office as a Foreign Service officer, Foreign Service information officer, or Foreign Service Staff officer, is a veteran or disabled veteran, as defined in section 2108 (1) or (2) of title 5 of the United States Code, shall automatically apply to that person all the privileges and rights of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and of the sections of title 5 of the United States Code relating to veterans and disabled veterans.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall become effective immediately upon enactment.

[From Tactics, Mar. 20, 1971]

TUMULT INSIDE STATE DEPT.

The state of chaos and demoralization that exists among the personnel of the State Department and its associated foreign affairs agencies is unprecedented. Responsible officers are asking whether anyone in authority is able to distinguish between reality and illusion. Under the leadership of William P. Rogers and William B. Macomber, Jr., his deputy undersecretary of state for administration, the State Department is plunging headlong into a personnel administrative system designed to remove any objective control by the Congress, the White House and the American people over the foreign affairs bureaucracy.

The State Department is pushing an "action program" designed to force career, civilian, domestic employees into the foreign service category where they will be totally under the control of personnel immune from any kind of accountability. They will not have to account for their actions to Congress, the Civil Service Commission or the courts if they fire anyone for any reason whatsoever, whether for a legitimate reason or because the employe has discovered gross negligence or subversive behavior, and has refused to collaborate in it.

The so-called reorganization would preserve an Alger Hiss, or an American Kim Philby, in his post, and hush up or eliminate any Otto F. Otepkas without their having any recourse. Security, in the Orwellian manner, would consider anti-communists, not communists, as the "security risks" who would have to be kept out of State Department jobs.

What this boils down to is preparation by the State Department of a purge program of the few remaining persons who consider loyalty to the nation more important than covering up for the failures or transgressions of the State Department.

WATERFRONT-LIKE BRAWLING

Because of turmoil such as one might expect on the waterfront are occurring within the offices of the department, the situation has become so tense that in spite of every effort to hush up the news, at least three reporters have given accounts of the breakdown in decorum and morale. On Feb. 11, in the tabloid Washington Daily News, the hush-hush was broken by a Scripps-Howard writer who does not cover the State Department ordinarily.

He was Dan Thomasson, who disclosed that top State Department officials, including Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., executive secretary reporting directly to Rogers, and John Ray, of the European section, "blew their diplomatic aplomb and wrestled for the microphone amid screams of 'shame,' 'fascism,' and 'is this the kind of democracy we're trying to export?' "

Reporters regularly assigned to the State Department were present, and although this unprecedented affair was indisputably news, they collaborated with State Department officials in the effort at censorship. At least, Russian reporters who cover the foreign ministry in Moscow have the excuse they are not allowed to report certain news. But what alibi have the American newsmen assigned to the State Department? This is a press scandal that editors throughout the country should look into. Why should so-called reporting in-depth, with a few, heroic exceptions, be limited in Washington to what is to the advantage of the reds? This is the double standard presently being observed.

AMERICAN SURVIVAL IS INVOLVED

The wrestling match took place over what on the surface was a minor issue, union representation of State Department employees. Actually, the passions reflected a simmering into public notice of the greatest crisis in American diplomatic organization since the formation of our republic.

The basic issue is whether the State Department and other foreign affairs agencies are subject to the control of Congress and the American people, or is the State Department to run foreign policy in secret, implementing unwritten "understandings" with the USSR and Red China, totally free of any kind of accountability within or outside the government? The State Department is asking for no less than the kind of special status possessed by the CIA, despite the disparity in their roles.

The key lies in the basic attitude toward government of William P. Rogers. History may well record his influence on President Nixon as unfortunate as that of Harry Hopkins and Col. House on other comparatively recent occupants of the White House.

Rogers has developed the doctrine of executive privilege in so extreme a manner as to make it indistinguishable from enlightened despotism. Under this doctrine, Rogers holds that Congress and the American people are not entitled to any information developed within the executive branch unless it decides to release it. The inevitable result is secret government.

Rogers, as a "pragmatist," has come up with a technique for dealing with the pesty Congress and the inquisitive public. The procedure is based on the thesis that the public has no right to this information, but insists on being told, so that it has to be satisfied in some such manner as an image is devised for a public figure that will gain approval, but not really change the man's character.

Under this technique, the executive branch has to maintain a constant flow of information to the Congress and the public, to satisfy this hunger but not to disclose the essential facts. The enemy, that has its own means of finding out what it wants to know, therefore is better informed than the American people—and the Congress—on our policies. The Kim Philbys, in such an Orwellian complex, are not our security risks; the Otepkas are! This tactic, too, by generating a news-managed flow of selected data, can inspire hearings on the Hill that have the effect of

destroying the credibility of members of the Congress.

The procedures and philosophy behind this resemble, in the Anglo-Saxon world, the conflicts between the Stuart kings and the British parliament. The result was the destruction of both the executive and the legislative branches, and the creation of the heavy-handed, Cromwell dictatorship.

COULD BECOME ELECTION ISSUE

On Feb. 28, 1971, in an unusually long comment in the Washington Sunday Star, Philip Shandler, a reporter on federal employe matters, stated that the issues at the State Department already have "embroiled top administration officials in an intensive debate, the outcome of which could become an issue in next year's presidential election."

The article, that warranted news space but was limited to Shandler's "The Federal Spotlight" column, dealt only with the issue of "how much freedom should the State Department have—in contrast to other government agencies—to assign its employes?" Executive Order 11491, issued by Nixon little over a year ago, provided for grievance appeals by employes to a third party, the Labor Department.

"The State Department last fall, however, requested exemption from the order for foreign service employes . . . The department sought to preserve the present system of in-house appeals to a board of high-level department officials."

What Macomber wants is to block any sort of review of personnel policies outside the department. Otepka had the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission, and there also is the Department of Labor. By exempting the foreign service from the executive order, the Labor Department would be excluded. By converting Civil Service employes to foreign service status, the Civil Service would be excluded. Only Rogers and Macomber would decide who was hired, fired, transferred, promoted, downgraded or reassigned.

Not only the present foreign service, but the entire State Department would be converted into a new CIA-type organization, with no ties to Congress, other executive departments, the courts or the American people. All of this would be put across without any act of Congress!

Originally, Macomber tried to carry out this operation by direct appeal to the Federal Labor Relations Council, on Oct. 14, 1970, asking it to approve exemption of the entire foreign service from the executive order when it was next revised.

The alert intervention of the American Federation of Government Employes (AFGE), which demanded a public hearing by the council, blocked this quickie operation from succeeding. A public hearing took place on Nov. 16, when the AFGE and other groups marshalled a set of Constitutional, legal, administrative and political arguments that overwhelmed those presented by Macomber.

On Jan. 30, the Federal Labor Relations Council sent the White House its opinion on the request, indicating the options available to the President, and recommending that he reject it. This would not affect other changes in the executive order that would add efficiency and precision. Nixon is said to want this done.

Macomber was informed by "an unimpeachable source" at the White House of the council's adverse action. He was told that if he could get agreement within 48 hours from the American Foreign Service Association, which the State Department controls and uses as a front, he might salvage or even recoup his losses. On the Jan. 30–31 weekend, Macomber and members of the AFSA board worked out a paper agreement to this end.

The AFSA board had no right to make such an agreement because its rank and file members at a meeting on Nov. 4 had specifically resolved that the board hold no secret meetings with Macomber.

"DEAR BILL" LETTERS EXCHANGED

Therefore, to conceal violation of this order, Macomber on Feb. 1 wrote a "Dear Bill" letter to William C. Harrop, AFSA board chairman, proposing the agreement they already had negotiated. On the same day, Harrop called an extraordinary meeting of the entire board and informed it that Macomber needed an affirmative, written reply within 24 hours, to transmit to the White House if the Secretary of State and the State Department were not to be discredited.

The board agreed, and Macomber received it the next day, Feb. 2, which he sent at once to the White House, saying this created a new situation, showing the employes themselves were in favor of the Rogers-Macomber project, which in turn was only a rehash of the bill that Congress rejected in 1966, when it was pushed by Macomber's predecessor, William P. Crockett. (See Jan. 20 TACTICS.)

Thus we are presented an example of the extent to which the State Department will go in trying to put over one of its schemes, including even the White House among the victims of its deceits. If only this skill would be exercised against our communist enemies!

Since the agreement was unauthorized by the grassroots membership, the AFSA board immediately sought to convince the board of the Junior Foreign Service Officers Club (JFSOC), a constituent subsidiary of AFSA, also to acquiesce. The club stands close to the grassroots, and its officers refused to concur, claiming the AFSA board had exceeded its powers.

Thereupon, the five-member JFSOC board drafted a letter of protest to Macomber, calling AFSA's agreement null and void, and asking that Macomber notify the White House accordingly. On Feb. 3, two members of the JFSOC board delivered the letter to Macomber's secretary, who immediately rushed it to him.

MACOMBER CALLS THEM "TRAITORS"

The two junior foreign service officers (FSO's) were walking down the corridor to take the elevator back to their offices when Macomber came running out of his office. He caught up with them, took them by the arm, and led them back to his office.

There, for 70 minutes, he swore at them, berated them, and called them "traitors" because they had drafted a letter for further communication to the White House. He said they were disloyal to the foreign service, for not solving all differences within its confines.

What transpired during these dramatic 70 minutes presented, in personal terms, the basic issue involved "in organizational loyalty" as contrasted with national loyalty. This was the crux of the Otepka case. The issue is whether the foreign service is answerable, in actual practice, to Congress and the President, or only to its senior members.

After berating the two, Macomber turned on the charm and assured them that any problem they or other officers encountered always could be resolved in a friendly fashion. His door always would be open so there never was any need to go anywhere else in Washington to make a point or present a grievance.

Then Macomber said, I just won't accept your letter. So far as I am concerned, it doesn't exist. I hope, now that you understand the situation, you will pick it up and take it away, and we will forget the whole incident.

The two, bullied FSO's picked up the letter and took it away with them. Thus, a formal note to the State Department and the President became a non-event, and ceased to be part of the record.

Macomber, to avoid charges of unfair labor practices by the AFGE, that had not been consulted, sent it a letter written along the same lines as the Feb. 1 letter to Harrop. AFGE, however, received it only on Feb. 3, the day after Macomber had already delivered the AFSA reply to the White House, thus attempting to create a fait accompli.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGE

On Feb. 4, AFGE replied, and distributed 3,000 copies of its letter at the State Department, Civil Service Commission, USIA and AID. The letter to Macomber declared: "We cannot in good conscience encourage Foreign Service personnel to participate in a system which calls for review of management decisions by the Board of the Foreign Service—a management appointed, management controlled body . . .

"I am sure that you can appreciate our concern over the events of the last four days and why we are therefore requesting our National Headquarters to review the facts for the possible service of a formal unfair labor practice charge against the Department of State."

The letter, on the stationery of the AFGE unit at the State Department, #1534, was signed by John G. Kenney, president of the chapter. While expressing "distress" over the State Department's conduct, it "unequivocally" rejected the proposal.

Macomber wrote JFSOC a similar letter as sent AFGE. The junior foreign service officers in reply reasserted their previous stand. When handed to Macomber, the new letter was accepted this time without any outburst.

Then, on Feb. 8, the American Foreign Service Association held a so-called "informational meeting" in the State Department auditorium. The AFSA board told the membership of the events of the past week, leaving out the secret meetings with Macomber on Jan. 30 and 31 and Macomber's tirade against the two FSO's on Feb. 3, when he called them "traitors."

This, of course, was a revealing as well as an upside-down use of the word, treason.

The meeting was chaired by Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., a top management, "old school tie" officer from Boston, who informed the members that no motions would be accepted from the floor and no resolutions passed. Consequently, the meeting was without power, he said, to instruct the board regarding the Feb. 1 agreement with Macomber.

This cavalier position naturally infuriated the rank and file members, as well as many others, who stamped with their feet, and cried, "Fascism . . . shame!" John Ray, of the European bureau, insisted on introducing a resolution instructing the board to withdraw its letter of agreement. Eliot ruled it out of order, whereupon Ray went to the podium to ask for a vote.

Eliot blocked his passage, pushing him away. Ray then eluded Eliot and dashed to the microphone.

The two thereupon wrestled for the microphone while the audience of more than 700 diplomats broke into pandemonium, as if at a boxing match.

Observers recalled nothing in the history of the foreign service approaching this scene in passion and violence. Yet this was an audience only of foreign service officers, all of whom had passed difficult written and oral examinations and had been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and again whenever promoted. This was of very special significance. Of equal significance was the almost complete failure of the press and the complete failure of the radio-television media to report this important news. Publishers and editors throughout the country might want to inquire of their syndicates why this was not reported.

WHERE FOREIGN POLICY IS MADE

This scene represented a protest of the deepest concern to every American worried about conditions under which foreign policy

is made. The protest, by responsible and sober, highly educated experts in their fields is an index to the degree to which the State Department has deteriorated. The present control by Rogers and Macomber simply continues the maneuvers in past administrations to cover up by every possible means the insecure way in which our foreign policy is devised and manipulated. How foreign agents must love it!

The reasons for covering up are evident. Foreign policy today is being made in the State Department by a secret clique whose interests are not tied to the Congress and to the American people, but to similar elements in foundations, universities and large international interests which pursue their own goals without the knowledge and inspection by the President and the Congress.

While these bizarre events were occurring, Macomber asked Rogers to intervene directly at the White House to reverse the findings of the Federal Labor Relations Council. The proposals they now are offering are a so-called compromise that still would exempt the foreign service from the executive order.

The White House, under this Rogers-Macomber pressure, has instructed the Council to study the "compromise," but not to reveal its terms to anyone, not even in Congress. Consequently, a veil of secrecy has again fallen over the affair.

Simultaneously, Macomber has intensified his campaign to exclude the Civil Service Commission as an appeals body. There would be no Civil Service employees in the State Department. All would be foreign service personnel, even those who never went overseas.

The State Department argues that this operation is legal, not because it was approved by the Congress, but because Congress had heard of it and had not acted adversely. This was an even greater extension of the Rogers doctrine on executive privilege, because it asserts that any department can make law simply by administrative trespass. If the busy Congress does not catch on, or not find the time to react, it would be interpreted as approval.

WHAT LINE IS BEING USED ON NIXON?

Why would a President, such as Nixon, who is concerned about reducing government power, tolerate such an unprecedented and dangerous situation? Unquestionably, he has been told that these powers would be used by Rogers and his henchmen to cleanse the State Department of the unreliables and holdovers.

Even if so, Congress still would have reason for alarm over why it is kept in the dark. But as history repeatedly shows, practically every such move is designed not to clean out the wrongdoers, but to cover over their secrets and prevent their being held to account, while additional questionable personnel are being infiltrated into the organization.

Nobody who has the best interests of the nation at heart opposes a reform of the State Department. But it is clear from the record of the present State Department management that this is not the goal of the "reorganization" and "reform." Under this, a Hiss could become undersecretary of state and in charge of national security. Indeed, this was the trend that already was underway at the time that Hiss held a topmost State Department post.

The new recommendations would accelerate the process.

The unprecedented tumult of Feb. 8 in the State Department's auditorium, therefore, had every reason for breaking out. The issues were not the comparatively minor ones of management-labor relations, but the survival of the nation.

Involved were the right of the people, maintained by Congress, and our capacity as a great power to meet the challengers of the 1970s.

Yes, this could be an election issue!

[From Tactics, Apr. 20, 1971]

STATE DEPT.'S COUNTER-REFORM—INTRIGUE GETTING WHITE HOUSE AID

The tension and crises within the State Department, stemming from the Rogers-Macomber maneuver to remove the last vestiges of Congressional control over the department's personnel, has spread to other agencies in the government, and affected even the White House. The intrigue is twofold. First, its intent is to remove all Foreign Service personnel from the provisions of Executive Order 11491, that provides federal employes with an appeals mechanism through the Department of Labor. Second, it seeks to transform all domestic Civil Service employes into so-called foreign service personnel, thus depriving them of their present rights of appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

These rights are of particular importance at this time, beyond usual employe-employer relationships, because the promised reform of the State Department by President Nixon is being accomplished in reverse. A quiet purge is taking place of those whose dossiers show they have correctly analyzed communist policy in the past, and accurately warned of communist projects, such as the building of the Berlin Wall and the invasion of South Korea.

A major part of this counter-reform is the destruction of the security section, and the replacement of experienced specialists by career men for whom the security office is a way station in a diplomatic career. Anti-communists are treated as security risks, not those who are pro-red.

A few names of those hounded and persecuted by the State Department because of proven accuracy on communist policy and aggressions have become known to the public, such as Otto F. Otepka and John P. Hemenway, but literally hundreds of foreign service and Civil Service employes are being penalized or fired behind the scenes.

SUICIDE RESULT OF THIS HOUNDING

The Washington newspapers, for instance, ran a few paragraphs on their obituary page on Apr. 14 about the suicide "by gunshot wounds to the head" of the former foreign service officer, Charles W. Thomas, only 48. Editors hardly a generation ago would have sent out a reporter to find out why such a man had killed himself. Such initiative nowadays is being used only on behalf of Marxists and revolutionaries generally.

Investigative reporting would have shown that Thomas was a brilliant, class 4 foreign service officer who had correctly reported on subversive and communist intrigues. He was the type of officer the United States cannot afford to lose. He is precisely the type being liquidated under Rogers.

Thomas was "selected out" by the last panel of the State Department under Dean Rusk, and his date of termination was July 31, 1969, in the first half year of the Nixon Administration. Like other patriotic foreign service officers he had hoped that the Rogers State Department would usher in an improved climate. Surely the Nixon Administration, with Chile as a warning, could recognize his brilliant alerts on the hostility to the U.S. of the revolutionary groups in Latin America and in the Caribbean.

But this was exactly what was not wanted on the record. On Mar. 2, 1971, William B. Macomber, as deputy undersecretary for administration, sent a smear letter, in concealing doubletalk, about him to an inquiring senator.

State Department blacklisting, as is usual in such cases, kept him from employment elsewhere. This is exactly what such conscientious officers are warned will happen, as part of the pressure. In despair, but "too much of a gentleman" to go to the press, he shot himself. His two daughters and wife can be proud he refused to betray his oath of office.

This unsavory climate has brought depression, fear and outrage into the State Department. Frustrated officers, as never before, have engaged in shouting and screaming matches, even petty fights.

Those known for their past firm policies on the Soviet Union and Red China, or for support of Nixon, are planning to organize, and to set up a fund for their protection against punitive firing or transfer to distant, unwanted posts. A subcommittee has been formed in local 1534 of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) to raise a fund, apart from union dues, and to pay for court actions.

ROGERS-MACOMBER'S DUAL PROGRAM

William P. Rogers and Macomber have launched a dual program. First, professional group and employee union leaders who collaborate are offered promotions and other advantages. Macomber has started inviting them to his Cathedral Ave. home for fine dinners with vintage wines. Secondly, U. Alexis Johnson, undersecretary of state, is similarly courting junior foreign service officers, whose careers depend on him.

Rogers and Macomber tried to put across the exemption of foreign service personnel from executive order 11491 by direct appeal to the Federal Labor Relations Council on Oct. 14, 1970. This leaked, and Macomber was forced to attend a council hearing where he was unable to gain consent. Indeed, the Congress had turned down much the same thing. [See TACTICS of Jan. 20 and Mar. 20.] Macomber then turned to Rogers to take advantage of his special relationship with Nixon.

Rogers accordingly, in secret, got the President to sign an extraordinary document. Written by Rogers on White House stationery, dated Mar. 11, it was entitled "Memorandum for Honorable Robert E. Hampton, Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Council."

This document overruled the council, instructing it to accept, as a fait accompli, the exclusion of all foreign service personnel from the executive order, effective immediately. This is being implemented, although technically, a provision was included that enforcement was dependent on the State Department developing a "separate program . . . acceptable to the Council." The document ended, with finality, "This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register." This, in effect, made it a separate executive order binding on all parties and amending executive order 11491.

The memorandum thus transfers all foreign service personnel out of the category of "regular civilian employes" into the category of the CIA and other intelligence and secret agencies. None of these answer to Congress, and in all, personnel is handled through "selection out," not reviewed by outside parties.

Frank Shakespeare, USIA director, was pressured into falling in line, converting all civil service employes into foreign service personnel, including even those persons at the Voice of America who scarcely can speak English, and would not be sent abroad.

Transfers already confirm that the main motive of the Rogers-Macomber element is to eliminate all who have knowledge of Soviet and Red Chinese machinations against the U.S. About 75 to 85 per cent of the "selected out" are identifiable as "suspicious of Soviet and Chinese communist policies."

Included are those who wish to maintain America's NATO ties and support Free China. Middle East experts who repeatedly warned of Soviet penetration of the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Ocean also have been transferred to posts making them ineffective.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 17, 1971]

STATE DEPT. HIRES WIDOW OF DIPLOMAT IT DROVE TO SUICIDE

(By Dan Thomasson)

The State Department has hired at about $15,000 a year the widow of a career diplomat who killed himself after a fruitless, two-year effort to win a department hearing on his protests that he had been unfairly mustered out of the Foreign Service.

The widow is Mrs. Cynthia Thomas, 34, mother of two, a graduate in international relations from Sarah Lawrence College who had aided her husband in his overseas assignments but never had held a State Department post.

Her husband, Charles Thomas, 48, had been a diplomat for 18 years before being notified that he would be forced to leave the service in 1969 because he had failed of promotion.

NO HEARING

In the following two years he was unable either to win a hearing or to find other suitable employment. He was turned down for a number of jobs as being overqualified. At one point he and his wife even turned to seeking work as domestic servants.

One day recently, with no outward sign that it had become too much, he finished repairing a fence at home, went into the house and shot himself with a gun.

"I guess he felt he was worth more to me and our two children dead than alive," said Mrs. Thomas, who now can collect the $320-a-month government annuity he had been prevented from collecting until he was 65.

Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., who with Sen. John Sherman Cooper, R-Ky. had sought unsuccessfully to help Mr. Thomas win a department hearing, was advised May 7 by deputy under secretary of state William McComber Jr. that he had decided to hire Mrs. Thomas.

"SELECTED OUT"

Mr. Thomas first came to Sen. Bayh's attention last summer when an Indiana attorney with whom Mr. Thomas had gone to school complained Mr. Thomas had been "selected out" of the Foreign Service because of failure to advance. The "selected out" system requires the dropping of all Foreign Service officers who haven't been promoted within a certain period of time.

The attorney noted that Mr. Thomas, who had grown up as an orphan in Indiana, was an ex-Navy fighter pilot with three degrees, two of them in law. He was fluent in two foreign languages and conversant in four others and had held a number of important posts since joining the service in 1951.

Sen. Bayh investigated and became convinced that Mr. Thomas' failure to earn promotion involved bureaucratic bungling and a stubborn refusal by State Department officials to accept favorable reports on his work from his superiors.

A recommendation for Mr. Thomas' immediate promotion from foreign service inspector Robert McClintock had been misfiled. A letter from ambassador to Mexico Fulton Freeman praising Mr. Thomas and urging his advancement had been ruled out of consideration.

Sen. Bayh found Mr. Thomas' record was studded with laudatory remarks from superiors and that even the reports of those reviewing his record for promotion showed no reason for his having been turned down.

INTRODUCE LEGISLATION

It was while he was serving as the chief U.S. spokesman on science at the UNESCO conference in Paris in mid-1968 that he was notified that he would be forced to leave the service in 1969. Ironically the paper he prepared on that conference has won high praise in diplomatic circles.

Within the next few weeks Sen. Bayh will introduce legislation to force the State Department to give employes a chance for a grievance hearing in firing and promotional matters—a right afforded to workers in every government agency except the Foreign Service.

Meanwhile, Mr. McComber has assured Mrs. Thomas and Sen. Bayh that her State Department job will in no way compromise her efforts to win retroactive reinstatement for her husband.

"That really is my goal," she said. She said she wants the reinstatement to include his promotion for several years back. She said she would use money due from back pay to establish a fund to reward excellence on the part of young Foreign Service officers.

"My husband believed in merit," she said "And I want him to be rewarded for his excellence."

HUNGARY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian population has long been forced to live under Communist domination. The people of this nation—with its rich, cultural traditions and many contributions to civilization—have been stripped of their right to individuality, personal dignity, and free choice. Hungary is a captive nation.

Americans who have loved ones in Hungary must endure many hardships when trying to contact their friends and relatives. I recently received a letter from a constituent who escaped from Hungary in 1956 and is now a naturalized American citizen. He describes the indignities he and his family had to undergo when they returned to Hungary to visit their dying father.

Here is a firsthand description of some of the conditions that do exist in Hungary today. Surely, after reading this letter, one must feel a sense of commitment to the plight of Hungarians and indeed of all captive nations.

The letter follows:

CONGRESSMAN HOGAN: Recently my family and I had to return to Hungary, because my father was dying. We had no time to obtain a visa in the United States, however; the Hungarian Embassy assured us that we could acquire our visa at the airport in Hungary, with no problem. This was not the case, because when we arrived on March 30, 1971, we were detained for four hours. During this time a gentleman took our passports and interrogated me about my personal life, such as, "Were you in the military, how long were you in the army, what outfit and what was my rank?"

I told him that I objected to his questions, and did not think this was a requirement to obtain a visa. He then stated that if one Hungarian comes to the United States he has to fill out two-hundred pages of questions, so therefore I have to answer his. By this time I could only assume that I was being interrogated. He again began asking me questions, this time about my police life. "What rank was I as a policeman and what did I do as a policeman?" Finally, I was disgusted with his questions and told him, "My dear sir, I am strongly against your interrogation and I refuse to answer anymore questions about my personal life, I either get the visa now, or I would like to return home."

After a moment of silence he said that he would give us a visa for one day. I then told my wife what was occurring. She couldn't believe that this was really happening, and also feared that I might be arrested. Therefore, she wanted to leave as quickly as possible. I then told the gentleman we had decided to leave, to which he acted surprised and said whatever you wish. He said there was a one hour wait for the last plane to Vienna, Austria. Also, the man said our luggage was not easy to find and he returned to his office with our passports and did not return until our plane had left.

By this time I felt that things were not as good as advertised by the Hungarian Government in the United States. We finally agreed to stay, and he told us that if we wished to stay longer than one day I would have to go to another office inside Budapest, without my wife and child, at 10:00 a.m. This was obviously a setup for further interrogation. We decided to go to the American Council first. There we conferred with a Mr. Sheldon who was shocked at what was happening, but assured us that nothing would happen, and if it did he would aid us. Mr. Sheldon told us that if we had any more problems to let them know that we had been to the American Council.

We arrived at 10:00 a.m., Nepszabadsa 6–St. 93, to obtain our visa. My family and I went to room No. 4, where an unsmiling woman started to ask questions. She wanted to know why I had brought my family since I was told not to. I replied that my family goes where I go. She then gave me a form to have my mother sign, and she kept our passports. I did not think we should be wandering around the city without a passport, so, I returned to her office and asked for same, and she said she needed them for information. I then stated we had been to the American Council, and right away she returned our passports. She then conferred with another gentleman, and after their conference she granted us a visa for three days only.

We finally saw my father who I found in a deplorable condition. He died three days after we left Hungary, which meant that the whole purpose of my trip was done in vain, because I was supposed to be there to help my mother with the funeral and in her grief.

I feel that their treatment of me and my family was outrageous and inhuman. I would like to know out of 30,000 Hungarians that go back to Hungary each year, how many of them talk. How many of them are being interrogated, and how much information does the Hungarian Government obtain from this. This is why I am writing this letter, in hopes that someone will do something about it.

We are back from prison, which is what Hungary is, and we are very proud to be American Citizens. All the people that do not like this country can go back behind the Iron Curtain where they keep the people in Hungary, with barbed wire fences, mines and soldiers patrolling it with German Shepherd dogs and watching from their watch towers.

EXTENSION OF THE TERRITORIAL SEA

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have become concerned recently with the activity of foreign vessels fishing off U.S. coastal waters. In recent years, extensive fishing by foreign vessels in these waters has caused serious deple-

tion in fish stocks. Some stocks, haddock in particular, are in danger of being completely wiped out. In addition, the intense competition for fish has produced obstructive tactics to which our fishermen have been subjected, causing substantial financial loss in gear, labor, and catch. The most recent incidents of harassment occurred on May 8, 11, 12, and 13. New England lobstermen were reportedly subjected to harassment by Soviet fishermen approximately 80 miles off Nantucket Island.

Consequently, in order to insure the conservation of fisheries resources off our coasts, and to protect the economic interests of American fishermen—including the unhindered access of U.S. fishermen to their traditional grounds—I am introducing H.R. 8424 to extend the limit of the U.S. territorial sea from 3 to 200 miles. According to the bill, in accordance with longstanding principles of international law, foreign vessels will be free to traverse the territorial sea of the United States in innocent passage.

LAST STAND OF IMPERIALISTS

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the debate on the proposal by Senator MANSFIELD to reduce by half the number of American forces in Europe is approaching. The administration has recruited former Government leaders, all of whom were architects of the policies which stationed American forces in Europe.

The commitment of a large portion of our Armed Forces to duty in Europe may have made good sense in the years immediately following the Second World War. The European countries, feeling themselves in peril, were too poor and too weak to assure their own defense. But yesterday's news shows that this is no longer the case. The balance of payments on the official settlements basis—representing the accumulation of potential claims against the U.S. Treasury by other countries—reached a record quarterly high of $5.5 billion. And most of these claims are held by the European countries which have now regained complete economic vigor. They are certainly capable of assuring their own defense.

The presence of American forces in Europe symbolizes our commitment to the defense of Europe and our belief that the defense of the United States begins in Europe. But there is no good reason why that symbol must be maintained at such high and costly levels as at present.

In a thoughtful and perceptive column, published today, Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden report that the "old guard" is defending a policy that no longer meets the need or the temper of the times. They may win their case today, mainly because Soviet Premier Brezhnev has just announced that he is prepared to negotiate on troops reductions in Europe. This is a positive gesture, but there are ample reasons for the kind of cutback that Senator MANSFIELD is proposing even without an immediate quid pro quo. Of course, we should allow sufficient time for consultation with our allies about the effects of a partial withdrawal. Of course, we should seek mutual troop withdrawals in Europe. But that does not mean we should abdicate our commonsense and fail to recognize the kind of changes the Messrs. Mankiewicz and Braden discuss.

In the gathering of "the old guard," I am sure that General Eisenhower, were he alive, would not be counted. For this statesman and soldier recommended years ago that we should reduce our forces in Europe to one or two divisions. How much more valid are his arguments today, when we still have the equivalent of more than four divisions stationed there. He spoke when we believed that our forces were greatly outnumbered. Now we know they are not, and there can be no reason to ignore his advice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the brilliant column by Messrs. Mankiewicz and Braden, "Last Stand of the Imperialists," be printed at this point in the RECORD, followed by General Eisenhower's article of 1963 as printed in the Saturday Evening Post of October 26, 1963.

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

LAST STAND OF IMPERIALISTS

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

Sometime—perhaps in the year 2,000—historians may look back upon the gathering at the White House last week and conclude that it was the last stand of the imperialists.

There was Dean G. Acheson, John J. McCloy, Lucius D. Clay, George W. Ball, Henry Cabot Lodge. The names read as though from old newspaper clippings: one caught oneself with the question, "Is Lovett still alive?"

But most of the rest were there—the last surviving veterans of the cold war, the Marshall Plan, Greek-Turkish aid and the Great Debate of 1950 which ended in the commitment to send four divisions to Europe. They were gathered at the behest of the President to defeat a proposal by Sen. Mike Mansfield to send half those troops back home. Nor is there much doubt that these last scions of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry L. Stimson will win the battle. But they will win it because Soviet Premier Brezhnev intervened with an expression of interest in troop withdrawals. They will win it on a technicality, not on points.

For the old guard is departing the scene. In their day, these men, and superiors now in their graves created an American empire unparalleled in history. They signed defense treaties with 42 nations, kept three and a half million men under arms, nearly half of that number overseas; they built or bought 2,200 military bases in 33 countries; they spent since World War II on defense alone more than a trillion dollars, and lent dependent nations $150 billion more. And they are through, as surely as they are old. For their countrymen no longer believe in the credo to which they devoted their public lives.

Consider, if you will, the difference between what the old guard thinks, and what most Americans think, bearing in mind, that most Americans are now under 30 years of age.

The basic consideration of the old leaders was that the whole point of foreign policy was to stop communism in the interest of "the Free World."

Young America does not believe that opposition to communism per se is a worthwhile goal. It is not clear to them why Communist Cuba is more evil than free Haiti.

The old men believed that any trouble anywhere in the world was due to Communist influence, that communism was on the march, ready to take advantage of the slightest turmoil in order to confound the "Free World."

Young America thinks of the Soviet Union as status-quo oriented, seeking advantages to be sure, but in no different manner than do we.

The old men believed that communism was monolithic; the young think nationalism is the stronger force. The old men believe the United States must play a strong role in Europe, working for integration, solving the problem of divided Germany. The young think Europe has recovered and should ensure its own defense. The old men think the phrase "national security" means defending the "Free World."

The young think national security means the solution of domestic problems—race, poverty, ecology. They are interested in Vietnam, but only because they regard what their country is doing there as immoral. They are not at all interested in NATO.

Which side is right? Historians may say that the cold warriers, having stopped Joe Stalin, kept the war going out of habit and momentum. But when present day revisionist historians speak of the sins of Dean Acheson, it is useful to reflect that fashions change: Frank Kellogg won the Nobel Peace Prize.

Perhaps the crux of the generation gap is that the older men have their eyes turned abroad; the young look inward.

And so, though Sen. Mansfield's proposal will probably not pass, it seems as sure to pass eventually, as, in a different sense, will the generation which won the cold war. The numbers are on the other side. The age of American imperialism is about to end.

LET'S BE HONEST WITH OURSELVES

(By Dwight D. Eisenhower)

Our country's responsibility for helping to maintain world peace, for meeting and turning back the enslaving forces of Communism, for aiding the family of free nations to build for a more secure future—these are not distant and apart from our daily life. Rather they are an extension of it. The character and strength the United States brings to world councils can only reflect the inner courage, strength and wisdom we have developed as a nation. This is national morale, and it is my unshakable conviction that morale, even more than sheer power, is the deciding factor in the fate of a nation. I recall vividly the inspiring example of Great Britain in the early years of World War II, when that nation seemed on the verge of defeat and ruin. Yet despite her bitter losses and reverses, her people had the morale—and little else—to keep on fighting until the tide turned.

This is the kind of morale that inspired Washington at Valley Forge, Lincoln after Chancellorsville, our nation after Pearl Harbor. In peace such inner strength enables us to be purposeful and firm, without being truculent; and if ever again we should have to face the test of war, that kind of morale will be absolutely essential to our survival.

In this nuclear age any prospect of war may seem unthinkable, but *think* about it we must, as long as any threat exists. As a practical matter, I do not believe that war between the United States and Russia is inevitable, as some people insist, because these two nations now have too much knowledge of and respect for the nuclear strength of each other. Each has too much to lose. But if we face the facts of life, we know that the threat itself cannot be wished out of existence as long as the two great powers of the world, motivated by mutually antagonistic philosophies, have vast arsenals of nuclear warheads and the missiles to deliver these weapons to any point of the globe. We cannot abate our efforts to achieve a world of law. Yet until that achievement we must continue to live indefinitely in an uneasy armed truce, constantly alert to see that a potential enemy does not gain any decisive advantage over us.

Frankly, without in the least minimizing the perils of nuclear war, I am more immediately concerned over the schemes of a militant Communism to achieve world domination by other means. These will severely test the staying power of self-government—the self-discipline of democratic peoples. We all know, in a general way, of the Communists' plans to communize and dominate the people of the earth by whatever means promise success in a given situation—subversion, infiltration, disruption, terrorism, coup d' état. The one thing of which we can be absolutely sure is that the Communists will continue—with a zeal for an unworthy purpose that we can scarcely understand—to probe for weak spots in democracy, seeking to break down cooperation between free nations. They will not hesitate to use military or quasi-military force, as they have in Korea, Cuba, Vietnam and Laos, whenever they see an opportunity to catch us off balance. We must have the will to continue this tedious and costly struggle.

In our dealings with the Communists—and we must deal with them one way or another in this world—I believe we should keep reminding ourselves that the basic conflict between their system and ours is a moral one. Our form of government is based on deep-rooted spiritual values which go beyond man himself. These are spelled out in the familiar phrases of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights. . . ." The generating force of our democratic government is a belief in these God-given rights and in man's inner obligation to deal fairly and honestly with his fellows.

The Communists see our moral precepts as a direct threat to their ideology, which starts by denying these priceless principles. They deny that the individual has either a soul or unalienable rights, viewing him as little more than an educated animal, subservient to an all-powerful state. Their atheistic, materialistic doctrine therefore justifies ruthless domination over others, including summary executions of innocent people—practices that to us are morally and legally abominable.

On the evidence it seems clear that the Communist leaders realize that our free system is far more appealing to most human beings than anything they have to offer. If they did not so believe, why do they prevent free elections in their satellite nations? They fear, and rightly so, that Communism never can exist permanently side by side with prosperous, self-governing nations. To save the system to which they are dedicated, they zealously believe they must destroy competing forms of government by any means. They are deterred only by risks that appear to them to be unacceptable.

From a practical, day-to-day standpoint, this means that we must judge all negotiations with Communist nations with our eyes wide open to their long-range goals. For example, we dare not interpret the new treaty for suspension of nuclear tests in terms of a "breakthrough" toward peace in the Cold War. We would be abandoning our common sense if we considered it as evidence that the organic nature of Russian Communism had changed. At the same time, we should do everything within reason, and consistent with our own security, to lessen the areas of tension and reduce humanity's nuclear risks.

If the Russians observe the agreement, the world will, of course, gain a greater margin of safety from radioactive fallout. We all could breathe a bit easier, literally and figuratively, but we should know by now that Soviet Russia cares little for the pledged word, or for the opinion of mankind. I remember only too well when, in 1958, I authorized a moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere for a fixed period. The Soviets, far from feeling any obligation to relieve the fears of humanity, rapidly prepared a vast series of explosions which greatly increased the radioactivity in the atmosphere. Although we had then been well ahead of the Russians in nuclear techniques, these tests indicated that in certain sectors the situation may have changed. We know that they have exploded more-powerful nuclear bombs than we then had in our arsenal—one of them being of at least 58-megaton force.

Many of our scientists believe that such massive bombs represent mainly a propaganda gain, a means of spreading fear among unthinking people, and not a military advance. They point out that, first, both sides have more than enough nuclear power to destroy each other and, second, that several well-placed 10-megaton bombs would do more actual damage than one 100-megaton weapon. In any case, our past experience with Soviet Russia clearly demonstrates that we must be on guard against any cheating on the treaty.

Despite these doubts, I expressed my belief that the treaty must be tried. Most nations are desperately anxious to see a halt to radioactive pollution of the air they breathe; and more than 90, I was told, had signed the treaty even before the U.S. Senate had an opportunity to act on it. All these peoples have fervent hopes that this limited agreement may lead to other steps for lessening of tensions—and ultimately to genuine disarmament. We should pray that those hopes are realized in full—but at the same time we cannot afford to let unsubstantiated optimism blind us to the fact that the treaty itself is scarcely more than an experiment.

We should keep in mind, too, that the sudden decision of Soviet Russia to sign this partial test ban did not spring from any newfound spirit of friendship and cooperation. While Russian motives are always hidden, we can speculate that the men in the Kremlin may have wanted to ease tensions and perhaps set the stage for possible aid on Russia's western flank while engaged in an apparently bitter ideological dispute with Red China. We have no way of knowing whether or not this schism between the two Communist powers is genuine or is a massive hoax designed to weaken the unity of the free world. If it is genuine, we may find practicable means of deepening and widening that breach, thus seriously diminishing the total thrust of Communism. But again we must remember that the two Communist powers are not quarreling about their goal of world domination, but merely about the methods by which they seek to achieve it.

In any case, the security of the free nations must depend on their continued close cooperation to meet the challenges of totalitarianism, whatever form these may take. We should put our lesser quarrels into this perspective, work out friendly settlements, and get on with the overriding job of making democracy work. Just as among members of a family, there will always be differences of opinion, but we should be able to thresh these out without breaking up the furniture.

In the newspapers these days I read much about the supposed shortcomings of many of the nations with whom we are associated in mutual-security efforts. It is true that few countries could say in all candor that they are fully meeting all of their own responsibilities. Many obviously are not carrying their fair share of the military and economic load. Others are not facing up to the reforms which are essential to their own sound development. Some are seeking a temporary advantage, at grave risk to their long-range future, by playing both sides against the middle in the Cold War.

However, before pointing fingers in other directions, I strongly feel that the United States must look to certain of its own glaring deficiencies—especially its lack of a sound federal financial policy. Others might place different problems, such as lack of a consistent long-range policy in foreign aid, in higher priority; but I put our fiscal situation as No. 1 because, unless we get on a sound track financially, we may undermine our whole structure.

I have written before in these pages on the dangers of overspending and government-inspired inflation, but I want to reemphasize that this is not an isolated domestic problem. It projects an image of weakness, not strength, to the world. It threatens the world's confidence in the integrity of our money. There is much concern because our international-payments deficit now is running at the rate of $5.2 billion a year, and the Administration has proposed various regulations and taxes to discourage the investment of American capital abroad. However, such temporary and restrictive expedients merely deal more with symptoms than with the basic disease itself. We know that the sound, long-range answer is to get our federal spending under control and work toward balanced budgets and dollars of assured buying power, as well as to minimize unnecessary and undesirable expenditures abroad. This is not an easy solution, but it is the only way to give ourselves and the world solid proof that we have the self-discipline to protect the integrity of our monetary system.

As one part of such a program I believe the United States has the right and the duty of insisting that her NATO partners assume more of the burden of defending Western Europe. When I went back to Europe in 1951 to command the forces of NATO, the United States agreed to supply the equivalent of six infantry divisions which were to be regarded as an emergency reinforcement of Europe while our hard-hit allies were rebuilding their economies and capabilities for supporting defense. Now, 12 years later, those forces somewhat reinforced, are still there.

Though for eight years in the White House I believed and announced to my associates that a reduction of American strength in Europe should be initiated as soon as European economies were restored, the matter was then considered too delicate a political question to raise. I believe the time has now come when we should start withdrawing some of those troops. I know that such a move would have many repercussions. Although we have invested billions of dollars in air and naval bases and have built up a supply system all over Europe, to say nothing of the billions we have spent in developing the deterrent power for the entire Free World, all this does not seem to have the same effect of "showing the flag" as far as Europeans are concerned, as the presence there of U.S. ground troops. But the fact is that we have carried and would continue to carry our fair share of the NATO responsibility. One American division in Europe can "show the flag" as definitely as can several.

It would be helpful, at this time, to put all of our troops abroad on a "hardship basis"—that is, send them on shortened tours of foreign duty and without their families, as we do in Korea. Unless we take definite action, the maintaining of permanent troop establishments abroad will continue to overburden our balance-of-payments problem and, most important, will discourage the development of the necessary military strength Western European countries should provide for themselves.

The time has come, also, when we must take into account the effect of the population explosion on our mutual-assistance system. I don't propose to go into the much discussed causes and effects of this phenomenon; I simply want to stress the responsibility we have for finding some realistic means of containing this human explosion. Unless we do, it may smother the economic progress of many nations which, with our technical and economic assistance, are striving to build a decent standard of living. The world population, now above the three billion mark, will

have reached 3.5 billion by 1970 and will have doubled to six billion by the year 2000. A large proportion of this increase is occurring in countries which are having difficulty in feeding and clothing their present populations and desperately need a little elbow room while they improve their resources.

Countries such as these need, more than anything else, some means of holding their population growth in check for some period, say 10 years or more, to provide a building spell during which they could construct sound technical foundations for a steady, balanced progress. Otherwise, I just don't see how we can effectively help them for the long pull. There is no real progress or security to a nation which, with outside help, raises its productive capacity by two percent a year while the population rises three percent.

Population control is a highly sensitive problem, of course. When I was President I opposed the use of federal funds to provide birth-control information to countries we were aiding because I felt this would violate the deepest religious convictions of large groups of taxpayers. As I now look back, it may be that I was carrying that conviction too far. I still believe that as a national policy we should not make birth-control programs a condition to our foreign aid, but we should tell receiving nations how population growth threatens them and what can be done about it. Also, it seems quite possible that scientific research, if mobilized for the purpose, could develop new biological knowledge which would enable nations to hold their human fertility to nonexplosive levels without violating any moral or religious precepts.

Of all the questions which worry the world, the one I wish I could answer positively is, "Can we ever have real peace?" The paramount goal of our times should be an era in which peoples and nations, free of the fear of war, could drop the sterile burden of vast armaments and devote their God-given resources and energies to building a better civilization.

Yet we know there is no golden road to peace. Peace is not, for example, a matter of a few world leaders getting together to parcel the nations of the globe into various spheres of power. It is not to be gained by imposing the will of the United States on other nations, any more than we can gain it by appeasing those who would dominate us. We want no Pax Romana or a modern substitute therefor.

Peace is a blessing and, like most blessings, it must be earned. As a nation, we can best work toward it by determined effort in advancing and supporting sound cooperation within the family of nations for mutual security and economic progress. We should work toward the liberation of the United Nations from subservience to pressures of arrogant dictators and excessive nationalism. We should assist in building it into a genuinely world-representative organization where nations can and will settle their disputes objectively and without resort to arms.

And above all, I repeat, we must face with honesty the test our democracy continually puts to its citizens: to build within ourselves and our children an abiding sense of those moral principles which must continue to be our inspiration. Only our individual faith in freedom can keep us free.

A PILOT'S VIEW OF THE F–111

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the April 1971 edition of Air Force magazine written by Capt. John Francis, Jr., U.S. Air Force, who has piloted this controversial plane. It does seem to me that the old axiom of "if you have not tried it, do not knock it" certainly applies in this case. I question whether any of the critics of the F–111 program have ever flown this plane. I am not a pilot and certainly have not flown it; but I would much rather put stock in the comments of those who have than those who sit back and criticize.

I include the article as follows:

F–111—A PILOT'S VIEW

(By Capt. John Francis, Jr., USAF)

After several hundred hours in the cockpit of any airplane, you get to know the bird pretty well. If you're a professional military pilot and the aircraft will do its assigned job better than any other, you respect it. If it's also a safe bird, both in training and combat, you have confidence in it. If it's a pleasure to fly, you develop real affection for it.

For two and a half years, I flew the F–111A. My feeling about the aircraft is a mixture of respect, confidence, and affection, tinged—even now—with more than a little awe. It's that kind of machine.

There has been a lot of political and economic criticism of the F–111. I don't feel qualified to discuss those matters. It may be that for the same investment of time and money, we could have had an even better aircraft. I'm not qualified to judge that, either. The point is that we now have F–111As and Es in operational units. The even more advanced D model, with improved Mark II avionics, will be along next year, and later we'll get the F model, with a more powerful engine and modified Mark II avionics. The F–111s we have now, and those to come, should be judged on their merits—not on the selection and management decisions that are now water over the dam.

UNIQUE MEANS PRICELESS

There's only one word that describes the F–111 in a nutshell. The word is *unique*. As any military planner will tell you, when a weapon system has a unique capability, it becomes a priceless machine. Unique doesn't mean just higher, faster, and further than some previous model. It means opening a combat arena where you have superiority because you are the only one operating there. The F–111A has such a unique capability. It opens to the Air Force nighttime, all-weather operations at low altitude. But the mission isn't the only unique thing about this airplane, from the point of view of the operational planner, and certainly not from where the aircraft commander sits.

As an aircraft commander, I can fly the F–111 at supersonic speeds within 200 feet of some awfully hard and unseen rocks. *So I have a very special perspective.* Keeping this perspective in mind as I discuss the F–111A will give you a much better appreciation of its special features. And almost everything in the F–111, from nose to tail, is special, unique, or revolutionary in some way. Let's start with the nose.

The nose section houses the electronic gear (avionics). You've probably read other articles that said avionics is one of the outstanding features of the F–111A, and so it is. You may have seen other articles calling those black boxes unnecessary electronic gadgetry that only runs up the cost of the aircraft. The truth is, without this equipment the aircraft would be incapable of its unique mission. A good aircraft, yes, but not unique. In other words, the electronic "gadgetry" is not only expensive—it is priceless.

The first item of avionics I want to talk about is the attack radar. So what's unusual about an attack radar? Lots of aircraft have them, but the F–111A system is greatly advanced in its ability to identify and delineate topographical features. That enhances the total radar-bombing capability. The ease of radar bombing and navigation will be obvious when I tell you the picture projected by the attack radar is like a map. Fantastic? Yes, but even more so when tied into the inertial-navigation system.

FABULOUS BLACK BOXES

The inertial platform and computers that make up the F–111A's navigational and bombing system are phenomenally accurate. It is this system that makes the F–111A capable of around-the-clock, all-weather weapon delivery within the lethal envelope of conventional weapons. Here, then, is the first of those missions that no other aircraft can accomplish. Interdicting the enemy's supply lines (bridges, passes, truck parks) and airfields at any time, in any weather, deprives him of an option he once had: digging in by day, repairing and moving by night.

You may have read that the F–111A's navigation equipment is accurate to a few thousand feet per hour (very good in itself). What you may not know is that, through the attack radar tie-in, the weapon system operator can maintain position accurately within hundreds of feet, at all times. Navigating at low level in bad weather increases your appreciation of such accuracy. Knowing your position and the terrain can be very reassuring when you depend on automatic systems to provide ground clearance.

The next avionic feature, the ballistics computer, is a pilot's dream. This computer was not originally a part of the F–111A. It's one of those modifications that contributed to the aircraft's escalating cost, of which you've heard so much. First, let me explain that the increased flexibility it provides. Then you decide whether paying more money for it was justified or not.

The computer can determine continuously the impact point of any bomb, given the aerodynamic characteristics of the bomb and the altitude, airspeed, and vertical velocity of the aircraft. It then relates this information to the target's location and continuously updates a release time for the bomb. What does this mean to me, the aircraft commander? For the first time in radar-directed, level bombing, it is not necessary to fly straight and level on the bomb run. Altitude and airspeed can be changed without affecting bombing accuracy. Since these two items are essential information for the enemy's air defense system, it gives you a decided advantage over the defenses.

But the F–111's revolution in bombing flexibility doesn't stop here. Since you can vary altitude and airspeed continuously, you can make a toss-bombing or dive-bombing attack with the same accuracy as in a level bomb run. You no longer have to overfly the target area. You can start a pullup miles short of the target, release in a climb, and break away, diving back to low-level concealment while the bombs continue to the target.

If you use the offset mode of the attack radar and bomb-nav-computer, you can further protect yourself from enemy defenses by choosing an axis of attack that positions a mountain range between the target and yourself. You can toss the bombs over the range. In this mode, without seeing the target, the weapon system operator aims on an offset point, which he knows is so many feet in such and such a direction from the target. Remember, if we cannot see the target area on our radar, then normal defense radars in the target area cannot see us. In other words, an enemy's first indication of attack would be weapons detonation. *This* is the tremendously flexible F–111A doing radar bombing.

DEFENSE SUPPRESSION

For still more flexibility, the ballistics computer can be tied into the LCOS (bombsight) for dive deliveries or visual-level deliveries.

As I mentioned, the computer continuously computes an impact point. It can show the impact point on the bombsight at all times. Now you don't have to dive bomb in the traditional way—rolling in at a set altitude and airspeed, diving at a set angle, releasing at a predetermined altitude and airspeed, and making large errors in accuracy if any of these parameters were wrong. Now you can come from any direction, at any airspeed, altitude, and dive angle, drive the bombsight pipper over the target and release. Flexible? Yes, and it greatly reduces delivery errors. But it means more. When you roll in on a target, you're not committed to the target by preset conditions of release. If the enemy's defenses open fire, you can switch your attack to them. It is no longer necessary for No. 4 in a flight to be a sitting duck because he's coming in at the same angle, airspeed, and altitude as the three previous aircraft.

Knowing my aircraft can do all these things, I wonder how anyone can say that the F–111 has no future as a ground-attack aircraft because it is too vulnerable and expensive to risk. The capability of striking targets and attacking the defenses at the same time doesn't leave you as vulnerable as all that. In fact, I think that defenses would be a little leery of giving away their positions by opening fire, once they figure out the tremendous accuracy, firepower, and flexibility of the F–111.

The last of the avionic gear I am going to discuss is the terrain-following radar (TFR). This is *it*—the marvel of the aeronautical world. It is this equipment that allows the aircraft to fly thousands of miles over all types of terrain, never getting higher than 200 feet, and without the pilot ever touching the control stick.

The terrain-following radar is actually two completely independent sets, each capable of performing the entire terrain-following function and one serving as backup to the other. The TFR is not just unique. It's revolutionary. It is the TFR that opens up the arena of low-altitude, night, weather operations. The TFR can take you anywhere it can see. If it encounters weather that it can't see through, it takes you over or around it. The TFR not only lets you stay close to the ground; it lets you go through the low points in the hills. It lets you fly along a rocky mountainside where you'll be very hard to discern on enemy radar. But the TFR does more. It frees you from the stick and rudder work and lets you concentrate on other duties of the aircraft commander—decisions on what weapons to use, enemy defenses, evasive action, and system malfunctions.

The terrain-following radar is safe in the hands of a pilot who knows it and its limitations, and it gives him the ability to fly where no other aircraft would dare. I would take my F–111A down into the Grand Canyon at night when the overcast was below the rim. In fact, one of our training routes does take us into the canyon. No other aircraft in the world could survive in that kind of environment.

So much for avionics. Now let's look at the crew module. Here is a system near and dear to every crew member's heart. It's the second revolutionary aspect of the F–111A. The crew module is the crew escape "capsule" that has had a phenomenal history of success. In an emergency, it allows the crew to abandon the aircraft *as a crew*. The module has been successful in every attempted ejection within the design envelope. It has been used at high altitude, high speed; at low altitude, high speed; at low altitude, low speed; in a spin; and while violently out of control. The ejections have resulted in no serious injuries to any crew member. While the success rate would seem enough in itself, it is even more significant because it gives crew members the confidence necessary to operate in the dangerous flight envelopes for which the F–111A was designed. Supersonic or low-altitude ejections, while still dangerous, are not the threats they once were. A little more about the crew module later.

A SWINGING WING

Now for the swingwing (switch blade, if you prefer). Revolutionary? You bet! Although there now are a few imitators in other parts of the world, the swingwing F–111 flew in 1964. When talking about the variable-sweep wing, you get into some pretty impressive statistics on aircraft range and bomb load. Range and bomb load, of course, are trade-off items. But any way you slice it, you're talking about several times as much payload, carried much further than any other fighter-type aircraft in history. And you don't drag your feet getting there. The variable-sweep wing comes forward for takeoff and, with the highly efficient Fowler flaps and full-span slats, allows the F–111A to get as many as twenty-four 750-pound bombs airborne. Then you sweep back the wings to reduce drag and push the speed right up to the delivery limit of the bombs. The same wing that allows you to come down the final landing approach at 130 knots sweeps back to reduce drag for supersonic flight on the deck.

General Dynamics could have made the movable wing a real nightmare. Instead, it is easy and natural to operate. In fact, there are some very favorable side effects of the engineering that went into the wing. As you might imagine, moving a wing changes the center of gravity and aerodynamic center of pressure. Problems of fuel balance, trim, and stability augmentation could be very annoying if the pilot had to compensate for them each time he moved the wing. Instead, the pitch-series trim of the aircraft compensates for trim changes. The fuel-distributing system is completely automatic, and the command-augmentation feature of the flight-control system gives a very nearly constant response to a given stick force, regardless of the wingsweep or aircraft speed. The aircraft always trims itself. Accelerating or decelerating, climbing or diving, you set the altitude with the stick and the aircraft trims off the forces. It is a dream during formation, flying a weather penetration, or on the air-to-ground range. The aircraft, through command augmentation, responds the same, with or without a bomb load.

Since the aft section of the wings sweep into the fuselage, conventional allerons were impractical. The pilot gets pitch and roll by differential or symmetrical movements of the horizontal stabilizer. With the wings forward, spoilers augment the roll response. As the wings sweep, the pylons rotate to keep the external stores aligned with the airflow. It is an outstanding engineering job.

BELOW AND BEHIND

Underneath the aircraft there is another completely new idea for fighters. Both wheels of the main landing gear are on a single trunnion. They both come down together: no chance of getting one without the other. The tires, designed to provide low-pressure footprints for landing on unpaved strips, are low wearing and may be used for up to 150 landings—ten times as many as some other fighter-type aircraft.

Within the wheels is a beautiful set of multiple-disc brakes. Combining the F–111's low approach speed with brakes that can be fully engaged at touchdown (thanks to the antiskid feature), the aircraft, weighing about twenty-five tons, can be stopped in a couple of thousand feet without a drag chute. Show me another fighter that can pull that one off! This short-field performance is vital to flexible, worldwide deployment. Not all places have 10,000-foot runways.

Finally, in the tail end we come to those unjustly maligned engines. Well, don't feel sorry for us F–111A crews. The P–1 engines (noted for compressor stalls) have gone the way of the test birds. The P–3 version of the TF–30 is another story. Another revolution in aerodynamics, the engine combines turbofan and afterburner for the first time in any aircraft. The result is a beautiful match of the outstanding features of each. The turbofans provide the very low fuel consumption that is needed for transoceanic deployments. The afterburners provide the thrust augmentation required to get a 70,000-pound vehicle up to two and one-half times the speed of sound. Boy, do they ever provide thrust augmentation—some eighty percent, compared to fifty percent in other engines! Further, the afterburner has five stages, each of which can be fully modulated.

Acceleration above Mach 1.0 is outstanding, and very rapid to Mach 2 plus. I've never been Mach 2.5 but that's only because our supersonic flight area runs out as we're accelerating through Mach 2.1 at 40,000 feet and climbing rapidly. This aircraft can move! Not only that, but the engines have the power, and the aircraft is so clean at seventy-two degrees of wingsweep that it can sustain supersonic flight while holding Gs in a turn—a trait not too common in other aircraft. Sure, I'd like more power; what pilot wouldn't. And that's exactly what we're getting. The P–9 is already here in the D model, and the P–100 is on the way for the F.

WHAT ABOUT SAFETY?

Well, that's the F–111A, pitot boom to tail feathers. Now we come to a critical question. Is the F–111A a safe airplane? My answer is: Yes, it is safer than other fighters. There has not been a single moment during the history of F–111 accidents and groundings when I would not have gone to the flight line and taken off with confidence.

The Air Force says the F–111's safety record speaks for itself. You've probably seen the figures of so many accidents per so many flying hours, compared to other Century Series fighters (see chart). But the pilot doesn't get his feeling of safety from statistics. He gets it from knowing the aircraft and its systems, and from knowing how well they work for him and his fellow pilots.

USAF's F–111 PROGRAM

Model	Powerplant	Remarks	Number in USAF program
F–111A	Pratt & Whitney TF30–P3 turbofan	Basic design to provide TAC with all-weather bombing capability. Now operational.	141
F–111E	do	Basic F–111A design. Improved penetration aids and weapons management. Stall-free propulsion through supersonic envelope. Now operational.	94
F–111D	Pratt & Whitney TF30–P9 turbofan	Major avionics modification to add air-to-ground, moving-target capability, plus improved weapons-delivery accuracy and payload.	96
F–111F	Pratt & Whiteny TF30–P100 turbofan	Growth engine for increased payload and maneuverability. Improved avionics—digital computers and advanced inertial navigation.	82

Note: In addition to the F–111 models produced for the Air Force were the F–111B—a Navy version that did not reach production—and the F–111C model for the Roayal Australian Air Force.

The history of all aircraft accidents early identifies areas that are critical: engine and associated systems failures; fires; flight-control malfunctions; bad weather; and, finally, pilot factors. Here's my evaluation of these areas as they relate to the F–111A.

First, the engines. As a basic design feature for safety, the F–111A has two highly reliable engines. The engines have fire-detection and extinguishing equipment as well as an automatic airstart feature. The automatic airstart system works off a pressure-sensing circuit within the engine that senses the sudden pressure changes of a flameout and provides automatic ignition. Consequently, either because of engine reliability or automatic airstart reliability, I've never had a flamed-out engine. Even if I had to shut down an engine, it's no big thing. The F–111A performs very well on one engine, and neither electrical nor hydraulic systems are lost with one engine shut down.

The F–111A has dual electrical and hydraulic systems. Losing one side of these systems does not affect the aircraft except in loss of redundancy, for a single engine will provide all the electrical and hydraulic power required for normal flight. Either generator can carry the entire electrical load. If both generators should be out, an emergency generator provides essential electrical power.

There are two hydraulic pumps, one for each system (primary and utility), mounted on each engine. If you lose an engine, the other engine powers both the primary and the utility hydraulic systems. Then, if things should get worse and you lose one of these pumps, the other system can still power the flight controls and the wingsweep. This does not mean that other hydraulically operated systems are lost. You can operate all of these by electrical or pneumatic backup methods.

The hydraulic systems contain an additional safety feature. Isolation valves keep fluid from being lost in flight if a non-flight-essential subsystem is lost. For example, if the landing-gear hydraulic actuators should leak in flight, the only fluid lost would be that in the line to those actuators. In the event battle damage occurs to the primary hydraulic system, the utility system would automatically cut out flow to nonessential subsystems in order to furnish power for the wingsweep and flight controls.

The possibility of critical flight-control malfunctions still exists in the F–111A, as it has in all other aircraft. However, the additional sophistication of the F–111A has not brought with it increased danger. The flight controls are filled with electrical circuitry designed for redundancy and self-testing. These features warn the pilot of impending malfunctions so he can prevent unwanted signals from going to the control surfaces.

The F–111A mission makes it necessary to operate in and out of airfields with marginal weather. The aircraft's systems are ideally suited for this environment. The attack radar can be used for navigation around severe weather. It can be tied to the inertial-navigational computer for an instrument approach (including glide slope) to an airfield without any ground radio or navigational aids. The TFR is an invaluable aid for providing terrain clearance in a low-ceiling penetration. Added to all this is the auxiliary flight reference system, a completely independent, backup instrument system that is visible to both crew members.

THE PILOT FACTOR

So we come around to the pilot factor. This is a very personal thing, so nebulous that it's hard to convey to a reader how the factor of possible pilot error is reduced.

The cockpit is comfortable and well pressurized. There is no need for parachutes. Fatigue is reduced on long missions. Instruments are well placed and easy to read. Caution lights quickly catch the crew's attention.

The automatic systems allow the crew to divide their attention among all operations tasks. The aircraft is easy to fly, to take off, and to land.

The crew sits side by side, able to monitor each other's efficiency and to double-check the operation of the aircraft's complex systems.

However, should the crew have to eject despite all the F–111A's safety features, there is the escape module. In many aircraft accidents, a fatality is the result of ejection-system failure or failure of the crew to use it in time. Again, the F–111A gives the crew an advantage over the crews of other fighters. The system works—it's been proved. The crew goes together and stays together. They don't face the hazards of ejection into the airstream. These advantages of the crew escape module should reduce the time it takes to decide to eject. And once on the ground, the escape module keeps right on working for the crew. They are together and equipped with more survival gear than can be carried in any other type of ejection system.

I don't want to leave you with the impression that I've covered all the safety features of the F–111A. I haven't even covered all of the major features. On almost every page of the flight manual, I can find some item that was designed to reduce a potential hazard in the air. I'll just say it again: The F–111A is a safe aircraft.

Within a pilot's frame of reference and the aircraft's operational environment, the F–111A does have shortcomings. All aircraft do. There never has been an aircraft that was all things to all pilots, performing all missions. There never will be. Just remember the things this aircraft, the F–111, can do better and more safely than any other. It can take the war to the enemy at any hour of any day of the year. He would have no time for rest, psychological relief, rebuilding and resupply, or training. Other fighters and bombers have left the enemy undisturbed as much as eighty-five percent of the time because of their inability to fly safely or effectively at night and in weather. The F–111A has taken this safe time from the enemy.

CRITICISMS—HOW RELEVANT?

Now, what are some of the criticisms that have been leveled at the F–111's operational performance? Are they accurate? Are they relevant to its ability to perform its mission? Here are some of them.

"The aircraft won't fly at 65,000 feet." Maybe it will, and maybe it won't. I've never had occasion to find out. I fly my F–111A below 1,000 feet above the ground, which is the best place to be when you're penetrating enemy defenses.

"The visibility of the aircraft is too limited." You can see what you need to see. And at night, in bad weather, there's not much to look at anyway.

"The aircraft can't reach Mach 2.5 without compressor stalls." This is more high-altitude performance data that's irrelevant to the primary mission. I operate on the deck. The F–111A will fly supersonic on the deck, as advertised.

"The aircraft could never win a dogfight against the MIG–21." It probably can't, but I never expect to encounter one at my speed, on the deck, at night, or in weather.

"The aircraft weighs too much." This is a relative statement. I still get off the ground and land with bigger payloads in less distance than other fighters. The aircraft maneuvers very well. The weight is a blessing in disguise. It is the weight that provides the fuel for long-range operation and the structure for carrying large weapon loads.

"The aircraft has no air-to-air role." That is simply not true. The F–111A could hardly be called a day fighter. But with air-to-air missiles aboard and the fuel to meet enemy bombers far out from our borders, the F–111A could perform admirably in augmenting our air defense forces. The fuel, incidentally, gives us another unique feature—the ability to make multiple supersonic attacks on enemy supersonic bombers.

"The aircraft cannot deploy transoceanic without refueling." The F–111A certainly can, and on internal fuel, as it did to Paris in 1967. There is even more flexibility with external tanks. And ferry distance for other fighters is always in terms of external tanks.

In the context of the F–111's primary role, many criticisms fade into academic discussion of specifications written more than eight years ago. During those years, the environment of tactical air warfare has changed considerably, and with it our understanding of how best to apply the unique features of the F–111.

I have tried to give you a view from the cockpit—the special view that F–111 crews have. For our particular mission, we do not need a different airplane. What we need are new techniques to fit a revolutionary aircraft to a new area of conflict.

The F–111 provides capabilities that are found in no other aircraft. It is unique, and, when the chips are down, unique means priceless.

CANCER RESEARCH AT NIH

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's statement on his proposed cancer cure program stressed the importance of "cross fertilization," urging that there must be as much interchange of ideas as possible between various scientific pursuits. If there was ever a need to prove the importance of this concept, I witnessed it last Friday during a visit to the National Institutes of Health.

I met with Drs. Robert Q. Marston and Robert W. Berliner, the Director of NIH and the Deputy Director for Science respectively, upon my arrival at the Institute, and we briefly discussed the administration's newly proposed program. In contrast to the proposal for the establishment of a National Cancer Authority outside of NIH, the President's plan has greater flexibility in that the program will remain within the Institutes, cooperating with the others, but viewed with a special interest, without a commitment to a large independent bureaucracy of its own.

Throughout my visit I saw a substantial amount of evidence supporting the "cross fertilization" concept. Drs. Frank J. Rausher, Jr., and George J. Todaro took me through one of the isolation facilities where research is done in protective—glove box—barrier systems. The point I want to make it that though this system is currently utilized in the Cancer Institute, it was first developed in the Allergy and Infectous Disease Institute. To further illustrate this concept, Dr. Norman P. Salzman told me that what 20 years ago were considered respiratory viruses, today have been found to cause cancer in laboratory animals. Furthermore, I was interested to learn that rifampicin, at one time an antibiotic used to treat bacteria infections, has now been

found to affect an enzyme in tumor viruses. All the current studies are so interrelated and dependent upon one another that every institute must be strong to properly attack cancer.

During the last 25 years the National Institutes of Health have played a major role in initiating the revolution in biological science that has brought the conquest of cancer from wishful thinking to a realistic possibility. The Institutes have a well-earned, and worldwide reputation, for excellence in medical progress—not only in cancer, but other fields as well.

We ended the day with a discussion of cancer immunology by Dr. William Terry and a discussion of chemotherapy by Dr. Vincent T. DeVita, Jr. Both doctors seemed optimistic about the current assault being waged on cancer and they, too, stressed that many of the recent breakthroughs have come about in areas where research was being conducted on programs and ideas once thought to be unrelated to cancer.

Many of the doctors I met that day, indeed, do cancer-related work, but within institutes other than NCI. The cross-fertilization concept was summed up by one doctor who said that at NIH he knows "If I have a problem there will be somebody a few hundred yards away with an idea for its solution."

SGT. DONALD E. WEISMAN HONORED

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a fine young man from Maryland, Sgt. Donald E. Weisman, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

VIET MINE KILLS WHEATON GI WHO WAS REPORTED MISSING

Wheaton, Md., May 17 (Special)—An Army sergeant from Wheaton previously listed as missing in South Vietnam was killed in action, the Department of Defense said today.

The Pentagon said that the 22-year-old sergeant, Donald E. Weisman, of 2322 Glenmont circle in Wheaton, died April 28 when an Army vehicle he was driving in struck an enemy mine.

Sergeant Weisman was described today by his grandmother, Mrs. Mary A. Weisman as a dedicated soldier who had entered the Army as a volunteer and was on his third tour of duty in Vietnam.

He was a graduate of St. Catherine Leboure school in Wheaton and also had been active in the Catholic Youth Organization.

During his stay in Vietnam he had worked with volunteers to help Vietnamese children, his grandmother said. She said that Sergeant Weisman also had encouraged the local Veterans of Foreign Wars post to send clothing to children orphaned by the war.

In his last letter to his grandmother, Sergeant Weisman said that he was planning to continue his education after returning from Vietnam.

Other survivors include his father, John E. Weisman, of Silver Spring; his mother, Mrs. Dorothy Whitmier, and two brothers, Richard Weisman, of Silver Spring and John E. Weisman, Jr., of Virginia.

NASH: HIS HUMOR WAS SERIOUS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday America lost one of its great poets with the death of Ogden Nash. I call attention to the summary of his career in today's Washington Post:

NASH: HIS HUMOR WAS SERIOUS

(By Phil Casey)

Ogden Nash was a serious man who wrote funny. For 40 years his humorous, lopsided verses have delighted a vast audience, including himself.

Nash liked his stuff and was adept at reciting both his published and unpublished poems.

He decided long ago not to take up prose. "I think if I did that," he told a reporter, "I'd feel James Thurber and E. B. White looking over my shoulder. I made up my mind long ago that I'd rather be a great bad poet than a bad good poet."

Nash, a tall, bespectacled man, was courtly and reserved, and loved to talk. He was fascinated by bad poetry and read reams of it. He used to spectulate about doing an anthology of bad poetry.

"There have been many truly bad poets," he said, "and I've read a lot of them and learned from them."

Probably his most famous lines were:

Candy is dandy
But liquor is quicker.

The only trouble was that many people thought the late Dorothy Parker wrote them.

Nash got $10 for that little gem from The New Yorker, which went on to print many of his verses over the years. Nash was publishing in The New Yorker way back when Robert Benchley, Thurber and White were at the peak of their powers, and for a while he was an editor of the magazine.

The first verse he is known to have written came when his sister got married. Nash was 9. He wrote: "Beautiful spring at last is here/and has taken my sister away, I fear."

Yet, years later, he would write:

So my advice to mothers is if you are the mother
of a poet don't gamble on the chance that future generations may crown him.
Follow your original impulse and go ahead and drown him.

Facing up to another birthday once, he had this to say:

At another year
I would not boggle,
Except that when I jog
I joggle

Of his verse he would say, "It is my individual method of concealing my illiteracy." And of course no one believed him. His work was clever, thoughtful, perceptive and often erudite, and he turned out thousands of verses.

Nash lived alternately in Baltimore and New York and had settled back in Baltimore in recent years. On his return to Baltimore, back in 1965, he received a letter of welcome from the mayor and responded in verse:

Dear Mr. Mayor,
My spirits are gayer
Because of your letter of welcome;
It rang like the clink
Of ice in a drink
To one who has newly from Hell come.
Though others may fatten
And thrive in Manhattan
I found it a verminous vault,
So I'm glad you don't shun
The prodigal son
Whose heart never wandered from Balt."

But years earlier, he had this to say of the two cities:

I could not love New York so much
Loved I not Baltimore.

Nash was born in Rye, N.Y., on Aug. 19, 1902. He attended St. George's School in Newport, R.I., and went one year to Harvard. "I am a quarter-bred alumnus," he used to say. Nash's was a Southern family. His great-great-grandfather was a Revolutionary War governor of North Carolina. This man's brother was Gen. Francis Nash, for whom Nashville, Tenn., was named.

After he left Harvard, Nash taught for a year at St. George's School. "I lost my entire nervous system carving lamb for a table of 14-year-olds," he said.

His next job was a bond salesman in New York City. In two years, he said, he sold one bond—"to my godmother."

He became an advertising writer because he was, he said, "a bit hesitant about starving to death as a poet."

The story goes that one spring day in 1930 Nash was in his office, with his mind wandering a bit, and he scribbled a little poem, read it, and threw it in a wastebasket. He changed his mind, retrieved the verse and titled it "Spring Comes to Murray Hill."

The New Yorker bought it and Nash's career was under way. Before long, he was earning most of his money after working hours. He quit his job, served as an editor of The New Yorker and then became a full-time poet and lecturer. He was in Hollywood a couple of times but nothing much came of it.

"When I first went out," he said, "they locked me up with another chap for two weeks." The project was to convert a novel into a movie. "But pretty soon the producer went off to New York and forgot all about it. So for two years they took up my option every time it fell due, and gave me a raise, and I did nothing whatever."

But Nash was a prolific writer, turning out book after book of light verse. Among them were "Hard Lines," "Free Wheeling," "Happy Days," "The Primrose Path," "The Bad Parents' Garden of Verse," "You Can't Get There From Here."

He wrote the lyrics for the Broadway hit, "One Touch of Venus' 'and for a TV special, "Art Carney Meets Peter and the Wolf." He tried playwriting, but with little success. He was sensitive about the fact that many of his Baltimore friends had invested in his plays and lost money. He even stopped going to Pimlico for a while.

"I felt if any of those people who backed those shows would see me at the $2 and $5 window they might believe it was their money I was betting," he said.

But always it was his verse that pleased him. "Yes," he said once, "that's really my pride and joy and my bread and butter."

He was a devoted husband and father. Many of his books were dedicated to his wife, Frances, whom he married in 1931. They have two daughters.

Nash used to worry about the future of humor and of humorous verse. He told a reporter back in 1965 that humorous verse was a fading art.

"Being funny is as bad as being a Communist," he complained. "They say we're not

taking the woes of the world seriously enough. Nothing awful has ever happened before.

"Well, the world's always been in a mess. We've always had syphilis and appendicitis and people dying in childbirth and being eaten by dinosaurs."

Scattered among the humorous verses in his books are occasional pieces or sections of pieces that show lyricism, tenderness and intensity.

One poem deals with the books we read and have read. One quatrain in it goes like this:

Forty years on, when afar and asunder,
Ashes are those who are reading today,
Strangers will graze on our leavings with wonder,
Sum up an era and turn to croquet.

And the poem ends with this couplet:

Golden pens and royalties must,
As chimney sweepers, come to dust.

REVENUE SHARING RESOLUTION

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the City Council of the City of North Chicago, Ill., recently passed a resolution endorsing the concept of revenue sharing as proposed by President Nixon. Cities and States all across the country are taking similar action in confidence that a breath of new life will be brought to local government through revenue sharing. It is the responsibility of this Congress to keep faith with the American people by acting quickly and positively in implementing this bold new concept which will return a larger share of the responsibilities of government to those who must govern at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to refer your attention—and the attention of our colleagues—to the following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of North Chicago:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the expansion of the federal government in recent decades has diminished the ability of state and local governments to meet their responsibilities; and

Whereas, this situation has resulted in part from the federal pre-emption of the income tax as a revenue measure; and

Whereas, the principal revenue sources of state and local governments—sales and property taxes—are rapidly reaching their upper limit; and

Whereas, this imbalance in the power to collect revenue has combined with the growing demand for public services to bring many local governments to the brink of bankruptcy; and

Whereas, the concept of general revenue sharing has been endorsed by an impressive number of national, state and local leaders and organizations as an effective means of helping resolve this crucial problem:

Now therefore be it resolved that the City Council of the City of North Chicago, meeting this day of May 10, 1971, does declare its strong support for the proposed general revenue sharing program and urgently requests the continuation of bi-partisan efforts in the Congress to enact this much-needed measure without delay.

CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES: REGIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE EMPHASIS

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I point out to my colleagues that Johns Hopkins Hospital, the world renown institute located in my constituency is one of four regional centers serving the congenital heart disease program funded under crippled children's services formula grants through title V of the Social Security Act.

This program is not only serving the Baltimore area but I am also pleased to bring to your attention that children from eight Eastern States as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are brought to Johns Hopkins to be treated under these services.

Shortly the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee will begin consideration of the maternal and child health budget for the coming fiscal year. I would like to bring to their attention and to the attention of my colleagues in the House a program of special interest to me, the regional heart programs funded under crippled children's services formula grants through title V of the Social Security Act. Regional heart programs provide comprehensive medical care, including hospitalization and surgery, to children with congenital heart defects. Regional heart programs are responsible not just for one State, but for an entire region of the country. Programs are located in Illinois, Minnesota, Texas, and Maryland.

The Maryland center at Johns Hopkins serves 11 States and Puerto Rico. Last year the State grant to the Maryland project was $50,000, $21,000 of which had to be spent to pay for staff and other expenditures at the Johns Hopkins Children's Medical and Surgical Center. The remaining $29,000 was able to provide care for only 74 children, a fraction of those requesting specialized medical services.

The appropriation for this regional program in Maryland has remained at $50,000 since 1960. Obviously, this allows for no extension of services or increase in the number of children served. The rising cost of medical care and hospitalization have made this care available to even fewer children. At the present time cardiac surgery and catheterizations are being postponed for a number of children until the beginning of the new fiscal year. This is a serious threat to the well-being of children and an agony to their parents. Adequate funding is needed.

At their present program level, the regional congenital heart disease programs are raising the hopes of parents to no avail. Parents eagerly bring their children in for evaluation, only to find that once the evaluation is completed, the program does not have funds for treatment or corrective surgery which is usually expensive.

Most programs have completely halted their intake procedure with the exception of extreme emergencies. The Maryland program is over $40,000 in debt, and it is estimated that a $35,000 increase would be needed over the assumed $50,000 to sustain the program at its present operational level.

At this point, I would like to present a table showing by State, the number of children served by the Maryland program, and the required funding:

MARYLAND REGIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE PROGRAM BUDGET INFORMATION

1970 referring State	Number of children	Amount spent	Amount budgeted
Alabama	1	$38	
Delaware	41	30,607	
District of Columbia	1	3,810	
Connecticut	1	43	
North Carolina	1	55	
Pennsylvania	9	2,199	
South Carolina	3	6,794	
Tennessee	1	38	
Puerto Rico	4	11,478	
Virginia	12	5,185	
Total	74	60,247	$29,316

The appropriations for crippled children's services has remained relatively constant over the past few years, thereby obviating necessary expansion of services to meet the medical care needs of our disabled young children. I urge my colleagues to bear these programs in mind when work commences on the HEW appropriation for health.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1969 I filed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement showing the income that I received over and above my salary as a Member of Congress for the various years I have been in Congress up to and including the calendar year 1968. I now desire to make public the sources and amounts of all outside income that I have received for the calendar years 1969 and 1970.

For the calendar year 1970, the total income received by my wife and me in addition to my salary as a Member of Congress was as follows:

From a family-owned dairy farm in Leicester Township of Buncombe County, N.C.	$2,583.41
From dividends from a variety of stocks and bonds (most belong to me, some are owned by my wife)	3,308.22
From capital gains on installment sales of Black Mountain, N.C. real estate. (These capital gains were more than offset by capital losses.)	715.48
From interest on purchase money real estate notes; savings deposits; and Swannanoa, N.C. Baptist Church bonds, etc.	997.60
	$7,604.71

For the calendar year 1969:

Dairy farm	$2,591.31
Dividends	2,968.96
Capital gains	714.34
Interest	1,131.47
	$7,406.08

The stocks and bonds were purchased in western North Carolina at market value and most of them represent investments in North Carolina industries. All of the income mentioned above comes from property investments, and not from the use of my time, all of which is devoted to congressional responsibilities.

JOSEPH BARTLETT

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call my colleagues' attention to two major honors that have been recently bestowed on our distinguished minority clerk, Joseph Bartlett.

On Wednesday of this week, as many in this chamber already know, Mr. Bartlett was promoted to the rank of full colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, in ceremonies held in the office of Marine Commandant Gen. Leonard Chapman at the Pentagon.

The promotion is the latest event in a distinguished military career that began with his enlistment in the Marine Corps in 1944, and I am sure all my colleagues join me in extending to Colonel Bartlett our sincere congratulation for his promotion.

The other honor being afforded Colonel Bartlett is his selection as principal speaker at Salem, W. Va., College's baccalaureate service this year. During that ceremony, Colonel Bartlett was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by the college.

Joe Bartlett has been making a great contribution to his country for 30 years, since he first entered the Page High School here at the Capitol, through his service in the military, his 17 years as reading clerk for the House, and his appointment last year as minority clerk.

Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are proud of Joe Bartlett today. We salute him for his service. We congratulate him for his recent achievements. We thank him for the tireless work he does that makes the work of this Congress so much better than it otherwise would be.

At this time, for the benefit of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD of today the text of Colonel Bartlett's baccalaureate address:

BACCALAUREATE MESSAGE

Thank you, President Hurley.

Ladies and gentlemen. In anticipation of this evening, I have been trying to imagine the thoughts and feelings of those of you to whom these services are dedicated: to you, the Graduates of the Class of 1971.

It must be a strange mixture of feelings. Of satisfaction, and accomplishment. Of relief, and anxiety. Of joy, and of sorrow.

It is sure to be a unique experience for you; a most significant milestone in your lives.

I want to assure you I feel greatly honored to be invited to share an occasion of such importance to you.

My credentials (which, incidentally, have been grossly, and most generously, exaggerated!) do not qualify me—nor am I inclined—to sermonize on the immutable varities of the life that awaits you beyond the Valley of Learning. I would not be so presumptuous.

I have been asked to bring you a message on what Homecoming '71 means to me.

As you know, the Governor has proclaimed a program for the State, for this year, urging her wandering sons and daughters to come back home to West Virginia for a visit.

Since I went to work in Washington in 1941, I have come home to West Virginia at every opportunity. That has been as frequently as three trips in a single week, one snowy December I recall. But overall, the trips home have not been nearly often enough to suit me, because each visit back among these West Virginia hills has been a heartfilling, a regenerating, experience.

This return today is especially meaningful for me. And if someone thinks I can impart a message that might help to heighten our awareness, and our appreciation, of these West Virginia hills, then I accept the assignment gladly.

As you may have heard, I was born in a little suburb of Salem, called Clarksburg. I am a native son of West Virginia.

For years, I was defiantly proud of that fact. In more recent years, I have become ferociously proud of it!

Fate has taken me to nearly every part of these United States; to nearly every part of our planet.

Love led me to neighboring Ohio, and events there have since commanded much of my attention.

The people there have been wonderfully kind and generous toward me. In fact, I am glad to report that people everywhere that I have gone around this world have extended themselves to me in a most considerate and becoming fashion.

So it is, with no denigration of any other place or people, that I claim there is something very special about our State of West Virginia.

Even those of you who have chosen to come to West Virginia must have come to appreciate that fact, as well.

I was much interested to learn recently, that some 1,015 students—over 2/3rds of the student body of Salem College—come from homes beyond the borders of the Mountain State!

If it is true that West Virginia's most precious export is her bright young citizens, it would seem evident it is also true that her most priceless import, is these bright, young students!

Of those of you who have come from afar, I cannot help but wonder how you found your way to Salem. The largest number, I would wager, are the recruiting results of the zealous missionary work of President Duane Hurley.

Some of your parents, no doubt, went to Salem a generation ago. They would remember that most magnificent man, the late President S. O. Bond. And they would want you to come here and try to find a spark of his immortal spirit.

Perhaps you were inspired somewhere along the way, by such distinguished alumni as the eminent, the eloquent, Senator Jennings Randolph; or my dearly esteemed friend, Governor Cecil Underwood. I don't believe there is a college in this country that can match Salem for its percentage of illustrious former students.

Some of you may have come to Salem, as have so many before you, because of Salem's reputation, that providing an opportunity for learning would never be denied a worthy student, solely for want of money.

Now, this policy has driven a few of the school's treasurers nearly to distraction. And it has built a history of sacrifice and survival that is incredible.

Like Doctor Hurley's aerodynamically impossible bumblebee—by all logic, Salem College should never have made it into the 20th Century. Nor many decades since!

But, thank God, it has! And the best is still yet to come. And, I am confident, you will help to make it so.

You know, that original class list back in 1888, contained the names of 5 Bartletts. I admit there were 17 Davises, and 11 Randolphs. But only 2 Bonds, and 5 Bartletts!

Now two of those Bartletts came from Simpson Creek. They were certainly cousins of ours. Our family is recorded in that community at the turn of the 19th Century. And resting side by side, in the graveyard at Simpson Church, are five generations of our direct ancestors. A most unusual circumstance even among West Virginia pioneers.

The History of Salem College tells that in 1925 an honorary doctorate was conferred upon a Bartlett, whose full name was Genius E. Bartlett.

I had never heard of him before, but I am quite sure we must have been related!

At least, I am sure he was related to my three sisters who have graduated from Salem with honors. I hope some of you know them: Jenneth Bartlett Smith, or Vineta Bartlett, or Cleo Bartlett Rollins. I am terribly proud of them!

When Jenneth and Vineta were attending Salem, we lived on McDowell Street in Clarksburg. That is one of those near-perpendicular, corrugated concrete inclines in Stealey Heights.

Memory assures me that during those winters, by some peculiar coincidence, it commenced snowing every Sunday afternoon at just about the hour Dad prepared to drive the girls back to Salem.

Dad had a great big old Packard touring car, with snap-on windows. We would watch them bundle up in the car, and disappear down the hill. And then we would wait and worry through all kinds of dangers, real and imagined, until an hour or so later, we would hear the unmistakable mesh of those powerful Packard gears returning back up McDowell Street.

The really big man on campus in those days was a dashing young fellow named Sam Montgomery. When he wasn't turning the campus upside down, Sam was working in the Clarksburg grocery store of D. M. Davis.

The late Mr. Davis' generosity to Salem College; his help to individual students; is legend.

I, too, went to work in Davis' Store in 1938, at the ripe old age of 11! It was my idea, and Dad didn't think very well of it. But he indulged me, and he gave me a rare bit of advice, that I guess I will never forget.

Dad told me: "When you take a job, get there earlier, work later, and do more, than is expected of you."

There is certainly nothing very clever about that advice. No magic road to easy success. But Dad himself lived that counsel for over 40 years with the Hazel-Atlas Glass Company.

Dad's formula did not earn for him any very impressive store of worldly possessions. But he and Mother had what they wanted most—a big family of ten children.

With untold sacrificing, they provided our needs, and a happy home, and an education for each child, to the limit of his desires.

I am sure Dad's labors in this life were a satisfaction to him. I know the good name and reputation he left us, is the richest legacy we could ever have desired.

I speak of my Dad, not just in eulogy, but as an example, and, I hope, as an inspiration to us all.

Dad was a true West Virginian! That independent spirit. The humble pride. The strength of character. The stubborn integrity. The loyalty to family. The concern for neighbors. Love of the land. Respect for others' property. Unabashed patriotism. Unashamed fear of God.

These are not traits exclusive to West Virginians. But, I submit, they are traits more prevalent, more truly characteristic, of the people of these mountains and valleys, than anywhere else I know.

I have suffered, in good humor, the endless joking about my native state. By some who know better, and by some who do not.

It is acknowledged that some 400,000 West Virginians have migrated to Ohio. And it has been alleged that it is a distinct improvement in both states.

Whenever we are headed for West Virginia, and we cross the state border, we invariably burst into song. The impromptu tune is usually "The West Virginia Hills," a song that was so dear to the heart of the late President S. O. Bond. I was never at a public meeting that he did not call for the singing of this state anthem.

These hills have been the source of inspiration, of strength, of refuge, to all of us who love them. And, I am sure, all of us do.

How many times when the cares of life have pressed heavily upon me, have I headed for the hills. To climb high above mere mundane things, and up into the nearer presence of Heavenly consolation.

The efficacy of this escape, I learned from my Mother.

When, on rare occasion, some problem would get to her, she would slip away to the top of our hill; there to look out and behold the endless majesty of God's creation, and to visit with her intimate friend, our Lord.

Mother never seemed to bring any of her problem back down the hill with her.

When I first read the 121st Psalm, I was sure it had been written for my Mom:

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help . . ."

Modern song would have us "go to the hills" when our "heart is lonely."

In the beautiful hymn with which we opened this service, we sang: "Field and forest, vale and mountain . . . call us to rejoice in Thee . . ."

Doctor Bond's second most favorite song —and perhaps yours—sings the praises of the hills standing "like sentinels" around your college home, your Alma Mater.

I commenced my address to you by testifying what a heartfilling and regenerating experience it is to come back to the hills of West Virginia.

But the refuge and strength of these hills, and the hill people, is not a new phenomenon. During the dark days of the American Revolution, General George Washington was asked what he would do if the revolution failed, and he replied:

"I would simply go to the hills of West Augusta (West Virginia), and I would rally to myself the people there, . . . and I would set my bleeding country free . . ."

The revolution, thanks to God, did not fail. And the most extraordinary assembly of patriots set about to constitute a government for the people.

The resulting framework for representative republican government is so inexplicably brilliant, that I can only accept that these founding fathers enjoyed Divine collaboration in their great undertaking.

Thus was launched the most magnificent experiment in self government in the history of mankind.

All the power of government was invested in the people. The very survival of the Republic, was entrusted to the people.

So far, the experiment seems to have validated itself.

During these nearly 200 years, whenever our country has bled, the people of the "hills of West Augusta" have been the surest source of strength and sacrifice.

We may be sure this "magnificent experiment" will continue to be tested. I trust we will continue to be worthy of our solemn stewardship.

You leave college to take a more active, a more responsible, role in this government of the people. It requires—it deserves—it will reflect—the very best that you can give of yourself.

Take with you, my friends, the marvelous gifts of these mountains. And I bid you return as often as you can, to refresh your perspective, and to restore your spirit, among the hills of West Virginia.

When I went to work at the Capitol, the man who held the post I presently have the privilege to occupy was a most kindly and distinguished gentleman, whose name was known to every school child. This was William Tyler Page; the author of the American's Creed. And he befriended me.

In memory of my friend, William Tyler Page, I would like to close my remarks by recalling his creed.

"I believe in the United States of America, as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and defend it against all enemies."

So help us, God.

VILLAGE OF SHERWOOD, WIS. SUPPORTS REVENUE SHARING

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is once more my privilege to report on the depth of support at all levels of Government for the idea of revenue sharing.

Today, I introduce the support of the village of Sherwood, County of Calumet, State of Wisconsin. Sherwood is one of those suburban communities in the metropolitan Appleton area that is overwhelmed by the mushrooming population and demands for Government services. The tax base of this village is nowhere near adequate to finance the roads, sewers, schools, and police and fire services demanded by its booming population.

Revenue sharing is clearly an idea whose time is now.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, President Nixon has called upon us to join him in a bold, new program to bring the power of government back to the people at state and local levels of government,

And whereas, An integral part of this programs is a proposal, supported both by Republicans and Democrats, which call for the sharing—with the states and localities—of federal income tax revenues,

And whereas, States and localities face a fiscal crisis because traditional sources of tax revenue, including sales and property taxes, can no longer support the expanding needs of local government,

And whereas, The Revenue Sharing Proposal would provide to states and localities needed funds to operate their governments, without federal controls now attached to federal grant-in-aid programs,

And whereas, The implementation of this proposal by the federal government would provide for property tax relief,

Be it therefore resolved, That the board of trustees of the village of Sherwood go on record as endorsing and supporting the President's Revenue Sharing Proposal.

Be it further resolved, That our Representatives in Congress and in the United States Senate be advised of the actions of this board and that they be urged to support and influence the passage of this proposal.

FASCELL INTRODUCES BILL TO HELP CREATE NATIONWIDE EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which would assist local communities in creating a nationwide emergency telephone number, 911. The bill, originally introduced by our colleague, J. EDWARD ROUSH, is in the form of an amendment to the Safe Streets Act of 1968, which I had the honor of cosponsoring.

The provisions of this legislation would overcome the main obstacle to the establishment of such a nationwide emergency number. Although the Nation's telephone companies have designed and are ready to implement the system, local communities lack the resources to provide personnel and communications facilities to handle and process emergency calls.

Under this act, financial assistance would be provided to units of general local government and combinations of such units to permit them to develop and improve emergency communications procedures and facilities in order to be able to dispatch, at the request of any person dialing "911," the required police, fire, medical, rescue, or other emergency service.

For this purpose the bill authorizes appropriations of $5 million for fiscal year 1972 and $7.5 million for fiscal year 1973.

Having a uniform nationwide number to call in all emergencies would save lives, reduce crime by making it easier to report, and generally increase the speed and effectiveness of the response of municipal agencies to emergency situations.

The average citizen, particularly in time of emergency, cannot and should not be expected to remember the myriad of different emergency numbers which now exist throughout the country. Furthermore, he should not have to have a dime in order to reach emergency help on a pay telephone.

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly an instance where assistance from the Federal Government in the form of a relatively small

appropriation could have a wide beneficial effect. We are living in a time of almost constant crisis, and we must improve our capability to respond to people in trouble.

This is the primary intent of the legislation I introduced. I ask our colleagues to join in its support.

DR. VICK: BIGNESS IS HIS BAG

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this week Dr. George Vick marked the 35th anniversary of his appointment as pastor of Temple Baptist Church in Detroit. The congregation's 13,000 membership is one of the largest in the country, and Dr. Vick is almost solely responsible for its incredible growth.

The following article from the Detroit Free Press summarizes clearly Dr. Vick's philosophy and achievements. I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE TEMPLE BAPTIST STORY—DR. VICK: BIGNESS IS HIS BAG

(By Hiley H. Ward)

Detroit's Rev. George Beauchamp Vick is a successful pastor.

He is, in fact, one of the most successful in the world, and certainly a case could be made for his being the most successful in Michigan.

His 13,000-member Temple Baptist Church, Telegraph and Chicago, is right at the top among the biggest Protestant churches in the nation.

Rivaling the 85-year-old Temple Baptist congregation in membership are only First Baptist (Southern), Dallas, and Akron (O.) Baptist Temple.

The $4,134,000 new colonial building of Temple Baptist, on 16 acres, has 200 classrooms and 176,000 square feet (four acres) of floor space. A $250,000 field house with gym, handball court, lounge, shuffleboard and other facilities was added last month.

The church parking lot can handle 1,075 cars and uses by special agreement the parking lots of three nearby businesses.

Success can be measured by the size of a staff. Temple Baptist, a member of the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship denomination, has a fulltime staff of 20. This includes 10 associate pastors, five of them ordained. There are four secretaries, four caretakers, and one cook.

Few churches can also boast 150 cribs for babies as does Temple Baptist.

Success is measured by dedicated lives, and Temple Baptist has sent 300 young people into fulltime Christian service. Income for the church in 1970 was $1,093,000, one third of that going to missions.

Success is longevity of service, and this week the beloved pastor marked his 35th year—half of his 70 years at Temple Baptist—first at Fourteenth and Marquette, then at 10100 Grand River, before the move to the far north side.

He came to Temple Baptist after seven years on the evangelistic team of Mordecai Ham, the "Billy Sunday" of the South, as Dr. Vick calls him. Dr. Vick was also youth director for eight years at the First Baptist Church, Fort Worth, Texas.

Dr. Vick is also founder and president of the nation's biggest seminary and Bible college, the 20-year-old Baptist Bible College, Springfield, Mo., now double the size of historic Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.

To those who measure success by social proclamations and policies, it is not hard to fault Temple Baptist and Dr. Vick. While there is no written clause, Dr. Vick affirmed Friday "it is not our policy" to bring in blacks.

His 25 buses drive through occasional black districts, but come back with whites from the far east side. Some members come from as far as Lansing and Port Huron. He's willing, he says, to see blacks "saved," but feels they can best serve in their own community.

Asked if a converted black—and there is an occasional black visitor in the audience—felt he could best serve the Lord by joining Temple Baptist instead of a black church, Dr. Vick said, "we wouldn't feel that way."

His church in many ways is a lift-out from the rural South, drawing together many in the Detroit area who have roots in the South. And he conducts a pulpit exchange with many of the leading preachers of the South.

Dr. Vick was only the choir director and Sunday school superintendent when he came to the church in 1935. The Sunday School had 700, now it has 4,500.

A humble man and unpretentious, he was asked what was his secret of success, beyond giving credit to the work of the Lord and the Holy Spirit.

It is "God that giveth the increase" (1 Cor. 3:7), Dr. Vick said, but he also acknowledges that "God uses human instruments."

What are 10 of Dr. Vick's—and Temple Baptist's—secrets of success? The greying, trim pastor, in bright shiny tie that contrasted with his slightly pencil-striped grey suit, sat back in his paneled study, beneath a row of figurines that included a "pieta" (Madonna and Christ), colonial soldiers and ancient galleon, and thought.

Temple Baptist—the successful church—uses these techniques, Dr. Vick said.

1. "We preach the gospel." The sermons are all biblically orientated, and the method is "expository," that is, taking verses of Scripture and preaching in reference to those verses.

2. "Evangelical thrust," "At the end of each service we give an invitation to accept Christ. The whole message is geared to that."

3. "Personal visitation." All 200 teachers are expected to call regularly on their class members. There are three regular periods in the week when members call on prospects: Monday—a 5:45 p.m. supper is followed by a pairing off of members into twos to make calls; Tuesday—young people go out to make calls at 7 p.m.; Thursday—women of the church call on their neighbors.

4. "A bus blitz." A selected territory where "the fishing looks good" is pegged, and a busload of 30 callers are brought in to make calls.

5. "Personal witnessing." Special courses are given on soul winning, and this information is also a high point of training programs for teachers.

6. "Scripture memorization." Basic soul-winning verses, from John 3: 16, "For God so loved the world . . .," to the declaration in Acts 16: 31, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," are learned. Four-page tracts with such verses are distributed by members to prospects.

7. "We teach the Bible only." No lesson quarterlies are used. A small list with the Scripture to be studied each Sunday in the year is distributed and pasted inside individual Bibles. On May 16, this Sunday, it is John 12: 1–11 (story of Jesus' visit to His friends in Bethany).

8. "Friendliness." The church has door greeters. "We drum the need to be friendly into all." New members in a class are seated next to those who are noted for their abilities and their concern for others.

9. Contests play a big role. Each Sunday, each class has a quota to reach. A trophy is given for the adult class with the best increase that Sunday, and another trophy is given to the youth class with the biggest increase. The trophies are rotated each Sunday.

The new field house is proving to be an attraction, Dr. Vick said. While youths and husbands engage in the sports programs, he said, wives gather in the field house lounge for parlor games. An afternoon program also draws retirees to the field house.

Temple Baptist is planning its own parochial school for 400 youths.

"We try to make the church the center of our people's lives," said Dr. Vick. "If that is so, then the church is strengthened, and the individual is strengthened."

INDOCHINA PEACE PROPOSALS BY WORLD WITHOUT WAR COUNCIL, MIDWEST

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is an organization in Chicago known as the World Without War Council, Midwest. They have undertaken to share the task of working for peace in Southeast Asia. It is a monumental undertaking, and we can use their help.

I would like to insert a copy of an article from their most recent newsletter in which the authors attempt to clear away the political cobwebs of Vietnamization and immediate withdrawal, and address themselves to proposals for bringing peace to Indochina. There is a world of difference between ending war anl bringing peace. Congress may be moving toward the former. The World Without War Council is more concerned with the latter. The article follows:

PEACE IN INDOCHINA: CRITERIA AND PROPOSALS

(By Lowell Livezey and Tom Ireland)

The present public debate about Indochina seems to be missing the point—at least if the point is *peace* in Southeast Asia. The debate goes on everywhere: in the streets, in the media, in and between the Congress and the Administration, and in the mainstream voluntary organizations of our society. The matter at issue seems to be quite simply: Should the United States withdraw militarily from Indochina—to what extent and when?

It is generally thought that this is a debate about how to get peace in Indochina. We disagree. It is much less than that. It is a debate about two options for American *military* policy: Vietnamization or immediate withdrawal. But that is not the same thing as a debate about the conditions necessary for peace.

It is tempting to think that if the U.S. would just "go away" from Indochina, the war would go away too. That is the wishful thinking of people who are tired of war, who are deeply embarrassed by their country's actions, who have lost hope in the constructive use of power. The withdrawal of U.S. forces would change the war, but it would not end it, for the U.S. is not the only belligerent nor the only source of conflict in Indochina.

In saying this, we are not joining the cry of "Bloodbath!," for we recognize that no bloodbath as great as the present one is likely. The U.S. must take a large share of blame for creating and sustaining the condi-

tions that perpetuate the war. In the light of those conditions, we are trying to be soberly realistic about the possibility that the war would continue in the absence of U.S. forces. Though we recognize that other parties are involved in the war, we are focusing our concern on the policies of our own government. We offer this discussion of policy alternatives in the belief that peace, and not simply U.S. military extrication, must be the goal of American policy in Indochina.

THE UNITED STATES POLICY OF VIETNAMIZATION

The Nixon Administration is quite candid about one point: that it seeks to withdraw from Indochina in a way, and to an extent, that will assure the *military superiority* of the Saigon government. The success of Vietnamization is measured by the strength of the South Vietnamese Army, as evidenced in "body counts." "Success" is conceived, not in terms of steps toward peace, but in terms of an increased potential for waging war.

Like many Americans, we think that the war was widened by the invasions of Cambodia and Laos—not narrowed as the Administration claims. We strongly doubt that the withdrawal of all U.S. forces is possible given the present U.S. commitment to preserving the military superiority of Saigon. And we fear that our already heavy reliance on aerial bombardment will increase as more troops are withdrawn. But our intention here is to criticize not the integrity of the Administration, nor the feasibility of its policy. We are criticizing the *purpose* of that policy. *The Administration seeks to Vietnamize the war, not to end it.*

SET THE DATE FOR WITHDRAWAL

While there are many and diverse criticisms of Vietnamization, its principle opposition comes from those who want the U.S. to get out of Indochina as rapidly as possible, without conditions and without pursuing objectives other than extrication itself. This policy is most commonly stated in the phrase "Set the Date"—for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Indochina and for the cessation of all U.S. military operations in Indochina from wherever deployed. This has been a demand of the Provisional Revolutionary Government (Vietcong) and North Vietnam. It has also long been dominant in the American peace movement. "Set the Date" has lately gained considerable support in the U.S. Congress.

U.S. citizens support a "Set the Date" policy for a number of reasons. Some favor the P.R.G.—often on "just war" grounds—and therefore want the U.S. to quit helping the "bad guys." Others see the cause as hopeless, or humiliating, or too costly, and want to bring U.S. resources home to meet our own country's needs. Still others think that however great our responsibility to promote peace, the U.S. has been so discredited by its conduct of the war, and by its support of anti-democratic regimes, that the least destructive thing this country can do is simply to get out.

We believe that there is substantial evidence to support the latter position. Yet in light of the conditions created by years of unresolved conflict and war, we make this unhappy observation: A policy limited solely to unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces, while it is better than the Administration's policy, still means a continuation of the war, not an end to it. We do not believe that a United States commitment to withdrawal is a sufficient condition for the cessation of hostilities between the P.R.G. and the Saigon government. On reflection, the choice between U.S.-supported Vietnamization and unconditional U.S. withdrawal seems to be a choice not between war and peace, but between one war and another.

We are dismayed at the readiness with which the American people have become resigned to this choice. We have not yet given up on the goal of peace. We think that some little-discussed policy proposals offer more hope of peace in Indochina than those in the center of the current debate. We therefore call for exploration and promotion of the alternatives discussed below.

CRITERA FOR A PEACE POLICY

How shall we assess alternative proposals for U.S. policy with respect to the goal of peace in Indochina? We suggest the following criteria:

First, a U.S. peace policy should lead to an end to the killing with the greatest possible speed.

Second, a U.S. peace policy should recognize—and neither deny nor belittle—the diverse and conflicting interests and purposes which exist among the Vietnamese people. It should enhance the possibility of non-violent processing and resolution of these conflicts, both now and in the long run. A *political solution* in this sense of the term is required. It might involve negotiation, mediation, and/or election; it must provide for the effective nonviolent participation of all parties, factions, and interest groups within all of South Vietnam.

Third, a U.S. peace policy should enhance the contribution of the international community to the establishment and preservation of peace in Indochina.

At a minimum, this would include (a) adherence to existing international law and agreements, (b) seeking acceptance of an international presence for peace-keeping and/or for overseeing the processes of political settlement among the South Vietnamese, and (c) a commitment to massive support for an international aid program for the reconstruction of Indochina.

Fourth, a U.S. peace policy should be politically feasible in the U.S. The most politically feasible policy may not be the most popular one now: a policy must be assessed according to its potential, in the near future, for gain implementation by the U.S. government.

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS FOR A U.S. PEACE POLICY

We do not know of a peace policy which fully embodies the above criteria, and we realize that no policy, at this time, can be a guarantee of peace. We wish to outline, however, three alternative proposals, with some variations, which we think deserve much more serious consideration than they are getting. These proposals have much in common. They all include:

(1) the withdrawal of all U.S. armed forces from Indochina;

(2) a cease-fire;

(3) a political settlement;

(4) a role for an internation presence in the process of political settlement;

(5) massive aid for reconstruction in Indochina.

The three proposals below differ primarily in the timing of, and pre-conditions for, each step. Let us examine the proposals more closely.

A CEASE-FIRE—PEACE INITIATIVES POLICY

The National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam has proposed that the first condition for peace is a cease-fire and that this should be initiated unilaterally by the U.S. and its allies. At the same time, the coming South Vietnamese elections should be opened to the full and free participation of all parties in South Vietnam, including the P.R.G. and the non-Communist groups now opposing the Saigon Government. The U.S. should refrain from any partisan aid or activity that would compromise the elections. To follow up these two unilateral initiatives, the U.S. and its allies should—and reasonably could—pursue: a permanent cease-fire, including international supervision of the cease-fire and elections; withdrawal of all non-South Vietnamese military forces; release of all prisoners of war; and guarantee of no reprisals by either side following the political settlement. The U.S. should pledge the withdrawal of all U.S. forces within six months after the date of a permanent cease-fire agreement, and offer one billion dollars aid for reconstruction of Indochina.

*Rationale.** The cease-fire is proposed as the *first* step toward peace because: it would end the killing soonest; it is necessary, as a practical matter, for the conduct of free and open elections; and there would be pressure on Hanoi and the P.R.G. for reciprocation due to the war-weariness of the people of all of Indochina and of the world. The setting of the date must be *conditional* because otherwise it would take away the P.R.G.'s incentive to negotiate a political settlement and would lead to continued warfare. Finally, it is argued that the United States' political climate is more amenable to a cease-fire than unconditional withdrawal.

A SET THE DATE/PEACE INITIATIVES POLICY

Most formal presentations of the "Set the Date" policy do not relate it to specific initiatives for peace. It is possible, however to see setting the date as a unilateral initiative to be followed by other steps toward peace. Consider a policy which would begin with the position of the American Friends Service Committee White Paper, "Indochina, 1971," which calls for setting the date for withdrawal and announcing the discontinuance of U.S. support for the regime of Thieu, Ky, and Khiem. With this beginning, the U.S. should then work for a cease-fire, free elections open to all parties, withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces, and a commitment of massive aid for reconstruction. International supervision should be utilized for as much of this as is necessary and possible.

Rationale. Setting the date is proposed as the first step toward peace on the grounds that: it is the only way to make the U.S. commitment to withdrawal credible and to get Saigon to negotiate seriously (they will fight on as long as they have U.S. support); the P.R.G. has said that everything else is negotiable once the date is set. It is argued that setting the date is politically more feasible in the U.S. because: it is accessible to Congressional action (via appropriations); and because there is already a significant movement in favor of withdrawal which could be mobilized to support a withdrawal/peace initiative policy.

SIMULTANEOUS SET THE DATE/CEASE-FIRE/PEACE INITIATIVE POLICY

A third U.S. policy would include elements of both of the above. The U.S. and the South Vietnamese governments would announce simultaneously that: a unilateral cease-fire would begin immediately; Thieu, Ky, and Khiem would retire from public office at the end of their present terms (October, 1971); and all U.S. forces would be withdrawn and all military support terminated at a given and early date. These three initiatives would be followed, as above, by specific measures aimed at getting a political settlement including elections open to all parties, a cease-fire, massive economic aid from the U.S., and withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces—all under international supervision to as great an extent as is possible and necessary.

Rationale. The cease-fire is necessary immediately both to end the killing and to create a climate in which open elections are logistically possible and a political settlement is psychologically enhanced. The setting of the date is necessary immediately to enhance the credibility of the U.S. in negotiations, to force the South Vietnamese government to negotiate seriously, and to meet the conditions under which all other matters have been declared negotiable by the P.R.G.

---

*Rationale not ascribed to the National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam.

and Hanoi. The political feasibility in the U.S. would be increased by the fact that the present momentum favoring "set the date" could be utilized, but additional support could be won on the basis of this policy's recognition of the need for an active U.S. role in securing peace.

Perhaps none of these policies is adequate as stated here, but all of them emphasize the importance of promoting *peace* in Indochina as opposed to only getting the U.S. out of an unpopular and costly war. It is this element which is so badly needed in the debate about the war and in a new United States policy direction. For without it, the choice posed is not between war and peace, but only between one war and another.

BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND TRADE UNION MOVEMENTS NEEDED

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Lane Kirkland, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO, makes an outstanding contribution to a better public understanding of the civil rights and trade union movements in his speech at the Second National Conference of the A. Philip Randolph Institute Affiliates in Chicago on May 1. The speech follows:

BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND TRADE UNION MOVEMENTS NEEDED

One thing can be said for the era that we are living in today. You don't have to look very far back to see a great deal of change. Ten or fifteen years ago, in the early days of the modern civil rights revolution, racism was the prevailing and the instinctive way of life for most people in this country. Most people practiced it one way or another and never even gave it a second thought.

We faced an elaborate system of segregation and discrimination, solidified by centuries held together by a senseless tangle of ideologies, codes, customs, taboos, habits and prejudices against a background of economic stagnation, social neglect and widespread indifference.

Just a few short years ago, in the 1950s, everything seemed arrayed on the side of the status quo and yet, looking back, with all those problems, somehow the task seemed simpler; it seemed more clearly defined among those who were dedicated to change.

There was a strong feeling of hope and there was a unity of purpose and of approach. That force of spirit, that unity, didn't flounder and splinter because it was frustrated or because it failed. Indeed, it succeeded beyond the limits of what seemed possible only a decade ago, it cracked many barriers and brought them down. They are still falling, not withstanding the efforts of the Nixon Administration to shore some of them up. Yet today this force seems to have faded. In too many quarters it has yielded to confusion and to cynicism. Why?

One reason, I would suggest, is that a good many well-meaning, liberal-minded people never really understood the problem in the first place. All that needed to be done, they thought, was to tear down the "white only" signs and integration would naturally result; the problem would be over and done with; we would have reached the new Jerusalem.

These people could never quite manage the transition from the world of lunch counters to the world of jobs, housing, schools, health, transportation, sanitation, welfare, crime, overcrowding—the world in which black Americans have to live every day and in which equality has been more strongly rooted than in public accommodations.

Some naive souls could not make that crossing because they were comfortable only with moral issues. They found that the intrusion of economics drained those issues of their moral content. It raised questions of money. It raised questions of taxes and that afflicts an entirely different set of nerves and it raises another set of barriers.

There were others who had a rather pleasant relationship to certain existing economic arrangements and were made uneasy by talk of such things as tearing down the slums, rebuilding the cities, guaranteeing full employment at decent wages, building housing that people can afford, upgrading public education, providing mass transit and the like. Our comfortable friends, very accurately perceived that all of these social needs have very fat price tags and, indeed, can only be met through a vast expansion of planned public investment.

Well, before you know it, you are talking about the allocation of economic resources and about such matters as redistributing income, closing the tax loopholes for the rich and tapping excess profits. And that kind of talk is very upsetting in some quarters and they respond with the classic, evasine maneuver—the buy-off—the buy-off of actual or potential leaders and spokesmen, hence, black capitalism.

Meanwhile, we have a stable of writers who call themselves radicals, who work fevirishly to spread the latest insight. Negroes want out. They don't want to be a part of this materialist society. They don't want a larger slice of the pie. Their quest is psychological to resolve an identity crisis. This requires cultural separatism. Integration is reactionary and only Uncle Toms really wanted it. Take Lester Maddox to lunch. Meanwhile, the media, drawn somehow to this dribble, works overtime to glorify black leaders representing no one but themselves, repudiate the age-old aspiration of millions and belittle the dreams of a century in favor of a deeper alienation, cults of personality, mystiques of violence.

And with it all, the new separatism, as dismally as all of its predecessors, serves the interests of the privileged. And the naive, the innocent, already disillusioned because some of the walls of Jericho survived all of the marching and the blowing, find an ideological excuse to abandon the cause of integration.

There is still another chapter in this little chronology of how the mice and the rats went over the side. Before the escape from commitment could reach its peak, something else had to happen, and it did, in Southeast Asia.

The Vietnam war provided a haven from domestic responsibility and in a way that prolonged the coupling of the naive with the privileged.

For the naive, the war excited moralistic passions that had lain exhausted and dormant since the early days of the civil rights revolution.

Here again, finally, was a simple, uncomplicated issue that lent itself to slogans, to demonstrations and displays of self-righteousness and, after all, it wasn't as if you were abandoning blacks by switching your energies to the anti-war movement. Fighting something called American "imperialism" abroad, was, in some way, helpful to black liberation at home.

As for the privileged, the war provided still another excuse to evade the issue of resource allocation here and now. "You can't have guns and butter," they proclaimed. "All of your ambitious domestic programs, which we really find quite interesting in principle, will have to be put on the shelf for now. Come and see us when the war is over."

One of the products of this seduction of the innocent by the privileged is the dangerous illusion that the end of the war will automatically bring an end to the urban crisis, to the problem of living in the cities. Tying the urban crisis into the war may be a convenient battle cry for the John Lindsays and other politicians who need to cloak their own failures with the mantle of virtue but it does not explain why our cities were on the skids, why they were decaying, long before the war started. Our priorities, our goals, were wrong then and they are still wrong now.

The wrong priorities are not voted because of the war and to suppose otherwise is reactionary. All of the money that is available and needed for public investment is not going to Vietnam. It is pouring, by the billions, through tax loopholes and into the pockets of speculators and those whose money works, even if they don't.

The wrong priorities were voted because the wrong people were voted into office. Money will be spent for the programs we need if we elect the right people to vote to raise and to spend the money—Vietnam or no. In New York, if we keep electing Buckleys, it won't make any difference whether there is a war or not. And the election of Buckley was just another product of the seduction of the innocent by the privileged.

One of the reasons I wanted to come to this conference is that I know you share my taste for cold political realities rather than political romance. We are not in politics as an ego trip or as a moral or aesthetic adventure. Politics is a fish fry. We have some fish to fry and we want to get into the kitchen.

Brothers, they are the same fish and we will get into that kitchen together or we will all be locked out. The difference between us and our opposition is that what they cook up is meant for a very small and very exclusive table. What we bring back from the fish fry has to feed millions and millions of people. We all here understand that politics helps to write the numbers on the pay checks, on the employment rolls, on the doctors' and the landlords' and the grocers' bills for better or for worse. Yours is a dual role. As trade unionists who are black and as blacks who are trade unionists, you will face problems different from those of your white brothers. They will have the continuing educational task of keeping white rank and filers voting their real interests, not their fears, not their impulses, not their prejudices.

In 1968 that was no small job but we succeeded, in large part, and the union vote for Wallace was well below the national average.

Your problem is not so much where the black vote will go but how large it will be. Less than 15 years ago, only one eligible black American out of ten was registered to vote. Today the figure has gone over the 50 percent mark and is climbing rapidly. But to get out this increasingly important vote still means overcoming an apathy, rooted in tradition, economics and the widespread conviction that voting really doesn't change anything.

Overcoming these obstacles isn't easy but certainly no one can do it more effectively than you, for as blacks who are trade unionists, you bring to the community valuable leadership skills and experience as organizers, speakers, planners, men of action, doers—skills which can only be acquired in the labor movement and which enhance your effectiveness not only in educating and mobilizing the vote but also encountering the anti-labor hostility which is being promoted by some in the community.

The power of the force that you represent has already been dramatically demonstrated. In 1968, the Negro-labor coalition, which is all there was going, refusing to become un-

stuck, came within inches of electing, virtually unaided, the President of the United States. And we were the core and the backbone of the movement that prevented a conservative sweep in 1970. Your work in voter registration, in get-out-the-vote drives, through the A. Philip Randolph Institute, was a significant factor in both of those elections.

I can state my own conviction, from close observation, that the creation, the development and the growth of the A. Philip Randolph Institute was one of the greatest things that has happened to the trade union movement in the last 10 years and, I believe, one of the greatest things that has happened to the civil rights movement in the black community.

When you look around you, you can only say "God only knows where we would be without it today."

The Negro Labor Alliance, according to some who would like to deny its existence all together, has been an election year, political contrivance that papers over some deep and growing antagonisms. The demands of the labor movement, they argue, are basically hostile to the interests of the black community and vice versa.

In most cases, of course, those observations emanate from people who know very little about the black community and have never once been to a union meeting. But I would like, nevertheless, to say just a few things about the value of the labor movement and the black community to each other.

I want to talk first about the importance of the black community to the labor movement, strictly in terms of self-interest since that is the cement that is the most durable and since avowals of pure idealism from the labor movement fall on deaf ears anyway.

In recent years the labor movement has made its greatest organizing gains among white collar workers and among those we have come to call "the working poor." With the advance of public employee unionism, large numbers of teachers, social workers, paraprofessionals, sanitation workers and other municipal employees are becoming a part of the trade union movement. In all of these areas, and in the South, Negroes and other minorities constitute a significant portion of the work force as they do also among farm workers and others of the working poor. Indeed, it has been estimated that one out of every three new union members is non-white.

Obviously, therefore, the support of the Negro and other minority communities is essential to the expansion of the labor movement. No doubt that is one reason why the enemies of labor are anxious to depict unions as racist institutions for the same basic economic reason that employers have, on other occasions, tried to break up organizing efforts in the South by calling trade unions "Negro-loving institutions." The smears don't seem to be sticking, however, at least not where it counts, for, according to a Department of Commerce study published in March, among private wage and salary workers, Negroes were more likely to be union members than were their white counterparts. The survey showed that Negro union membership in 1966 was 35 percent, as compared with 31 percent for all men. By now I would guess the figure would be considerably higher.

Furthermore, the black community is important to us as a source of new leadership within the house of labor. It is a rather special kind of leadership because it draws its strength from two different, yet profoundly related struggles—the struggle against racial injustice and against economic exploitation. Each struggle contributes to the personal realization of full manhood and dignity. This leadership is expanding and rising in the labor movement and it is a force with which our enemies are going to have to reckon.

Also, the black community is important to us all because on the basic issues most vital to labor's programs—full employment, higher wages, decent housing, more aid for public education, national health care, increased Social Security—on these and many other issues, the black community is more consistently and solidly supportive than any other single population group.

But this is not a one-way street and by any standard of self-interest the labor movement is important to the black community as an instrument of progress—in fact, the most effective single instrument now on the scene.

I am perfectly well aware that to say such a thing flies in the face of passion. It is met with disbelief in many circles. But whether we are in style or not, whether the chic and the slick like us or not, facts are facts and there is no need to be defensive or apologetic about them. Despite all of their imperfections, deficiencies, shortcomings, failures and sins, the trade unions are still far ahead of anything else on the road. They are surely the most integrated of all the mass institutions of American society. That Department of Commerce study showed that in 1966, Negroes constituted 10.4 percent of all private wage and salary workers, but 11 percent of those in labor unions. In other words, Negroes constitute a higher proportion of union members than they do of the the private labor force.

In these days of numbers games, quotas, guidelines and what have you, there is no other mass institution that so nearly reflects the composition of society. The churches? Compare the average union meeting with the average church service for integration. The colleges and the universities are good for a lot of free advice, tinged, of course, with moral superiority, but they are not much good for integration.

Out of a college student population of about seven million, only 500,000 are black and large numbers of these are in all-black southern schools. As for the faculties, forget it.

The corporations? At last count, well, there isn't much to count. Aside from the recent selection by General Motors of one of their own choosing, the 500 top corporations in America could boast of no black faces on their boards of directors or in the upper levels of management. Urban Coalition, please note.

How about the mass media? According to the most recent evaluation of a 1967 study by the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, in the radio and TV industry, Negroes constituted less than 1 percent of the officials and managers and less than 2 percent of the professionals. In periodical publishing, they were less than 1 percent of the officials and managers and exactly one percent of the professionals. And in newspaper publishing, Negroes were less than one-tenth of one percent of the officials and managers, and 1.2 percent of the professionals.

All of these institutions—the churches, the colleges and the universities, the corporations, the mass media, the press, magazines, television, radio—all of them are powerful moulders of public opinion. All of them share some responsibility for the myths and stereotypes that portray unions as bulwarks of racism and reaction. Yet when it comes to racial integration, not one of them can hold a candle to the trade union movement.

Of course, a union means much more to a black worker than a chance to be integrated with white workers. For one thing, it means he will earn more money. According to the same Department of Commerce study, a full-time, year-round Negro blue collar worker earned 50 percent more if he was a union member than if he was not. This differential is greater than that between union and non-union workers generally. The black union member not only made more but he worked more. Sixty-six percent of all union members were employed full-time the year-round as compared with only 51 percent of non-union workers.

Better wages and job security are only part of the picture. Union-won fringe benefits, group health programs, dental plans, credit unions, pension programs and so forth, help to stabilize the black worker and his family, giving them a position of dignity in the community. Anyway you turn it, the union card is still the best way out of poverty and into economic security and self-respect.

Unions are engaged in a broad range of programs that address the needs of the minority communities—not just union members.

Through the AFL–CIO Mortgage Investment Trust and the efforts of international unions, the labor movement has financed low- and middle-income housing, including cooperatives, and that effort is rapidly expanding.

Through the Human Resources Development Institute, the labor movement is involved in manpower programs around the country helping to train and upgrade the skills of minority workers. The Outreach Program that we helped to promote, to launch and expand has been reaching into the black community to recruit youngsters into apprenticeships in the building trades in cooperation with the Joint Apprenticeship Program of the Workers' Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Institute, the National Urban League and other civil rights groups. The Outreach Program has so far placed approximately, 9,000 minority group youngsters in these highly desirable apprenticeships, most of them in the mechanical trades.

Our civil rights department not only assisted in these programs but has helped to mobilize union support at the international, state and local levels to the broad objectives of the civil rights movement. The list of AFL–CIO programs, manifested in action as well as resolutions, is long-ranging from pioneering health plans to community training to school desegregation. Through all of them, directly and indirectly, the labor movement reaches out from the work place and the union hall into the homes, into the schools and the hospitals of the community, including the black community.

None of us need to apologize for labor's role in any part of the national political scene. The struggle to eliminate segregation and discrimination from the house of labor has taken a long time—too long, and it will continue until the job is done. We have no need to apologize for stopping Haynsworth and Carswell. We did notice, however, that some of our red hot liberal critics were a little slow getting into these fights and waited and waited until our flag was half-way up the hill.

We have no need to apologize for the civil rights legislation of the last decade for which the labor movement provided the most powerful backing, nor have we any need to apologize for the array of social legislation which labor's muscle has brought forth over the past generation.

To say that much of this legislation is inadequate today is merely foolish. It was less than we asked for then. Obviously it will not solve the new problems arising from our rapidly changing society. But the point is that insofar as this legislation has advanced the interests of the have-nots and the have-littles, it has brought gains to the black community which is so disproportionately concentrated in the lower-income categories. This kind of social legislation is also civil rights legislation, for it strengthens the social and economic basis for progress toward genuine racial equality.

The reverse can also occur. The Labor Department reports, for example, that "the gen-

eral decline in economic activity in 1970 reversed the improvement in jobless rates that had been made by poverty area residents between 1967 and 1969." It doesn't take much to figure out that a disproportionate number of these poverty area residents are black and that this reversal in their jobless rates does not bring them closer to equality.

The decline in economic activity engineered by the Nixon Administration is profoundly anti-civil rights. It is, of course, also anti-labor.

The great majority of American Negroes are working people. Their income derives from wages and salaries, not from dividends, capital gains and stock bonuses. So long as this is true, and it is going to be true for a long, long time, the Negro and the labor movement will necessarily share common interests. And because the black community is, in the main, a community of workers, its interests are bound with labor's and that bond must prevail over any differences.

Economic policies that are anti-labor must, inevitably, be anti-civil rights. There is really no way to engineer a recession that raises unemployment in the ranks of labor but not in the black community. There is really no way to promote inflationary price increases that cut into the purchasing power of union members but leave intact the purchasing power of the black community. There is no way to keep union wages down, even in the name of fighting inflation, that allows incomes to rise in the black community.

And yet, the view persists that the interests of labor and the Negro are antagonistic. Why? Because it has behind it powerful backers and a long tradition.

The old tactic of dividing workers along racial lines goes back a long, long way in American history. And today it is back in force, this time with White House backing.

The immediate target is the building trades, but the larger purpose is to thwart the national union drive, the drive of all working people to catch up with the rising cost of living and to get all working people a fairer share of the country's wealth.

Toward this end, the campaign has been mounted to blame union wage demands for inflation and to portray unions as the main obstacles to socially desirable goals. But an end to the heritage of slavery will not come from union busting, depressed wages, cheap labor pools or plantation-style paternalism. It will not come from pitting black and white workers against each other in a struggle over scarce jobs. It will not come from engineered recessions that render men and machines idle. It will not come from an inflation that starves the lean and feeds the fat. It will not come from interest rates that enrich the bankers and wreck our housing programs. It will not come from fiscal and monetary policies that redistribute income from those who need it to those who do not. It will not come from a continuing neglect of our social and environmental needs in the midst of blight and disorder.

It will come from the vision, the goals and the broad national programs of the labor movement. It will come from the economic and social policies advocated by labor that would put our resources where our intentions are—on the side of integration.

We do not throw up our hands and we have no patience with those who do. We know where we are going. Our purpose is clear. We have the staying power and we do not run out on our friends. And, therefore, we have hope. That hope is fed by people like you in this room.

I know that you do not have an easy job. These days the bearers of labor's message in the black community have many enemies. You are a conspicuous target for the demagogue, for the hustler, for the opportunist and the nut. They come in all sizes, shapes and colors.

You must not yield ground to them because the black community needs the special kind of leadership that only you can provide. It is special because, for one thing, it is a symbol of integration which needs to be held ever higher when there are those who would give up on it and run out on it. It is also special because it demonstrates that leadership in the black community need not come exclusively from the thin layers of the college educated, well-to-do professionals—from what DuBois called the talented tenth and Frazier called the black bourgeoisie.

Leadership can come, has come and must come in greater measure from the ranks of black working people who have real stakes in their communities, who know the value of organization, who can see clear goals and who are not afraid of the hard nuts and bolts, down-to-earth work that it takes to reach them.

These are qualities that run deep in working people of all races. They have a sense of purpose and organization and discipline that comes from being a part of the productive process of making and doing, not just talking and dreaming.

These are the qualities from which you draw your strength, the leadership from which all decent people now draw hope.

Thank you, very much.

USIA SHOULD ADD YIDDISH LANGUAGE BROADCASTS TO HELP DEMONSTRATE U.S. CONCERN FOR THE FATE OF THE OPPRESSED SOVIET JEWS

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is continuing its harassment of the Soviet Jews. Nine more members of the Jewish faith have been convicted in a closed-door court hearing in Leningrad. The foreign press was barred and little or no details were reported to the Soviet people themselves.

Over the past months, I have expressed great concern about the intolerable situation facing the Soviet Jews. It was my privilege recently to meet with a group of concerned citizens from the 27th Congressional District which I represent and to assist them in arranging meetings with other Congressmen and officials at the State Department.

One result of that meeting was a letter I sent to the U.S. Information Agency to urge that the Voice of America restructure its programing to the Soviet Union to include a segment of its 8-hour broadcast in Yiddish.

I would like to share a copy of that letter with my colleagues:

MAY 13, 1971.

Hon. CHARLES D. ABLARD,
General Counsel, U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABLARD: I very much appreciate the time several members of the USIA staff took to meet with the Rockland County Committee on Soviet Jewry and Mr. Ketcham of my staff on Wednesday, May 12th.

I am writing to urge that the Voice of America restructure its programming to the Soviet Union to include a segment of its eight-hour broadcast in Yiddish. I fully understand the very great demands on the program time, but am convinced that a careful review of your program policies would create the necessary broadcast time for the Yiddish language without significantly altering any large foreign language time block or requiring a complete, high-level policy decision.

It is very important to remember that the issue of Soviet Jewry is an increasing issue of national importance in the United States. Although there have been some very low key remarks by top governmental officials, there has been no demonstrated support, no real statement of concern such as would be possible by instituting even a limited Yiddish broadcast into the Soviet Union.

There are several compelling arguments which I only wish to restate briefly for your consideration of this question:

Of the Soviet Jewish population, a large number are Yiddish speaking.

This audience would be a more receptive audience to VOA programming in their own language.

There is a strong cultural need for the proposed programming.

With eight hours of program time, any policy change would be considered a significant breakthrough.

I feel that with the increasing overt acts of aggression against Soviet Jews, highlighted by the trials beginning on May 19th in Kishinew and May 24th in Riga, that appropriate and significant action must be undertaken by our Government.

In addition may I ask for your help in obtaining information on several of the issues discussed at the May 12th meeting:

1. Some scripts of VOA Jewish news.
2. The broadcast schedule into Russia.
3. Census figures and VOA estimate of Jewish population and Yiddish-speaking population.
4. Other languages being considered for broadcast into Russia.
5. The approximate cost of building another transmitter.

I would be most grateful for your consideration of the need to broadcast in Yiddish and for the above information.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. DOW,
Member of Congress.

The point is clear that the Voice of America beams native language broadcasts to Baltic nations although none of them have such a great population as the 3 million souls which make up the group of Jews living in the Soviet Union.

I most decidedly feel that the Voice of America should be broadcasting to these people in their own language—Yiddish. I am sure that it would be a tremendous lift to them to have word that they could understand coming from the free world.

I would also like to share with my colleagues a letter I have sent to the Secretary of State urging the United States to do everything possible to assure clemency for those Soviet Jews who pleaded guilty to charges under highly suspicious circumstances:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1971.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY ROGERS: I would like to express my deep concern about the trial being conducted in Leningrad involving nine Soviet Jews.

There are many doubts in my mind about the validity of guilty pleas by the defendants to charges of participating in plans to hijack an airplane to Israel. The defendants are all professional persons who have never before had any criminal record.

The sentences demanded by the prosecution, one to ten years in prison camps are unjust. It is painfully obvious that these demands represent continuing efforts to harass, intimidate, and terrify the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. We would like to think that this kind of treatment was a thing of the past.

I am asking you to use the power of your office to urge clemency for these persons who are in reality pawns caught up in the vicissitudes of domestic and, indeed, international policies.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. DOW,
Member of Congress.

Because of my concern, I joined in cosponsoring legislation, H.R. 7887, with my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), which would grant 30,000 special visas to Soviet Jews who would like to leave Russia and come to the United States. By adopting this legislation we can set an example of concern for the oppressed.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share with my colleagues a weekly report I issued my district on the problems facing Jewish people in the Soviet Union and the Middle East:

JEWISH PEOPLE STRIVE FOR A GOAL OF PEACE AND FREEDOM

(By Congressman JOHN G. DOW)

The situation in the Middle East is a smoldering tinderbox.

A tenuous cease-fire has existed for the past nine months and U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers has been touring the area. The greatest danger is that pressure may be brought to bear on Israel to accept a one-sided settlement.

Some forces have been trying to persuade Israel to pledge in advance of any negotiations to surrender the territories she holds as security for her borders. If this occurs, there will be little incentive for any concessions by the Arabs to assure future Israeli security.

A settlement imposed on Israel by outsiders will merely place our single ally in the Mideast in greater peril than before the six-day June War of 1967. There has been massive and unprecedented direct Soviet military involvement in Egypt. Only the creation of defensible borders will offer Israel some reasonable hope that hostilities will not resume as soon as the Arabs feel they are ready for another round.

It is in the best self-interest of the United States that Israel continue as a strong viable force in the Middle East. Many people in the 27th Congressional District have expressed concern about the situation in Israel and have urged that I make a special trip to the Mideast. I am hopeful that such a tour can be arranged by early summer.

The United States must continue to press the Russians to declare her aims and objectives in the Middle East. If we can bring the two great powers to an understanding and standstill, a solution to the Israeli-Arab conflict will be possible in a free atmosphere.

The intolerable situation facing Jewish people is not limited to the Mideast. The Jews who live in the Soviet Union are being denied of their rights—these are rights guaranteed not only by the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights but by the Soviet Constitution itself.

Many of these people have been deprived of their jobs and are pushed to the brisk of desparation. For many Soviet Jews, the only wish is to leave Russia. Yet they are denied permission to leave.

Toward this end, I have co-sponsored legislation, H.R. 7887, to authorize 30,000 special visas for Soviet Jews who want to come to the United States. Such humanitarian action follows the great American tradition of opening our land to the oppressed of the world.

Adoption of this bill would set an example for other countries to follow. It would also be a challenge for the Soviet Union to open its doors and permit Jews who want to leave to do so.

The Jewish people are proud and industrious and their entire history is evidence that they seek only freedom from oppression. Such a goal is worthy be it applied to Jews behind the Iron Curtain or to the Israelis now celebrating their 23rd year as a free nation.

HAWAII STATE SENATE SUPPORTS LEGISLATION TO PERMIT STATES TO SET NOISE STANDARDS STRICTER THAN FEDERAL

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is only recently that we have begun to address ourselves to the problem of excessive noise, but we have progressed to the point of having created an Office of Noise Abatement and Control, by last year's Clean Air Act Amendments.

The present administration, to its credit, has sent to the Congress legislation designed to deal further with noise pollution; but it is defective in a number of areas. It seems to call, for instance, for the disbanding of the Office of Noise Abatement and Control.

In addition, the administration's bill would forbid State and local governments from setting noise level standards that differed at all—either looser or stricter—from federally established standards.

The anomaly is clear: If the citizens of a particular city or State want to protect themselves from noise to a greater degree than Federal standards would allow, that city or State could not do it.

This is unacceptable, particularly to a State like Hawaii. Noise levels in my State, although they are rising, have yet to approach the excessive, intrusive level found in some other areas of the United States. And since the Federal standard must be high enough so that the noisiest city in the land will be able to comply without shutting down its economy, we can reasonably expect that the noise levels permitted under Federal regulations will be relatively high. If Hawaii is to be able to preserve the modest quiet now remaining, it must be permitted to establish stricter noise standards than those applicable nationwide. Many, perhaps most, States, are in the same position.

That is why I have joined my colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN) and dozens of other House Members in sponsoring a comprehensive bill to broaden the functions and responsibilities of the Office of Noise Abatement and Control. Included specifically in our bill is authority for State and local governments to set stricter noise level standards.

I trust that the Congress will act favorably on this proposal in the near future.

Last month, Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the State of Hawaii addressed itself to this problem, and passed a resolution urging Hawaii's congressional delegation to support changes in the law to permit stricter local and State standards for noise levels. That resolution points out another reason why noise standards applicable in other parts of the United States would be unsuited to Hawaii. Since Hawaii's near-perfect weather has resulted in open, light-weight construction throughout the islands, noise levels that are acceptable in areas with heavier, closed structures, "if applied without modification in Hawaii may not be stringent enough—and may degrade the natural environment that makes Hawaii attractive."

I could not agree more fully with the judgment of the Hawaii Senate, and I include at this point the complete text of the resolution:

Resolution requesting Hawaii's congressional delegation to seek a change in the proposed Noise Control Act of 1971 in order to allow Hawaii to set lower sound level for noise standards

Whereas, Hawaii's mild climate allows and encourages residents and visitors to enjoy throughout the year living in close companionship with Hawaii's environment; and

Whereas, many of Hawaii's homes, schools, hotels, and places of business have been designed to make use of the trade winds to cool and refresh the living spaces; and

Whereas, the resulting open and lightweight construction also allows noise easily to enter the living and sleeping spaces; and

Whereas, noise both within and without the living spaces greatly interferes with the enjoyment of the "trade-wind" quality of life which is so attractive to residents and visitors; and

Whereas, noise control standards that are reasonable for areas having closed, heavyweight structures, such as those typical of cold climates, if applied without modification in Hawaii may not be stringent enough for open, lightweight structures, and may degrade the natural environment that makes Hawaii attractive; and

Whereas, the products of commerce, such as construction equipment, transportation equipment, and equipment powered by internal combustion engines, with which the Noise Control Act of 1971 is concerned, have the capability through noise of degrading Hawaii's natural environment and of destroying its attractiveness to residents and visitors; and

Whereas, most of the products of commerce will not, when used in Hawaii, be used in interstate commerce; and

Whereas, The Noise Control Act of 1971, as submitted to the Congress by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, would allow the Administrator to set noise-generating standards for many products of commerce, and that Section 6 (d) of the Act specifies that no State shall adopt or enforce for any product a standard higher or lower than that set by the Administrator; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Sixth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1971, that Hawaii's Congressional Delegation be, and hereby is, respectfully requested to seek a change in The Noise Control Act of 1971 that will have the effect of allowing State authority in Hawaii to set noise-generating standards at *lower* sound levels than those set by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for those products of commerce that are used, or intended for use, entirely within the State of Hawaii or between the various Islands thereof.

Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to

the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senator; the Honorable Hiram Fong, U.S. Senator; the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga, U.S. Representative; the Honorable Patsy Mink, U.S. Representative; and Mr. William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States of America.

"DAIRY INDUSTRY OWES A DEBT OF GRATITUDE TO COPERNICUS"

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish American Journal has called to our attention an interesting bit of historical research which shows that the famous Polish astronomer, Nicholas Copernicus, was first to suggest the practice of putting butter on bread.

It is an interesting footnote to history and I am pleased to include in the RECORD today the Polish American Journal editorial.

As an aside, I might point out that obviously this innovative idea by Copernicus has led to the development of a huge industry throughout the world, and I believe that dairy farmers and the whole dairy industry ought to make Copernicus their hero.

The editorial follows:

[From the Polish American Journal, May 22, 1971]

JUST BETWEEN US: COPERNICUS STARTED "BREAD-BUTTERING"

A recent issue of the Journal of the American Medical Assn. carried a stimulating essay by Samuel B. Hand, Ph.D., and Arthur S. Kunin, M.D., entitled "Nicholas Copernicus and the Inception of Bread-Buttering."

The researchers did a study on the practice of bread-buttering. As best they were able to learn, it was during the period that the Teutonic Knights were expected to lay siege to the Castle of Allenstein during the years 1519 and 1521 when a plague struck. The castle was under the command of the able and distinguished Polish Canon of the Cathedral of Frauenburg, Mikolaj Kopernik. Much of the renowned astronomer's reputation at the time rested upon his skill as a physician. As a youth, he had studied medicine at the University of Padua and, although never securing a medical degree, he did acquire a professional proficiency reputed to be well above the level of most of his contemporaries.

From all indications, the plague which struck Allenstein Castle was a moderately serious affair. The researchers could attribute much morbidity but only two fatalities to it. Some victims, including Kopernik himself, fortunately suffered relatively slight indispositions. Kopernik, who at first contented himself with prescribing routine treatments, became disquieted when in many instances the disease either persisted in spite of his therapy or (which was even more disturbing) reappeared in cases which he had regarded as cured. He determined therefore that, rather than limit himself to ineffective treatment for the malady, he would search out and define its etiology and pathogenesis.

Eventually, the Canon determined that the bread baked at Allenstein Castle, and then common to all Europe, was a large, coarse black loaf which could collect substantial amounts of foreign debris without noticeable discoloration or other obvious evidence of contamination. While other articles which fell into the squalid Allenstein courtyard could, in most instances, be easily purged of unsightly extraneous matter, the bread, seldom showing any evidence of its defilement, was consumed.

It was finally decided to coat the bread loaves with a thin layer of an edible light-colored spread. After such treatment any foreign matter adhering to the fallen loves would be readily visible and potential victims would be able to protect themselves from contagion by either cleaning off or discarding the contaminated loaf. A decision to coat all bread with a spread of churned cream subsequently resulted in the elimination of the plague from the castle.

The method, as an apparent tribute to its most effective proponent, Adolph Buttenadt, a friend and classmate of Kopernik from the Padua medical school, was described as Buttenating, and it is, of course, in the elided form, buttering, that we describe the practice today.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the education community is alive with discussion about the financial problems of our colleges and universities. The Federal Government is being asked to come to their rescue. As we know, many agencies of Government have programs of assistance to students and to institutions. And several committees of Congress have legislation dealing with aid to higher education.

It is too seldom that we have a chance to see the Federal role in higher education from the broadest perspective. James B. Cardwell, Assistant Secretary and Comptroller, HEW, provided such a perspective in an April 26, 1971, speech to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

As well as reviewing the history and current status of Federal aid, Mr. Cardwell provides some very important questions about the issue of general, unrestricted Federal aid to colleges and universities. Since the Education and Labor Committee, and perhaps the Congress itself, will have to face this issue, I commend Mr. Cardwell's excellent speech to the attention of our colleagues in the House:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND HIGHER EDUCATION

(Remarks by James B. Cardwell)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Secretary Richardson sends his greetings and best wishes.

I am not here this evening as the Government's spokesman for higher education, but more as one who has spent all of his working life in Washington, in and around the Federal budget.

My purpose is to help you—as best I can—get behind the dollar signs—to help identify the public policy for higher education as expressed through the Federal budget. I believe if we look closely we will find such a policy. In fact, we may well find more than one.

Let's begin with what the Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 says about higher education.

The 1972 budget identifies $6 billion worth of Federal outlays for higher education. According to the budget, this accounts for one-fourth of all funds—Federal, State, local, and private—to be spent for higher education during the same period.

Proceeding with our journey, we find that this $6 billion resides in many different places within the budget. In fact, it is not always where one might normally expect to find it.

1. First, we find that the Defense Department plans to spend $523 million for what the budget calls "academic research and other Defense-supported activities."

2. In the portion of the budget for the U.S. Office of Education, we find:

$800 million for student assistance,

$201 million in payments to subsidize loans and liquidate prior grants made for college construction,

$34 million for grants to predominantly Black and other developing colleges,

$174 million for fellowships, scholarships, and grants for graduate students working in the fields of teaching and higher education, and

$100 million for post-secondary vocational training.

3. The health part of the Federal budget shows:

$281 million for institutional support grants, as well as fellowships, scholarships, and grants for students in the health professions,

$147 million for construction grants for medical and other health related schools,

$268 million for fellowships and grants for the training of biomedical researchers,

And again we find an item called "academic research," $677 million to be spent through grants and contracts to universities—mainly by the National Institutes of Health.

4. Elsewhere in the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we find $32 million for fellowships, scholarships, and grants for graduate students in social work—plus $17 million for "academic research" in social services and rehabilitation.

5. Still within the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we find a large outlay from the Social Security Trust Funds in the form of survivor benefits. $594 million will, according to the budget, be paid to support college costs of young people of deceased parents who were eligible for Social Security.

6. In the Housing and Urban Development portion of the budget, loan subsidies for college housing account for $56 million.

7. In the Veterans Administration, educational and student benefits account for over $1.2 billion, the largest single higher education item in the Federal budget.

8. The last major item consists of $363 million for grants, fellowships, and institutional support administered by the National Science Foundation.

Allowing for that haven of all budget analysts, the category known as "Other," all of this adds up to slightly over $6 billion. In this case, "Other" includes $450 million to be spent by a number of other agencies, including NASA, AEC, Agriculture, OEO, and Interior. As it turns out, most of this is for "academic research."

This is what the Federal budget says it will spend on higher education. It tells us more about "from whom" than "to whom." If one digs a little further, he finds that, of the $6 billion—

Two-year institutions receive $687 million, or slightly over 10 percent.

Other undergraduate schools account for about $2.6 billion, or about 45 percent.

Support of graduate programs within colleges and universities and support to graduate and professional students account for about $2.7 billion, or about 45 percent.

Looking at the $6 billion from another plane shows that half goes for student aid.

About one-fifth goes to institutions to help finance faculty and other expenses. A little less than one-third goes for Federally sponsored research and research training.

Converting the percentages to dollars, student support accounts for about $3 billion, institutional support for operations, facilities, and equipment accounts for about $1.2 billion, and Federally sponsored research and training account for about $1.8 billion.

By this time, I've probably confirmed something you have known all along—Federal support for higher education does not always go directly to the institutions themselves and, when it does, it is often directed toward a specific Federal purpose.

A large share of the money—almost one-half—goes to the students rather than directly to the university.

Another large share, while going directly to the college or university, is used to finance research and research training activities tailored more to the special interests of the Federal Government than to those of the university. Of course, much of it also goes to support the universities' own research interests.

It seems likely that, given their choice, America's colleges and universities would distribute $6 billion quite differently. If they could start all over again, so might the Feds.

I believe it is fair to say that, like most of the budget, that part designated for higher education is simply the current cost of past decisions—decisions made about different things for different reasons at different times. This becomes clearer when one examines the history of Federal programs for higher education.

HOW THE BUDGET GOT THAT WAY

The first significant Federal support for higher education can, as I am sure most of you know, be traced back to the Land Grant College Act of 1862—the Morrill Act.

The original Morrill Act granted lands for educational purposes as a means of establishing colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. Several of today's great research and engineering universities are eligible for and continue to receive grants under the original Act. MIT is an example of such a school.

By the turn of the century, the Act was modified to provide annual payments to help defray operating costs of the so-called land grant colleges. Some historians believe that the concept of land grants to promote the development of agricultural and engineering training established a principle which is still being followed today. Whenever the Government has decided that the country needs manpower trained in a given skill or discipline, it has moved to subsidize this training through payments to institutions. Much of what is being spent today in the form of support for research and other special college level training stems from this principle.

Except for the Federal land grant payments, during the first half of the 20th century, the Federal Government resisted any temptation to help finance the development of our national system for higher education. It was during that period that higher education benefited the most from private philanthropy. This was the era of the Vanderbilts, the Stanfords, and the Johns Hopkins.

Although the Land Grant College Act brought Federal Government into higher education, the Feds did not really become deeply involved until World War II. Prior to World War II, most Federal funding had gone, through the Land Grant route, to support training in agriculture and engineering and some research in agriculture. World War II, however, brought a demand for massive research efforts on the part of the colleges and universities in many other fields. This was the beginning of the modern practice of Government-funded research. It is a practice that continues today.

The next development, of course, came with the GI Bill. Although financial assistance was provided for some individual students during World War II in a few selected disciplines. Federal support of individual students was not significant until passage of the GI Bill. Since the end of World War II, more than 12.7 million veterans have received more than $21 billion in direct Federal financial support for education and training. Most of this, of course, went to students attending colleges and universities.

1950 brought the establishment of the National Science Foundation and its support of the sciences. That same year, the College Housing program was enacted, authorizing loans to both public and private institutions to finance the construction of dormitories and related facilities. To date, over $3.7 billion has been loaned for this purpose.

Sputnik brought the next change, with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This Act, which included Federal programs for elementary, secondary, and higher education, authorized student assistance, as well as support for graduate students pursuing advanced science degrees.

This was followed by the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. This Act authorized both grants and loans to finance part of the costs of construction of both undergraduate and graduate teaching facilities, libraries, and other buildings for academic use. To date, over $2.6 billion has been made available under this authority.

Next came the Higher Education Act of 1965 which, in addition to expanding Federal student aid programs, authorized new forms of grants to promote community involvement on the part of colleges and universities, as well as a new program of grants for developing colleges—the small isolated institutions which have not yet attained a satisfactory academic standing. Most of the Black colleges are eligible for this form of assistance.

While this constitutes the list of Federal programs that have come into being specifically for the purpose of supporting higher education—both students and schools—two other Federal activities affecting higher education have evolved since World War II. These are the growth of Department of Defense supported research, both on and off campus, and the biomedical research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health. These two kinds of research, coupled with the interest of the National Science Foundation in the sciences, have, of course, had a tremendous influence on the way in which many of our major colleges and universities are financed.

It should be clear by now that the present Federal budget for higher education is the product of a variety of different decisions made over a very long period of time. However, it would, I believe, be a mistake to conclude that the Federal Government lacks a current policy concerning what it wants to do and doesn't want to do regarding higher education. To the contrary, it is my view that a close examination of the budget alone will show that the Federal Government has, for some time, been developing a fairly clear-cut set of interrelated policies with regard to higher education. By sorting out the various programs, it has, I believe, developed a very definite role for itself. I see the following as representing some of the more clearly defined choices:

1. *A deliberate choice to place first emphasis on greater and more equal access to the system on the part of minorities and the poor.*

The most significant evidence of this choice is the President's commitment to provide every student access to the system. Both the President's budget and legislative program stress direct Federal support for students from families with low incomes. Under this plan, the poorest students would be eligible for direct Federal grants, and middle income students would be eligible to borrow from private sources, with both direct Federal subsidy and a Federally guaranteed secondary loan market. Upper middle income students would be eligible for loan guarantees. The 1972 budget would provide either direct or guaranteed student aid for over 3.5 million students. This means that 1.5 million more students would be eligible for some form of Federal support this year than last. In total, these 3.5 million students are expected to spend $2.8 billion in the pursuit of their studies during the coming school year.

The second evidence that equality of opportunity and access represent a policy of choice is the continuing support that is being given to the so-called developing institutions.

Five years ago, the budget provided only $5 million in grants to 122 institutions. This figure has increased so that by 1972, over $34 million will go to assist over 200 institutions.

2. *Next, there is a clear Federal policy to support innovation in higher education.*

The proposal to establish the National Foundation for Higher Education with a first-year budget of $100 million shows clearly a decision to make a considerable investment in the development of new approaches to higher education and new educational enterprises.

3. *A policy of continued reliance on the university for advances in research and technology in areas of national need.*

Despite all of the concern that has been expressed during the last two or three years about the so-called "cut-back in Federal support for academic research," the signals are extremely clear, I believe, that the Government is continuing its reliance on America's colleges and universities for research in areas of special national interest. I should point out at this time that, no matter how one analyzes it, the 1972 Federal budget shows an aggregate increase in funds for academic research. With the exception of limited cuts in AEC and NASA research, every major category of Federally supported research shows an increase in 1972. This is true, be it Defense sponsored research, biomedical research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health, or research in the sciences sponsored by the National Science Foundation. On the other hand, it should also be said that the Federal Government has already moved toward a policy of more deliberate and selective choices among the many competing research programs. For example, the 1972 budget increases grants for cancer, heart, and family planning research. At the same time, it proposes decreases in support for social service research.

We in Government realize that we have a lot to learn about how to make such choices without trauma among the universities at the other end of the line. If we work together, I believe it can be done. Not to learn to shift our priorities would serve neither your interest, our interest, nor that of the Society which we are trying to serve.

4. *A policy of continued reliance on colleges and universities for manpower development in skills and disciplines in short supply.*

No less a part of the Federal policy for higher education is the Government's continuing interest in what began with the Morrill Act—incentive financing for the training of special skills and disciplines. However, as with research, it seems clear that the Government is beginning to ask critical and searching questions about whether such support is properly balanced against current supply and demand. This can be seen in the 1972 budget policy which provides no new fellowships for the graduate training of Ph.D.'s who want to be college teachers. However, despite this kind of selective decrease, the overall Federal budget for support of graduate students and programs shows an increase in 1972, from $248 million to $256 million.

5. The last, and I believe most important, feature of the emerging Federal policy is a decision to put a greater share of the Federal investment in the hands of the students.

As I have already pointed out, over half of the Federal investment for 1972, would go to students in the form of grants, loans, and loan guarantees to pay tuition and other charges. Five years ago, only a third of the Federal funds for higher education went to the student.

I have no difficulty concluding that the Federal Government has made up its mind about the role it wants to play insofar as these five areas are concerned.

Although colleges and universities may not have accepted it, I have no trouble in discerning that at least the Executive Branch—if not the Government as a whole—has developed a preference for interest subsidies and loan guarantees rather than direct grants and loans to support facilities construction. Two budgets ago—1970—the Government spent almost $650 million out of the U.S. Treasury to finance such grants and loans. The 1972 budget calls for no outlays for new grants or loans. Instead, the budget proposes subsidies in support of about $800 million worth of such loans—loans that would be obtained from the private money market.

This, of course, represents a significant shift in Federal policy. I have to concede that perhaps the most significant change is the decision to eliminate grants altogether. I will be the first to recognize that it is difficult to get a grant from your friendly local bank. On the other hand, we believe that the loan guarantee and interest subsidy approach will, over the long run, do as much, or more, to support higher education generally than would the earlier policy of limited grants and loans. Why do I say this?

1. Because this policy requires fewer Federal construction dollars for any given year, it will make it possible to apply more Federal funds to those aspects of higher education that cannot be funded through the private sector—those activities that, by their nature, cannot be supported through interest subsidies or guarantees. In other words, we are applying monies previously used for direct support of construction to finance increased grant support in other areas of Federal concern.

2. Because the previous construction grants and loans required local matching and because such matching was often borrowed at interest, there are many instances in which the net cost to the college or university, over the full financing period, could actually be reduced. Let me try to explain. Under the direct loan arrangement, a college would borrow all of the needed funds—three-fourths from the Government at 3 percent interest and one-fourth from private sources at rates of 8 percent or more. Under the new approach, the school would still borrow the full amount, but now they would be required to pay the full market rates on only one-tenth of the loan. The Government picks up all interest over 3 percent on nine-tenths of the loan. This should produce a net gain for the college.

The big question, of course, is will it be possible, even with the Federal subsidy, for all colleges and universities to borrow on the open market. We recognize that private institutions—particularly the small developing institutions—could have difficulty. To meet this problem, we have just recently asked the Congress to authorize a Federal guarantee in support of construction projects sponsored by private institutions. We hope this will solve the problem. It is the Government's view that State institutions already enjoy a borrowing advantage because interest on State and municipal obligations is exempt as to Federal interest income. The one other remaining problem is State or local limits on borrowing. We would urge the States to examine such policies and modernize them to fit today's circumstances.

Given cooperation by the States and the private sector, we believe this policy will work to the ultimate advantage of both the Federal budget and the cause of higher education.

THE NOT SO GREAT DEBATE

While I believe the several Federal policies that I have enumerated are discernible and fairly well defined, it seems equally clear to me that within the Federal establishment there is, at present, no consensus concerning whether a policy of general support subsidies should be adopted.

There are signs in Washington these days—signs as sure as those of spring—that others have already decided that such a policy is needed. This, they say, is necessary if higher education is to solve its "financial crisis"—its "new Depression."

Frankly, my fear is that we may rush toward such a concept without having thought through all that it may mean—both to Government and to education. I believe we need to think more and perhaps even worry more about the possible consequences of such a policy. As I have attempted to illustrate, the past development of Federal programs for higher education has not always been orderly. Nor has it always produced the desired result. Some Federal programs were born in haste—without full debate. Despite such lessons of the past, we seem to be headed toward another "not so great debate."

Although it may fast become one of the great Washington cliches, it's hard to underestimate the influence that the term "financial crisis" can have on the legislative process—once having been spoken by men of repute and purpose.

My fear is that these words—and very little more—spoken often enough by the right people to the right people—may rush us all into a public policy for education that later turns out to be wrong. This is what I mean when I talk about the "not so great debate." I express this concern not out of any special desire to protect the balance sheet of the Federal Treasury—although it could surely benefit from more protection—but out of concern that we may be trying to solve a problem before we know enough about it.

Despite all that has been written and said by learned men about the so-called financial crisis in higher education, I do not believe all of the right questions have been asked and answered. With your indulgence, I would ask some of these questions here tonight. I see them as questions to be considered not just by the Government, but by board of governors, college presidents, faculty, and all others who care about the future of this most vital of American resources.

I ask these questions with the full realization that given schools, or parts of schools, are experiencing or soon will experience operating deficits—at least in terms of how they keep their own books.

I ask these questions with full knowledge that costs have risen and that often the acceptance of every new student has added to the income-cost squeeze.

I ask these questions although I am aware that much of the Government's support of university research depends on cost sharing by the university—cost sharing that hurts when the Government shifts or reduces its support.

My questions are:

1. Will general institutional aid from the Federal Government really solve these problems? Instead, is there any chance that, over time, it could even aggravate them?

2. Next, I would ask. Do any of us know enough about the dimensions of the "financial crisis" to settle on so simple an answer? None of what I have read or heard suggests that anybody has examined critically—not that it could be done without great effort—the extent to which the university balance sheet is affected by good or bad business management practices, by the design and character of given academic programs, or by the design and character of non-income producing community services. Nor have I found very much information about how much of the crisis may stem from things that may be cyclical and how much of it from things that have become chronic.

3. My next question has to do with whether Federal institutional support casts the Feds in the proper role. While I insist that this question was not inspired by Faust, I am asking whether or not there is any risk that such a course may eventually result in unnecessary and excessive Federal involvement in the affairs of the academy. My experience in Government tells me that—once tax dollars go out—so do the Federal requests for accountability on the part of those who receive the money.

One might conclude that accountability is a small price to pay for such a great cause. For, after all, what question can we ask that you would not be prepared to answer? It is my guess that we have stored up in the nooks and crannies of our offices in Washington all kinds of interesting questions about what may be right and what may be wrong with higher education.

4. Recognizing that tight budgets have not always produced self-improvement on the part of Government, I hesitate to ask the next question. Yet, there is a chance that it may be of value.

As difficult as the stresses are on the system and its financing, might not the stresses themselves lead to reforms and efficiencies to the ultimate good of education? By turning to what may prove only to be an expedient, are we taking the pressure off and thus making it more difficult for those who would improve and reform and easier for those who, for whatever reason, would preserve the status quo?

5. I frankly do not know very much about the current trends in income to colleges outside of tuition and Federal assistance. But I have no doubt that in the past this has always been the critical element in the income and expense equation. Thus, I would ask whether there is any risk that a general Federal institutional subsidy might become another example of Gresham's law, with the Federal money driving out other money normally realized from the alumni, philanthropic individuals and foundations, business enterprises, and from the States.

6. Finally, I would ask, Is the academy satisfied that its life style is the right one for the future? Has it become too expensive? Will students and the public continue to accept the established roles and the built-in costs asosciated with the traditions of academic life? This may be viewed as an audacious question, coming from someone in Government. Yet, I believe the question is already in the wings, ready to be asked by others. Thus, it may be relevant at this time.

I am certain that I have far enough in my discourse on the question of institutional aid. Yet, it would not be fair for me to rush into town, drop a series of difficult questions concerning whether a Federal institutional subsidy is in the best interests of education and then leave without acknowledging the Federal Government's responsibility to help solve the problems that led to the questions in the first place.

There can be no doubt of the Federal Government's dependence on higher education for much that is important to our society—our health, welfare, and general prosperity depend heavily on our system of higher education. This is borne out by the growing investments that have been made by the Government in the system—investments that have almost always been tied to an expectation of specific response and performance by the system.

But as true as this may be, there is now

reason to ask whether the Government's involvement itself may not be at the source of at least some of the financial problems now facing higher education. Thus, it is only fair that I should acknowledge the existence of legitimate questions that you might ask of the Government—questions on the other side of the issue.

Examples of such counter-questions include:

1. What are the cost implications for colleges and universities of the emerging policy of greater access for the poor and the minorities?

2. What will a policy that places more money in the hands of the students themselves do to the system?

3. In the areas of research and manpower development, is the Government always paying its fair share? Are grant and cost sharing mechanisms used by the Government in any way a part of the problem?

4. A related question deals with the issue of shifting Federal priorities and the effect of such shifts on built-in costs and commitments of the university.

These are but a few of the questions that higher education might wish to ask of Government. You probably have many more.

I submit that they warrant our full, immediate, and thoughtful attention. Both higher education and Government need to examine themselves, as well as each other.

My purpose tonight has been to demonstrate—not that Government has made up its mind against a policy of general institutional support—but that more work and thought need to be applied to the issues before adopting this or any other policy.

We in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, although perhaps slow to start, now have underway a number of efforts directed toward this problem. By working with others in Government and with the higher education community, we should be able to find at least some of the answers.

Thank you.

THE SST

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the SST on the two previous occasions when it came before us this year. I did so for several reasons: I did not want to see unemployment rise in California. I wanted to encourage the aerospace industries to move from defense to the civilian market. Most importantly, I felt that, since we could get the two prototypes for the same price—or so we were told—as it would cost us to close down the program, that we should go ahead and see what we had.

But now the manufacturers have told us they will need another half billion, or another billion, to build the prototypes. They say they do not want to continue a contract under which they have to pay 10 percent while the Government pays 90 percent; they want the Government to pay it all. And they say they would require support for the production phase, running into several billions of dollars.

This is a horse of a different color. It is another kettle of fish. It is a new ball game. It is another thing entirely. It is just plain out of sight.

I understand that the Yates motion to instruce the conferees to recede to the Senate and kill the SST will not be offered, because it has become unnecessary. If it had been needed, and if it had been offered, I would have voted for it.

THE FAR-OFF FIFES AND DRUMS: THE HERITAGE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is no logical reason why men should invest anniversaries measured in centuries with an almost-mystical quality, yet we do. We are now close to the 200th anniversary of the independence of the American Republic. We can well expect this occasion to have, surrounding it, the same undefinable and curious aura of wonder, pride, and mystery that it is the way of men to give all such—deeds, events, nations—whose lives are marked off on lines denoting 100 years.

Two hundred years since the Declaration of Independence—it seems so long. Yet, we are inclined to forget it is really very close. We are still infants among many nations of the world in the strict terms of time. There are many persons today not yet 40 who can easily remember seeing—and perhaps knowing—Civil War veterans. And at the time of the Civil War, in fact, near its end, in 1865, there were definitely six veterans of the American Revolution still alive. So, then, if you knew a man who had fought in the Civil War, you also knew a man who could have known a member of the Continental Army.

And, closer yet: native Hoosier—Angola—Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, longtime Director of Selective Service and now special adviser to the President, has the most unusual link with this era that I have ever heard.

His grandmother, when a little girl, saw General Lafayette on his last visit to this country, early in the 19th century. She remembered very clearly seeing the white-haired, bent old man sitting in his carriage; her school had been let out for the day to watch him pass.

She told General Hershey of this many times. An acquaintance of mine remarked about this after his young children, ages 7 and 8, had met the general:

> It won't mean anything to them for years, but if they live to be 60—in 2020 A.D.—just think what they can say: "When I was little I shook hands with a man whose grandmother had seen General Lafayette." This will capsule the entire span of our history right down into their hands!

So close—yet, unfortunately, almost forgotten, and so immeasurably tragic that it has been. Not alone in the sense that the words and deeds of men who created our country should always remain hallowed and fresh in our minds but because there is a tremendous sweep and panorama to the whole story that is being allowed to slip away from and out of our national memories.

John Adams, in 1777, wrote a stern injunction to the ages of Americans yet unborn:

> Posterity! You will never know how much it cost the present generation to preserve your freedom! I hope you will make good use of it. If you do not, I shall repent in heaven that I ever took half the pains to preserve it!

It is a pleasure to report that today we are moving in the right direction to give this bicentennial the attention it deserves. Beginning this year, at least one special commemorative stamp will be issued annually on the 4th of July, bearing on the Revolution. A team of experts is hard at work in the Library of Congress, with the ultimate goal of compiling an 8,000-item bibliography of Revolutionary War source material. We can expect beginning at any time—in fact, it has already begun—a flood of new books dealing with the period. States, cities, communities that figured in Revolutionary events are already planning their celebrations.

This is, of course, quite as it should be. For myself, I like to think that it just might barely be possible, as the time approaches, to hear, faint but clear, the roll of drums and the shrilling of fifes across the length and breadth of this land. Before we continue to make good use of that freedom of which John Adams wrote—and I believe that as a people, as a nation, we have thus far in our existence—we should make the most of these bicentennial years, and the years leading up to them.

So listen for the fifes; hark to the muffled mutter of the drums. They can call up for you, if you let them, that which no one can ever take away from you: Your national heritage given to you by the men who shaped this Nation. They can play their faint but stirring accompaniment to the grand pageant of sound, light, color, drama, sacrifice, heroism, and dedication that attended the birth of our Republic. And let them always continue to play, in your mind, for we are that posterity to whom John Adams spoke.

VOICES FROM THE PAST

Time dims images; figures of the Revolutionary War era, to us, are shadow figures, without form or dimension. Let us bring them to life, by recalling their own words:

Molly Pitcher has gone into the history books, or, at least, she used to be in them. She was a very real person; to the Continental soldiers at the Battle of Monmouth she was Mary Ludwig Hayes, wife of one Private Hayes, and by all accounts a bawdy sort who had no education whatever, but did have a love for chewing tobacco and was gifted with a startlingly complete vocabulary when it came to swearing.

What she said during the battle, as she helped serve the artillery, has been noted by one observer. It never went into the history books; it is not going in here, either, but let us consider some others:

The Earl of Sandwich, in the House of Lords, February 10, 1775; the issue was war with the Colonies, and the noble lord was contemptuous of doubt of the outcome:

The noble Lord mentions the impracticability of conquering America . . . Suppose the Colonies do abound in men? . . . They are raw, undisciplined, cowardly men. . . . the very sound of a cannon would carry them off . . . as fast as their feet could carry them. . . .

On Sunday, February 26, 1775, General Gage sent a force of British regulars from Boston to Salem, to try and seize some supplies. They failed; the people of Salem, unafraid, denied them passage over a drawbridge. On the return march, one nurse, Sarah Tarrant, called to them from her window:

Go home and tell your master he has sent you on a fool's errand, and broken the peace of our Sabbath. What, do you think we were born in the woods, to be frightened by owls?

And when a British soldier aimed his musket at her:

Fire, if you have the courage, but I doubt it!

It is worth noting here that, on the march back from Salem, the British fifes and drums played the tune "The World's Turned Upside Down." Alpha and Omega; it would be heard again at Yorktown, where Cornwallis surrendered to Washington.

Baron von Steuben, that wonderfully fraudulent Prussian, Washington's drill master extraordinaire, wheeling in a frustrated rage to Capt. Benjamin Walker, his interpreter, after a particularly difficult time with his charges, and ending a volley of oaths with:

Viens, Walker, mon ami, mon bon ami! Sacre! Goddam de gaucheries of dese badauts, Je ne puis plus.

and having exhausted his stock of German, French and English, wearily finishing with:

I can curse dem no more!

The incredibly brief and simple dialogue between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, in which Adams prevailed upon Jefferson to write the Declaration of Independence; Jefferson said Adams should do it. Adams responded, "I will not." The following ensued. It is from a letter Adams wrote:

You should do it.
Oh! no.
Why will you not? You ought to do it.
I will not.
Why?
Reason enough.
What can be your reason?

Reason first—you are a Virginian, and a Virginian ought to appear at the head of this business. Reason second—I am obnoxious, suspected and unpopular. You are very much otherwise. Reason third—You can write ten times better than I can.

"Well," said Jefferson, "if you are decided, I will do as well as I can."

Very well. When you have drawn it up, we will have a meeting.

A British column had expected to catch Gen. Francis Marion off guard. The Swamp Fox was ready for them; his men were in position. Colonel Horry, of Marion's command, had a speech defect but he did not let it get ahead of him. In the words of Captain Tarleton Brown, with Marion's men:

Col. Horry stammered badly, and on this occasion he leaned forward, spurred his horse, waved his sword and ran fifty or sixty yards, endeavoring to utter the word "charge", and finding he could not, bawled out, "Damn it, boys, you . . . you know what I mean! Go on!"

A few days before Lexington and Concord, in early April 1775, General Gage sent one John Howe out from Boston to spy on the state of the locals in the surrounding country. Howe stopped at a small house along the road; where an old man and his wife lived. The man was cleaning his gun. Howe did not get the old man's name, but his report read as follows:

I asked him what he was going to kill, as he was so old I should not think he could take sight at any game; he said there was a flock of red-coats at Boston, which he expected would be here soon; he meant to try and hit some of them, as he expected they would be very good marks. I asked the old man how he expected to fight; he said, "Open field fighting, or any other way to kill them redcoats!'

I asked the old man if there were any tories nigh there; he said there was one tory house in sight, and he wished it was in flames. The old man says, "Old woman, put in the bullet pouch a handful of buckshot, as I understand the English like an assortment of plums!!"

In 1842, one Captain Preston, 91 years old and a veteran of Concord, was interviewed.

Did you take up arms against intolerable oppression? he was asked.

Oppressions? I didn't feel them.

Were you not oppressed by the Stamp Act?

I never saw one of those stamps. I certainly never paid a penny for one of them.

Well, what then about the tea tax?

I never drank a drop of the stuff; the boys threw it all overboard.

Then I suppose you had been reading Harington or Sidney and Locke about the eternal principles of liberty?

Never heard of 'em. We read only the Bible, the Catechism, Watts' Psalms and Hymns, and the Almanac.

Well, then, what was the matter? And what did you mean in going to the fight?

Young man, what we meant in going for those redcoats was this: we always had governed ourselves, and we always meant to. They didn't mean we should.

FOUGHT ON LAND—WON ON WATER

Ask anyone to name at random at least three land battles of the American Revolution. You'll get a response: Yorktown, Saratoga, Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, Trenton, Princeton, Cowpens, Monmouth, Bennington—but ask him to name a sea engagement and chances are all you will have in reply is John Paul Jones with *Bonhomme Richard* against H. M. *Serapis*.

But before any land battles could be fought—and won—the armies had to be supplied and there was great reliance on aid from abroad that had to come by sea. In 1775, the British Navy had 131 ships-of-the-line—60–100 guns; 98 2-deckers and frigates—20–56 guns; 38 sloops—8–18 guns; and 2 bombships and 1 fireship. There was outright opposition in the Continental Congress to even making the attempt to build an American Navy. Some thought it would be suicidal, considering the odds. Not until December 11, 1775, did the Naval Committee see adoption of its report, which called for a squadron of frigates: "Five ships of 32 guns, five of 28 guns, three of 24 guns, making in the whole thirteen."

George Washington had started his own Navy and on September 2, 1775, had signed an order to one Nicholas Broughton, appointing him a Captain in the Army, and instructing him to take the schooner *Hannah* and proceed—

Immediately on a cruise against such vessels as may be found on the high seas or elsewhere, bound inwards and outwards, to or from Boston, in the service of the Ministerial Army, to take and seize all such vessels laden with soldiers, arms, ammunition or provisions, for or from said Army, to take and seize all such vessels laden with soldiers, arms, ammunition or provisions, for or from said Army, or which you shall have good reason to suspect are in such service.

Broughton snapped up a prize on his second day out. Others soon followed but the men had enlisted as soldiers, not sailors, and winter patrol duty on the seas was not to their liking. Washington was to write:

The plague, trouble and vexation I have had with the crews of all the armed vessels is inexpressible. I do believe there is not on earth a more disorderly set.

The Continental and State navies never commissioned over 100 ships; Britain increased its fleet from 270 to 468 and 174 of these had 60 or more guns. But the British Navy had within it facets worth another 300 ships to the Americans. First Lord of the Admiralty was the Earl of Sandwich, totally incompetent, corrupt and scheming; his contribution to history was—the sandwich, invented by him due to a love of gambling. A 24-hour stint at the gaming tables, fortified with slabs of roast beef between hunks of bread, and you might say he is the spiritual godfather to thousands of drive-ins and carry-outs and snack bars all over the world.

Privateering was something else again. This was a good old American custom. During the French and Indian War—1754–63—an estimated 11,000 Americans were in the business. Quite frankly, it was little more than licensed piracy, and historians argue over whether or not privateers during the Revolution did more harm than good to the American cause.

Be that as it may, an estimated 2,000 or so went into service. Massachusetts alone, in its best seafaring tradition, sent out 600. Privateers went where the money was, and not necessarily where naval strength was needed, but they did take 600 British ships, 1775–1783—including 16 men-of-war; nothing hesitant about privateer crews—with estimated total value in prize money of $18,000,000. One, *Rattlesnake*, swept into the Baltic and scooped up $1,000,000 worth of loot, on one voyage.

Prize money was an incentive for the Continental Navy, as well. In 1779, it is recorded, a 14-year-old cabin boy, after only 1 month in *Ranger*, got as his share $700, 1 ton of sugar, 35 gallons of rum, and 20 pounds each of cotton, ginger, logwood, and allspice.

Fought on land but won on water—when Cornwallis at Yorktown was pinned to the seacoast by Washington, and the French fleet under de Grasse had beaten the English fleet, and Cornwallis had no recourse but to surrender. But the

why of de Grasse being there in the first place traces directly back to an almost forgotten naval engagement on Lake Champlain, 5 years before, in 1776. Indeed, there is a strong case to be made that the entire outcome of the American Revolution hinged on the Battle of Valcour Island, where the Americans were commanded by—Benedict Arnold.

The Canadian invasion had failed beneath the walls of the fortress of Quebec. Arnold led the beaten remnants of his force back to the safety of Fort Ticonderoga, at the southern end of Lake Champlain and about 100 miles north of Albany, N.Y. Arnold knew a British invasion would follow, down the lake route, and it would cut the Colonies in half. Benedict Arnold demanded a fleet.

Skilled carpenters assembled from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Philadelphia, followed by sailmakers, riggers and blacksmiths. The summer of 1776 was busy, and by August 20, Arnold's squadron was ready. On August 24, he set sail and headed north but not until the first of September did he reach the northern end of the lake.

The British general, Sir Guy Carleton, had also been busy, but Carleton had the resources of His Majesty's fleet in the St. Lawrence to help him, and his squadron could throw twice the weight of shot in a broadside as could Arnold's. Besides, his men were trained seamen; Arnold had only landsmen, and Arnold himself wrote of them:

> We have a wretched, motley crew in the fleet. The Marines are the refuse of every regiment, and the seamen, few of them were ever wet with salt water.

A head-on clash would have been disastrous. Arnold took his little fleet back down the lake and anchored on the west side of Valcour Island.

The island was a small one, about halfway down, lying near the western shore of Champlain. Coming from the north, vessels could not see what lay in the channel between the island and the shore because of a projecting point of land. Arnold's plan was simple: wait right inside the south end of the channel in line of battle, then hit the British from the rear, or else force them to attack him by sailing against the wind.

Carleton's fleet had not bothered to send scouts ahead, and they were 2 miles past the island when Arnold's force was sighted. They swung about; Arnold's force slipped anchor and moved to meet them, and by noon the battle was in full swing.

By the end of the day one British gunboat was sunk but the Americans were in worse shape. *Philadelphia* had been sunk—but was raised in 1935; she rests today in surprisingly good shape in the Smithsonian Institution. Ammunition was running low and three other ships were either destroyed or badly damaged. A renewal of battle in the morning would have meant total destruction, so under cover of darkness the Americans slipped away.

The British caught up with them 10 miles down the lake. There was another short, sharp fight; the battle ended with 11 of Arnold's 16 ships destroyed and 80 men casualties. It was an immediate American defeat, but the effects, in the long run, were totally disastrous for the British.

Arnold's action gave the Americans a year; it cost the British the same amount of time. The British advance had to be postponed; when it did come, a better-trained and better-equipped American Army defeated Burgoyne at Saratoga, preventing a linkup between Burgoyne and Howe's forces, which were coming up the Hudson. Such a junction of the two British forces at this time of the Revolution might well have meant the end for Washington.

Even more important, the British defeat at Saratoga enabled Benjamin Franklin to negotiate the long-sought-for treaty with the French. This meant aid for the hard-pressed Americans—aid that paid off in 1781 when de Grasse hemmed in Cornwallis at Yorktown, from the sea, while Washington attacked from the land.

The Battle of Valcour Island has been called "the strife of pigmies for the prize of a continent." Alfred Thayer Mahan, the naval historian, summed it up:

> That the Americans were strong enough to impose the capitulation of Saratoga was due to the invaluable year of delay secured to them in 1776 by their little navy on Lake Champlain, created by the indomitable energy, and handled with the indomitable courage of the traitor, Benedict Arnold.

THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

By and large, it has been badly treated by historians. Congressional interference with Washington comes in for the harshest treatment. But, as one historian has noted:

> Too much has been said, perhaps, regarding the failings of the Congress. It was created in emergency, endowed with uncertain authority and plagued by rapid changes in personnel. Hence it exhibited obvious defects lacking or less conspicuous in long- and well-established legislatures.

and

> The Congress declared the independence of the United States; appointed the commander-in-chief and higher officers of the Continental Army; established the American navy and the marine corps; formed a diplomatic service; negotiated treaties with European nations and Indian tribes; organized a postal service; issued currency; and borrowed money. It even gave advice to the colony-states with respect to the making of their constitutions; and it drew up the Articles of Confederation.

From yet another writer:

> Before the war ended, more than half of the members were fated to have their property looted or destroyed. Others were to be imprisoned or driven into hiding by man hunts, and even their families would not escape persecution.
>
> But if the courage of the delegates is to be questioned, the statistics of the Continental Congress show a record of military service which has probably never been bettered by any other parliament of history. Of the 342 men elected during the fifteen years, 134 bore arms in either the militia or the Continental army. One was killed in action, twelve seriously wounded, and twenty-three taken prisoners in combat. When it is recalled that a majority of the delegates had passed the age of 40, the valor of Congress needs no apologies.

Congress fought its war, all right; a quick scan through the Journals of the Continental Congress reveals in astonishing detail the extent. The first resolution of the day for Thursday, July 4, 1776, reads:

> *Resolved*, That application be made to the Committee on Safety of Pennsylvania for a supply of flints for the troops at New York and that Delaware government and Maryland, be requested to embody their militia for the flying-camp, with all possible expedition, and to march them, without delay, to the city of Philadelphia.

Next entry deals with the Declaration of Independence; immediately following the Declaration, we have:

> *Ordered*, That Mr. Morris and Mr. Hewes determine the hire of Mr. Walker's vessel, which was employed by Commodore Hopkins in the service of the continent.

And, the last entry for that day:

> *Resolved*, That the secret committee be directed to sell 25 lb. of powder to John Garrison, of North Carolina.

Rations for the Army? On Saturday, November 4, 1775:

> Resolved, that a ration consist of the following kind and quantity of provisions:
>
> 1 lb. beef, or ¾ lb. of pork, or 1 lb. salt fish, per day.
>
> 1 lb. bread or flour per day.
>
> 3 pints of peas or beans per week, or vegetables equivalent, at one dollar per bushel for pease or beans.
>
> 1 pint of milk per man, or at the rate of 1/72 of a dollar.
>
> 1 half pint of rice, or 1 pint of Indian meal per man per week.
>
> 1 quart of spruce beer or cyder per man per day, or nine gallons of molasses per company of 100 men per week.
>
> 3 lb. candles to 100 men per week for guards.
>
> 24 lb. soft, or 8 lb. hard soap for 100 men per week.

Keep the Indians friendly? Saturday, November 11, 1775:

> Resolved, That for the propagation of the gospel amongst the Indians, and conciliating their affections to the United Colonies, and thereby preserving their friendship and neutrality, Mr. Kirkland be continued in his mission amongst them.

Spiritual welfare of the Navy? Thursday, November 28, 1775; part of the rules for the Navy:

> The commanders of the ships of the thirteen United Colonies, are to take care that divine service be performed twice a day on board, and a sermon preached on Sundays, unless bad weather or other extraordinary accidents prevent.

What to do with prisoners of war? Especially if someone happened to complain they were living a bit high, at the expense of the Government? Thursday, January 11, 1776:

> Resolved, that the conduct of the officers at Trenton, though in other respects unexceptionable, is, as to their manner of living, exceedingly extravagant, they being boarded at taverns, and the inn-keepers supplying them in a luxurious manner, on the credit of the continent;
>
> That the Congress will, for the future, allow two dollars per week for the board and lodging of officers, who are prisoners, (for which sum they may have decent lodgings) to be repaid by the officers before they are released from their captivity.
>
> That the accounts of the several inn-keepers against the officers be paid by the continent, which are also to be repaid by the said officers before their discharge.
>
> That no tavern keeper supply the said officers, for the future, on the credit of the continent.

That the officers now at Trenton, be directed to remove to some other place at a proper distance from the public post-road.

Did an officer get somewhat carried away by "spoils of war?" Saturday, August 17, 1776:

A letter of this day, from Martin Johnson, lieutenant of artillery, was laid before Congress and read; wherein he desires Congress to enquire into the circumstances of Mr. Anstruther's diamond ring, which he acknowledges he has; that he never made a secret of it; that he found the ring sometime after the garrison capitulated, and thought it to be a prize; and, for the truth of which, he asserts, refers Congress to the certificates of several principal officers.

Resolved, That lieutenant Martin Johnson be directed to deliver the ring to the secretary of the war office, who is ordered to send the same to Mr. Anstruther, the owner.

Medical supplies? This one has always intrigued me; how big was the box? From Wednesday, August 28, 1776:

Resolved, That an order for 312 dollars and 24/90ths be drawn on the treasurer, in favor of the medical committee; the same thing being for a box of rhubarb bought by them of Pelatiah Webster.

And when things looked dark; Wednesday, December 11, 1776:

Whereas, the war in which the United States are engaged with Great Britain, has not only been prolonged, but is likely to be carried to the greatest extremity.

Resolved, That it be recommended to all the United States, as soon as possible, to appoint a day of solemn fasting and humiliation; to implore of Almighty God the forgiveness of the many sins prevailing among all ranks, and to beg the countenance and assistance of his Providence in the prosecution of the present just and necessary war.

The Congress do also, in the most earnest manner, recommend to all the members of the United States, and particularly the officers civil and military under them, the exercise of repentance and reformation; and further, require of them the strict observance of the articles of war, and partciularly, that part of such articles which forbids profane swearing and all immorality, of which all such officers are desired to take notice.

THOSE CURIOUS CORNERS OF REVOLUTIONARY WAR HISTORY

The rifle captain on the Rappahannock River, in Virginia, was doing his best to answer the summons of the Continental Congress for men. But he had more volunteers than he was authorized to take. Eliminate them by competition; John Harrower, indentured servant but also teacher on a plantation school, watched:

He took a board of a foot square and with chalk drew the shape of a moderate nose in the center and nailed it to a tree at one hundred and fifty yards distance, and those who came nighest the mark with a single ball was to go. But by the first forty or fifty that fired, the nose was blown out of the board, and by the time his company was up the board shared the same fate.

The example of one Mr. Coggeshall; we can only assume he was a dedicated patriot, who took great offense at His Majesty's armed cruisers patrolling Newport Harbor. So—as one newspaper wrote:

Early last Saturday morning, one Coggeshall, being somewhat drunk or crazy, went on the long wharf and turned his backside towards the bomb brig in the harbor, using some insulting words, upon which the brig fired two four-pound shot at him; one of which went through the roof of Mr. Hammond's store . . . and lodged in Mr. Samuel Johnson's distill house.

The American General Charles Lee—soldier in half the military of Europe before gravitating to America, he had once served with General Burgoyne himself. Somewhere along the way he had presumed to personally upbraid George III. His character had led the Mohawk Indians to show uncommonly good foresight when, Lee having been adopted into their tribe, he was given the Indian name of "Boiling Water."

The Continental Army learned the hard way. Lee was with Washington soon after Washington took command; discipline was lax and courts-martial were the order of the day. Boiling Water was more direct; Lieutenant Benjamin Craft scrawled in his journal:

Stephen Stanwood for saucy talk to General Lee had his head broke. The General gave him a dollar and sent for the doctor.

The miserable winter of 1779–80 had abated somewhat; the trials of the Continental Army at Morristown, where winter quarters had been set up, were equally as great and probably worse than those of Valley Forge, but Morristown has not become the synonym for suffering as has Valley Forge. But now things were easier at Morristown.

Washington liked parties; he loved to dance; he and 34 other officers formed a dancing assembly and the local belles attending were sturdy enough to wring this from Captain Samuel Shaw:

Three nights going till after two o'clock have they made us keep it up.

What Washington did at one of Colonel Biddle's parties is not known for sure, but Mrs. George Olney told him in no uncertain terms that—

If he did not let go her hand, she would tear out his eyes, or the hair from his head; and that though he was a general, he was but a man.

EPILOGUE: "WHAT, THEN . . .?"

Out of it all, of course, was born a new nation and a new people. We were not too concerned, at the time, of asking any really searching questions of ourselves. This would come later. But someone did, even before the contortions and pangs of birth had subsided.

Michel-Guillaume-Jean de Crevecoeur, better known to us as J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, was of impoverished Norman gentry stock who had come to New France in 1755 to serve under General Montcalm. After the Plains of Abraham, he stayed in the new world and went south to the British colonies, changing name and citizenship as he did so. Salesman, surveyor, explorer—1769 saw him married and settled in New York, on the way to becoming a successful farmer.

With the coming of the Revolution, de Crevecoeur took a neutral stand that alienated both Americans and British. There were valid reasons for going back to France: certain legal steps were necessary so his children could inherit his estate in that country. He left his New York home in 1778 but did not see his native soil until 1781. On the way, while passing through London, he sold to a publishing firm the manuscript of a book with the deceptive title "Letters From an American Farmer."

It has been said that publication of this book marked the first emergence of American literature as the voice of our national conscience. In it, de Crevecoeur posed, for the first time, the question we have continually asked of ourselves, and which the rest of the world has also asked of us:

What, then, is the American, this new man?

Let us look at part of de Crevecoeur's answer:

He is the American, who, leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced, the new government he obeys, the new rank he holds . . . Americans are the western Pilgrims who are carrying along with them that great mass of arts, sciences, vigour, and industry which began long since in the East; they will finish the great circle . . . The American ought therefore to love this country much better than that wherein either he or his forefathers were born. . . . The American is a new man, who acts upon new principles; he must therefore entertain new ideas and form new opinion. . . . This is an American.

This was a judgment handed down while our destiny was yet uncertain and battles still raged. It was rendered by a man who had no particular affection for the avowed aims and purposes of the Amreican Revolution. But de Crevecoeur had an uncanny perception that enabled him to see, even before the more directly engaged participants themselves, what was slowly but steadily rising.

Our Republic has, really, never ceased to repeat this question. At one point it drove us apart in civil war; at others, it has admitedly put stresses and strains upon the fabric of our national being. I don't see any end to discussion about it; I don't see any eventual answer that will stand good for all time and will satisfy everyone.

But, the point is, something new had arisen. And something new has survived, and flourished.

As I said, we probably have not really yet plumbed the depths of what we are, individually or collectively, and perhaps it is just as well. But we can know that from which we sprang. We can know our heritage. We can know the faith our forefathers had in the future of this land.

We are almost two centuries old. Yet, no country is ever too old to neglect its roots. That is when its decline begins, and its national soul starts to die.

Tom Paine, fiery pamphleteer of the Revolution, wrote the following in the last of his "Crisis" papers, April 19, 1783, when the war was over:

It would be a circumstance ever to be lamented, and never to be forgotten, were a single blot, from any cause whatever, suffered to fall on a revolution, which to the end of time must be an honor to the age that accomplished it; and which has contributed more to enlighten the world and diffuse a spirit of freedom and liberality among mankind, than any human event (if

this may be called one) that even preceded it.

Indeed. Such a blot, as Tom Paine warned against, would be to forget it. So listen, listen closely, for the shrilling of the fifes and the roll of the drums, that heralded our birth and still pace our march on the road of human history and destiny. For these things, like the country whose heritage they are, fade and die, only if the people let them. And when and if they die, the end of the country is not far behind.

ARE VA HOSPITALS REALLY THAT BAD?

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, medical care for veterans has been debated heavily during the past year both within the Congress and in news media. While this debate stems, no doubt, from a genuine concern that public responsibility be fulfilled toward the men who meet the call for military service, some distortions have resulted. Thousands of aroused citizens have expressed their private concern over the quality of medical care available to veterans. But as a more serious result, the reputation of Veterans' Administration hospitals has suffered to the point that some combat wounded veterans, as well as their parents and wives, view with alarm the prospect of their entering a VA hospital.

For those people, there is concrete reassurance that their fears are unfounded. There is evidence from the best possible source—physicians talking to other physicians—that Veterans' Administration hospitals deliver top quality medical care. It is clear that the problems that do exist in VA hospitals are the same problems that exist in other hospitals that make up this Nation's total health care delivery system. And more to the point, VA hospitals are overcoming these problems within their own walls, and they are making a tremendous contribution toward their solution for the whole health care delivery system.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the full text of this article "Are VA Hospitals Really That Bad?" from the May 1971 issue of the magazine Resident and Staff be entered in the RECORD.

The text follows:

[From the Resident and Staff, May 1971]

ARE VA HOSPITALS REALLY THAT BAD?

Last year, in an article on VA hospitals, Life Magazine used such terms as dirty, full of rodents, understaffed, a medical slum. Rather harsh words . . . with stark photographs to go with them. Could VA hospitals on the whole be all that bad, we asked ourselves. To find out, we queried VA doctors across the country—and for comparison, we also asked doctors in city, county, state and voluntary hospitals about conditions in their institutions. Here's a look at the care and comfort patients receive in VA hospitals—as seen through the eyes of 337 VA physicians. Nea D'Amelio

A 32-year-old cardiologist in a southern VA hospital told us: "This is a VA hospital—reasonably clean and staffed, with beautiful grounds, where good medicine is practiced and care is comparable to any good hospital, private or otherwise—and there are no rats, mice or other 'patient eaters' as reported in Life."

Of course this young VA doctor was referring to the far from flattering article "Assignment to Neglect" published in Life Magazine last year. In fact it was this article that prompted us to conduct this survey—to ask the doctors in VA hospitals what they thought of the professional care and creature comforts in their institutions. While we were at it, we decided to poll doctors in other hospitals—city, county, state and voluntary—so we could make comparisons.

Our survey produced 694 replies from physicians working in hospitals across the country Respondents were asked to rate the following conditions in their hospitals as either excellent, satisfactory, barely adequate—or dismal.

Numerical strength of medical staff, nursing staff and paramedical personnel (aides, therapists, etc.).

Quality of medical care, nursing care and quality of paramedical personnel.

Laboratory facilities and outpatient clinic facilities.

Cleanliness, space (no overcrowding), and availability of beds for new admissions.

Quality of patient meals.

Recreational activities for long-term patients.

And finally, we asked our respondents:

How would you rate the nursing and paramedical staff in providing TLC (Tender Loving Care) to patients?

How would you rate your hospital buildings in terms of providing a cheerful atmosphere for patients?

As you might expect, in nine out of the 15 categories covered, doctors in voluntary hospitals were more prone to give their institutions an excellent or satisfactory rating than were doctors in other hospitals. But VA hospitals didn't fare so badly either. In five of the remaining categories—space, availability of beds, recreational activities, patient meals and TLC—VA doctors put their institutions in first place, topping even the doctors rated certain conditions barely adequate or even dismal, by and large the consensus of opinion was that conditions overall were more than just satisfactory and in some areas they were excellent.

In future articles, we'll give you a detailed rundown on how doctors in voluntary, state, city and county hospitals rated them, but for the time being let's concentrate on how doctors in VA hospitals voted.

NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF MEDICAL STAFF

Sixty three percent of the 337 VA doctors who answered our questionnaire rated the numerical strength of the medical staff as excellent (17%) or satisfactory (46%). While this would seem to be a pretty good score, nevertheless it was one of the VA hospitals' weakest areas—because doctors in voluntary, city and county hospitals were even better satisfied with the number of doctors on their staffs. Understaffing on all levels, by the way, was a major criticism of VA hospitals in the Life article.

Conditions, of course, can and often do vary from hospital to hospital—so some institutions undoubtedly deserve a dismal rating. It's also important to remember that what is satisfactory to one man may be barely adequate to another. Thus one internist—who rated all other conditions in his VA hospital as excellent—gave a satisfactory rating to the numerical strength of both medical and nursing staffs. His pithy comment: "Some of the younger breed of medical men may not agree with my rating the available staffing pattern as satisfactory, because they don't accept long hours and hard work as readily as their elderly brethren." This doctor, incidentally, is 67 years old!

A 41-year-old surgeon, on the other hand, said the numerical strength of the staff in his VA hospital was barely adequate. "The major problem," he wrote, "is recruitment of the professional staff. The VA doesn't begin to compare with private hospitals when it comes to salaries. The result is that there are always shortages on the staff and the replacements are often people who can't work anywhere else. In spite of this, I'm amazed at the morale of the nurses." While granting that VA salaries undoubtedly make recruiting difficult, nevertheless in fairness it should be borne in mind that the problem is complicated by the fact that there just aren't enough doctors to go around, anyway.

A radiologist said the situation was dismal in his hospital—and the care was barely adequate. "Most depressing part of the staff shortage is the utter lack of TLC to patients. There's always a terrific rush-rush among employees—professional and paramedcial—which results in a very impersonal and often even hostile atmosphere."

A young internist informed us that things were pretty ship-shape in his VA hospital. "Our medical staff is growing. We haven't filled all the spots yet, but it's sure to reach full strength. We're affiliated with a medical school now and have an *active* teaching program."

But a 40-year-old psychiatrist in an eastern VA hospital wrote: "There aren't enough doctors here because there isn't enough money allocated to the hospital. Until the powers that be realize that care costs money, you'll find that most VA hospitals are understaffed and need equipment. The whole system should be overhauled."

THE QUALITY OF MEDICAL CARE

Closely linked to the numerical strength of the staff is the quality of medical care. Yet while almost 40% feel VA hospitals need more doctors, nevertheless 89% rate the quality of care rendered by the doctors who are there as excellent (40%) or satisfactory (49%). And several VA doctors made comments like this one:

"With over 20 years of private practice and a little more than a year with the VA, let me say that not one of the four private hospitals I was associated with even remotely approached this particular VA hospital in the quality of medical care. The only deficiencies I've noticed are with equipment and the lack of funds to obtain such for the occasional unusual problem. However, referral to another VA facility usually solves this."

A pathologist in a southern VA hospital wrote: "A significant number of our patients have drug or alcohol related diseases and receive much better care in our hospital than would be provided them anywhere else in this medical community."

Two young doctors—one on the east coast and one on the west—wrote enthusiastically about how their hospitals' recent university affiliation was improving the quality of care. Said one: "It's always been satisfactory enough, but medical care is rapidly improving because now we have an active teaching program as well as a full time staff."

On the other hand, some oldsters had a different view. A 70-year-old surgeon wrote: "Association with a university could lead to a mixup of priorities. Care of veterans should come before research and teaching."

And just to prove how different one VA hospital can be from another, read these two views:

A surgeon in an eastern VA hospital rated the quality of medical care as "barely adequate." He wrote: "Unfortunatly, this hospital suffers from lack of federal funds. It's a shame because the people who work here are very dedicated."

On the other hand, a chief of urology rated his hospital as "excellent because there's no skimping or economizing on patient care. Cost of a medication or needed device does not prevent its use for a patient requiring it.

The patient's *need* is our main therapeutic index. The very fact that we can look for quality instead of economy or 'least expensive but acceptable' makes this a superior place to practice."

NOT ENOUGH NURSES . . . ANYWHERE

Slightly more than half of our VA doctors rated the numerical strength of their nursing staff excellent (7%) or satisfactory (46%), 40% thought it was barely adqeuate and 6% thought it was dismal. While obviously far from a desirable situation, nevertheless, VA hospitals got a better score in this area than city, county or state hospitals—coming in second only to voluntary hospitals, which received an excellent or satisfactory rating from three-fourths of their doctors. And as a VA internist commented: "*Any* hospital could always use more nurses."

Agreeing, another VA physician, some 700 miles away, reported: "Our affiliated university medical center and the local church related hospitals have just as critical nursing shortages as we do. Something *must* be done on a national level to increase the number of graduate nurses."

"We just don't have enough nurses, and to be scrupulously honest, I'd have to rate this area of staffing as dismal," a psychiatrist wrote, "but those we do have give our patients their devoted attention—really excellent care that is more than TLC."

And, as you will see, this physician's opinion was typical.

READER'S DIGEST CITES SORE SPOTS IN VA HOSPITALS

A recent article in Reader's Digest,* the result of . . . "an intensive five-month investigation of the VA system," says that:

The staff of VA hospitals deliver "basically good care to most patients."

The VA system is besieged by "critical malfunctions—problems of management, financial support and utilization of resources—that means misspent funds and misdirected treatment."

Pinpointing these basic criticisms, the Reader's Digest article showed that:

Salary restrictions hamper recruitment at every level.

Budgetary cutbacks have also resulted in deteriorating hospital equipment.

Bureaucratic gamesmanship results in waste. "Since VA hospitals receive the bulk of their funding on the basis of the number of beds filled, ambitious administrators all too often do everything they can to keep the count high."

VA's limited financial resources are further drained by isolated, poorly utilized—and what were often politically located—hospitals still in operation.

New blood is "urgently needed" to fill managerial posts. "Men well trained in hospital management should be given the authority to make decisions free of needlessly stringent bureaucratic regulations."

THE QUALITY OF NURSING CARE

32% of the VA doctors rated the quality of nursing care as excellent;

56% rated it satisfactory—a total "up" score of 88%. Thus the VA nosed out voluntary hospitals, where 82% of the MDs rated the nursing care satisfactory or excellent, and was well ahead of State hospitals (76%) and city/county hospitals (66%).

A typical comment on the efforts of VA nurses came from a VA surgeon in the midwest: "We're terribly short-staffed on nurses and aides, but they all give excellent care with a smile and TLC thrown in to boot, no matter how long they've been on their feet and running."

A 65-year-old doctor was not so complimentary. "More older women are coming back to nursing in the hospitals and in ours there are too many of these 'old guard gals' in key positions. We need to get younger blood." This MD was one of only five (1.5%) of our VA respondents who rated the quality of nursing care as dismal.

But the overall vote was on the plus side and VA doctors, in general, would agree with an opthalmologist who wrote: "They are few in numbers, but our nurses are superb!"

PARAMEDICAL PERSONNEL

68% of the VA doctors rated the numerical strength of the paramedical staff as excellent or satisfactory. And one doctor voiced the opinion of many. The internist who wrote that "Any hospital could use more nurses," had the same thing to say about paramedics. As to their quality, he added: "Some on the staff are excellent—others not so good. I'd rate the average paramedic's work satisfactory."

Another physician said that the shortage of paramedics was acute. "I can only rate the quality as dismal because the ones here have too much to do, which results in a rancorous atmosphere and an impersonal attitude toward the patients—about as far removed from TLC as you can get."

However, the score for VA paramedics—both in quality and strength of staffing—was second only to voluntary hospitals. And a VA psychiatrist's comment reveals this general comparison, noted by many in different specialties:

"I'd rate the number of paramedics that we have as satisfactory—but the quality is sadly lacking. However—if I compare them with the staffing and quality of paramedics in most psychiatric facilities, I'd have to rate both areas in this hospital as excellent."

In addition to the quality of nurses and paramedical personnel, we also asked respondents to rate them on TLC.

86% of the doctors in VA hospitals gave RNs and paramedics an excellent or satisfactory rating in this area—which certainly should refute, to some extent, the allegations of neglect contained in Life's article.

An orthopedic surgeon commented: "They all deserve an E for Excellent here because they do give patients TLC despite increased difficulties due to poor physical layout and occasional short staffing."

But a physician in another VA hospital wrote: "Tender loving care is not possible when the numerical strength of nursing and paramedical staffs is barely adequate and even dismal."

And two internists—reporting from different VA hospitals—agreed that the deliverance of TLC depended on the individual. Said one: "TLC is excellent in most instances—but certain characters just don't measure up." And the other doctor commented that in his hospital ". . . there are just too many patients for everyone—doctors, nurses, therapists, aides—to give TLC unstintingly to all. But just a little interest shown in patients would save a lot of pills and psychosomatic complaints."

LAB FACILITIES

83% of the VA doctors responding to our questionnaire rated lab facilities in their hospitals as satisfactory or excellent. But, then, as a young VA internist in the south—who rated his hospital's lab facilities as satisfactory—commented: "Would *any* physician in his right mind *ever* admit that lab facilities were anything better than only satisfactory?"

It probably will come as no surprise, but right across the board in all the hospitals surveyed, the OPD didn't fare so well. It is, quite apparently, the thorn in the side of most hospital based doctors. And VA MDs are no exception—although more than half—56%—rated the clinics in their hospitals as satisfactory or excellent, 39% said they were barely adequate or dismal.

A surgeon, who rated the whole VA hospital system "deplorable" gave as his first reason: "There are too many unnecessary admissions to the hospital just because there is no OPD. They should establish an outpatient clinic for diagnosis and treatment whenever possible."

On the plus side, however, another VA doctor commented: "We have only a limited number of outpatients, but we do have good facilities for them. And they never have to wait to be treated."

AVAILABILITY OF BEDS FOR NEW ADMISSIONS

29% of our VA doctor respondents rated the availability of beds for new admissions excellent.

52% said that it was satisfactory.

17% said it was barely adequate or dismal.

Actually, the VA came in with top score in this area of concern. Ratings for voluntary hospitals, next in line, were as follows:

20% rated bed availability excellent.

43% rated it satisfactory.

36% rated it barely adequate or dismal.

CLEANLINESS AND CREATURE COMFORTS

The Life article particularly assailed the lack of cleanliness and creature comforts—the overcrowding in specific VA hospitals—and stated flatly that these conditions are "typical of many facilities in the VA system." However, RESIDENT AND STAFF PHYSICIAN's survey of MDs within the system reveals a pretty favorable picture on the whole. And one young surgeon—who rated the cleanliness and space in his hospital as excellent—thought the creature comforts might be *too* good. "At times—most of the time, I should say—this hospital takes on more of the aspects of a Holiday Inn or Sheraton Hotel than those in keeping with a hospital for acute illness." Having rated the numerical strength of all staff as dismal (although he considered the *quality* of care satisfactory) this doctor added: "A higher premium is placed on providing satisfactory meals, hot coffee—things like that—than in upgrading medical, nursing and paramedical strength."

But let's take a look at "creature comforts" item by item and see how VA doctors voted.

QUALITY OF PATIENT MEALS

Whatever its other shortcomings, the VA, it would seem, has good cooks. As one respondent from a southern VA hospital wrote: "While hospital meals will probably never achieve excellence, ours are satisfactory." And most of his colleagues agreed:

92% of the VA doctors rated the quality of patient meals as excellent (38%) or satisfactory (54%). And few VA doctors rated the meals "barely adequate" or "dismal," so it seems safe to conclude that generally speaking, the food VA patients are getting is pretty good.

CLEANLINESS

Photographs in the Life story gave almost appalling evidence of neglect, dirt and despair in one VA hospital—whose director categorically denied the authenticity of the photos—saying that they were staged, that conditions in his facility were not at all as portrayed. In any case, the overall vote on cleanliness seems to refute the idea that all or most of the VA hospitals are filthy and rodent ridden:

88% of VA physicians rated the cleanliness of their hospitals as excellent or satisfactory—getting first place and honors over voluntary hospitals by one percent. (City and county hospitals were at the bottom of the ladder in this category.)

Typical of several comments, one VA doctor wrote: "This is an old, rambling building which is inherently difficult to keep truly clean—*but they try!*" And, like almost half of the respondents from VA hospitals, he rated cleanliness in his institution satisfactory.

* Tomlinson, Kenneth Y. "Our VA Hospitals Are in Trouble," *Reader's Digest*, (March 1971), 163–170.

OVERCROWDING IN A MEDICAL SLUM?

A caption in the Life magazine article referred to one VA hospital as having . . . "Staff shortages, overcrowding, dirt and leaky roofs in a medical slum."

While we didn't ask about leaky roofs, we did ask about overcrowding. And the VA system showed up better than any of the other hospitals surveyed. In fact almost 80% of the VA doctors were satisfied. But this does *not* mean that some doctors didn't have specific criticisms of overcrowding or lack of space. A psychiatrist who rated available space as "satisfactory," added the comment: "Lack of privacy in sleeping areas is a serious problem—as is lack of privacy in toilet facilities."

And another doctor, an internist, wrote: "Some two-bed rooms are a little small and would be better as singles—but it's no real problem here."

CHEERFUL ATMOSPHERE

We asked respondents to tell us how they would rate their hospital buildings in terms of providing a cheerful atmosphere for patients—and more than three fourths of the VA doctors rated their hospitals excellent or satisfactory. The VA came in second to voluntary hospitals—where 80% of the MDs voted the atmosphere of the buildings excellent or satisfactory. One southern VA hospital MD wrote: "This is a World War II 'temporary' hospital. Could it really be cheerful?" He did say however that "the grounds and the main building are *beautiful*."

RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR LONG-TERM PATIENTS

Quote from the Life Magazine article: "Facilities for long-term treatment and rehabilitation, indispensable for the kind of paralytic injuries especially common in this war of land mines and boobytraps, are generally inferior." Granted that there may be some confusion between the term "recreational activities" and "rehabilitation facilities," nevertheless when asked about recreational activities for long-term patients, the vote in Resident and Staff Physician's survey was as follows:

[In percent]

	VA hospitals	City and county hospitals	Voluntary hospitals	State hospitals
Excellent	43	7	11	26
Satisfactory	40	16	30	33
Barely adequate	11	25	30	26
Dismal	5	49	24	13

Although the VA is the obvious winner in this category, it could well be stated that, considering their patients, they *should* have facilities for long-term cases.

One physician commented: "VA hospitals have many long-term patients—especially orthopedic. We have a fine recreation hall and excellent planned activities."

A psychiatrist: "Except for the lack of a swimming pool, rehabilitation facilities are outstanding and recreational activities are also fine."

An anesthesiologist: "Despite harrassment by government clerical workers, our recreational and rehabilitation facilities for long-term patients are excellent."

A "CRUSADE" FOR BETTER CARE?

Perhaps Life magazine was "crusading" for more government funds for medical care to our wounded veterans. Or perhaps they wanted to "shock" the general public into an awareness of the conditions that exist in *some* VA hospitals, for obviously every VA hospital should be topnotch and standards should be uniform throughout the system. Nevertheless our survey shows that the entire VA system of 166 hospitals (the biggest in the world incidentally) is far from a medical slum. The consensus of opinion among VA doctors would seem to be that while improvements are needed in certain areas, the system in general does right by our veterans. One surgeon in a New England VA hospital expressed it this way:

"I feel that this hospital, despite inadequacies along the line, provides better care in many instances than those available in other hospitals in this area. When I compare all the conditions in this hospital with those in the hospitals in Connecticut and Massachusetts where I trained, I'd have to rate all the conditions in this VA hospital as being satisfactory plus."

INTO THE VALLEY OF THE LITTER MARCHED THE 500

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my contention that effective work at the grassroots, or local level, will be as effective a contribution to the eradication of pollution as the grandiose blueprints developed by the Federal bureaucracy.

Therefore, I believe the Members will be especially interested in the Harvey Tribune editorial of May 12, 1971, which tells of the effort of 500 volunteers to clean up a stretch of the Little Cal River, and which also points to the thoughtless actions of the individuals that contributed to the debris which had to be cleaned up.

The editorial follows:

INTO THE VALLEY OF THE LITTER MARCHED THE 500

The 500 volunteers that mobilized Saturday for the clean-up of the Little Cal river seems insignificantly small when compared with the 159,071 population of the six towns that were most involved in the campaign.

But these sincere and dedicated 500 gave up a beautiful Spring day and the result was over 100 tons of gunk, goo and garbage removed from the river and its banks.

The question isn't why these volunteers showed up, but rather, why the garbage showed up. Cleanups of this type have become a regular summer pastime for the unselfish and "messups," which do not get the publicity, are the pastime for the selfish and unthinking.

It isn't as if the river were the only place to dump the garbage. There are a lot of vacant lots that sport "no dumping" signs that should be just as attractive—and easier to clean up. The hardest thing for these individuals is not to dump at all, to call up the public works department of their towns and ask them to collect the debris and take it to a designated area.

Perhaps the reason is that the river and its weeded banks offer secrecy for indulgence in the illegal act. The offender sneaks out to the river at 4 a.m. with a broken lawn chair, in the family car's trunk. He's alone—of course. With shifting eyes, he slips out of the car, opens the trunk and grabs the chair. His hands are sweating, but he gets a good grip on the piece of junk, and flings it over the bridge with an Arnold Palmer follow through.

He was lucky. Part of the leg sticks out of the water's surface, a monument to his act. Looking around again, he gets back into his car and drives back home—his tensions relieved and his frustrations vented by the littering.

He, friends, might be your neighbor.

REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which is scheduled to convene at Stockholm in June 1972, marks perhaps one of mankind's most important steps in his march toward the goal of a livable world. It will be the first truly international meeting of representatives from both the industrialized and the developing nations to confront the serious problem of environmental degradation that threatens all of the human race.

Along with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH), I was privileged to participate, as a congressional adviser, to the U.S. delegation, at the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference, which was held at Geneva on February 8 to 19. I believe the report of that meeting will be of great interest to Members of Congress, many of whom have expressed their deep concern for the environment and their hope for the success of the conference.

Only a few of the nations of the world are large enough to be able to control some of the great resources that affect their environments. But none can claim sovereignty over the great fluid masses of air and water that sweep the globe. They are the earth's commons, and their protection and enhancement are the proper concern of every nation. That is the compelling reason for the Stockholm Conference.

When one considers the enormity of environmental problems that affect almost every nation, one can understand the urge to view such a conference as a forum for correcting all of those problems. But a moment's reflection will convince reasonable men of the danger of regarding the meeting as a cure-all. If the Conference is to achieve some degree of success, substantial agreement on priorities and other details for an agenda must be accomplished before it is convened. The alternative would spell chaos.

I can assure Members of Congress that arrangements for the Conference are in very good hands, and I believe that every Member who read the report of the second session of the preparatory committee will agree. To say that I was impressed by the ability, dedication, and judgment of the U.S. delegation at the February meeting in Geneva would be an understatement.

The U.S. delegation was led by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Jr., Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Environmental Affairs. Mr. Herter's exceptionally capable leadership, his persuasive presentation of the U.S. view of its role in the problems of the environment, and his easy-mannered,

completely dedicated approach, convinced me that the program of the conference will be one that will be manageable in the scope and focus. Our delegation's alternate representative, the very able and hardworking Mrs. Shirley Temple Black, Deputy Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conference on Human Environment displayed an outstanding competence and unique grasp of the committee's task that further assured our mission's success.

The U.S. delegation to the preparatory meeting was exceptional. The members, all dedicated professionals who displayed brilliance and rare expertise, were: Wallace Irwin, Jr., Special Adviser to the U.S. Permanent Mission to the United Nations in New York; Fitzhugh Green, of the Environmental Protection Agency; Donald R. King, Chief Scientist, Bureau of Internal Scientific and Technological Affairs of the Department of State; J. M. Cates, Jr., Counselor for Political Affairs, Permanent Mission to the United Nations Office at Geneva, and L. Felsenthal, Counselor for Economic Affairs, Permanent Mission to the United Nations at Geneva. I believe the Congress and the Nation owes the entire delegation a vote of appreciation and confidence.

The report of the preparatory committee's second session—particularly sections 2 through 4 of the report—contains the program that has so far been agreed upon for the 1972 Conference. I hope that all Members of Congress will read these sections from the report, and continue to give their support to the very important work of the Conference:

REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT, SECOND SESSION, GENEVA, FEBRUARY 8–19, 1971

II. THE PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE

Statement by the Secretary-General of the conference and general remarks by delegations

7. One of the more important subjects discussed in the report of the Secretary-General to the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee[1] concerned the Agenda and Programme for the Stockholm Conference. In this report the Secretary-General gave his preliminary views on the Conference programme, and included a list of topics that had been proposed from various sources for inclusion in the Conference Agenda. He also pointed out that it was necessary to allow for additional consultations with governments, United Nations agencies and other organizations concerned, before he could present his specific recommendations to the Preparatory Committee on the Conference Programme and Agenda.

8. In his statement and the accompanying material the Secretary-General of the Conference presented specific suggestions as to the proposed items of the structure and Programme of the Conference. He devoted considerable attention to the Conference documentation and gave details of the nature of the material requested from Governments and United Nations and other organizations. The dates by which such material should reach the Secretariat were given and other preparatory work for the Conference was outlined.[2] He also outlined steps being taken to facilitate the participation of the developing countries in the Conference. The statement of the Secretary-General of the Conference is given in full in Annex IV of this report.

9. The general debate that followed reaffirmed the advice of the Preparatory Committee at its First Session, as well as the specific recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly and of ECOSOC, that the Stockholm Conference as a Conference of governments, should be essentially action oriented. The principal subjects presented for the Committee's consideration in the Secretary-General's report, and in his opening statement, were discussed in the presentations made by most delegations taking part in the general debate.

10. There was concurrence in general debate that the Declaration on the Human Environment would be a commitment of all countries to the preservation of the global habitat of mankind. Several delegations felt that the Declaration could thus be a major result in line with the concept of the Stockholm Conference; while it would not be formally binding it would nevertheless have the force of a statement of understanding mutually agreed by all countries, and it would carry moral strength. The Committee generally proposed that the Declaration be brief, concise and inspirational in character.

11. The Declaration should be directed mainly at public opinion, it was felt, and should contain principles recommended for action by Governments and by the international community. With regard to the preparatory work and negotiations, it was suggested that an Intergovernmental Working Group should be established to provide guidance and advice at the various drafting stages. It was understood that the Third Session of the Preparatory Committee would devote an important part of its time to consideration of the first draft of the Declaration.

12. It was agreed that countries should act in concert to undertake solutions for the problems of marine pollution and that there be provision for substantive discussion of the issue at the 1972 Conference in light of the many aspects of human activity which affect the oceans. While the IMCO Conference and the Law of the Sea Conference in 1973 appeared to many to be the proper occasion for adoption of conventions on certain aspects of marine pollution, the Stockholm Conference seemed to most delegations to be the occasion for consideration of all aspects of marine pollution, including the sources and effects. The global nature of this issue was emphasized repeatedly by delegates in the course of debate. Many delegations, however, stressed that regional and subregional agreements might prove most useful, at least initially, in preventing or controlling pollution of the marine environment. A number of delegations felt that the work and study already under way in the United Nations system could be given greater impetus by the Stockholm Conference, thereby strengthening the action to be taken by the IMCO Conference and the Law of the Sea Conference.

It was thought advisable for the Preparatory Committee to establish an Intergovernmental Working Group which would study the matter with a view to guiding the Secretary-General of the Conference in his consultations with Governments, UN agencies and other organizations on the preparation of material for the Stockholm Conference and in deciding on subjects in this field capable of Level III action, i.e. actions which could be completed even in an initial stage by the Conference.

13. The ability systematically to acquire environmental data on a world-wide basis was recognized by most delegations as being an important foundation for action on many specific environmental problems. In any such international endeavour it would be necessary to take account of the sovereign rights of participating States. Several countries referred to the need for adoption of common standards and for compatability of measuring techniques, which could in turn provide a basis for the establishment of global standards and criteria on environmental matters. Several delegations drew attention to the number of existing monitoring systems, both national and international, pointing out the importance from various points of view of utilizing existing knowledge and experience and of ensuring an appropriate place for present systems in any study of future needs.

14. Members of the Preparatory Committee underscored the importance of the Report on the State of the Human Environment (Level I), as this would provide the conceptual framework within which the specific discussions for the Conference would be organized, and would serve also to include all other relevant discussion of problems of the human environment. This report would be directed at the widest possible audience and would contain the ingredients of the environmental actions required, but would not itself be a document for discussion at the Conference.

15. The general debate affirmed acceptance of the concept suggested by the Secretary-General of the Conference that the main body of substantive decisions at the Stockholm Conference would be at Level II—the action-plan level—which would set forth the elements of the basic work programme in the international environmental field for the post-Conference period. It was emphasized that the subjects for Level II action-plans should cover topics which would in a balanced manner reflect the interests of developed and developing countries.

16. Delegations attached equal importance to a number of specific topics which were capable of third level action, and therefore required immediate initiation of preparation. It was clear, in some cases, that the distinction between Levels II and III should be as flexible as possible in order to enable a subject to be developed for conclusion at the Conference, although it may have been originally proposed for consideration under Level II—or vice versa. A number of delegations made specific suggestions regarding subjects that should be included for consideration under third level actions. A more detailed report on these suggestions, and the recommendations made upon them by the Preparatory Committee is contained in paragraphs 37 to 89 below.

17. It was generally recognized that it was of greatest importance to outline the mechanism for implementing the programme that will emerge from the Stockholm Conference. Delegations felt, however, that it was too early to give any detailed consideration to what mechanisms might be necessary. The subject would be studied in sufficient detail for discussion at the Third Session and for full consideration at the Stockholm Conference.

18. The General Debate generally recognized the fact that problems of the human environment are of concern to all countries, regardless of their state of development, but it was accepted special emphasis should be placed on the problems of the developing countries. It was felt that far from retarding the process of development, measures to safeguard the environment should form an integral part of the whole process of economic and social development. As the question of development and environment is a central issue in the preparations for the Stockholm Conference, delegations welcomed

[1] See document A/CONF.48/PC.8 and Add. 1.

[2] See Annex V to the present report.

the report of the Secretary-General of the Conference on the proposals he had made to convene regional seminars as soon as possible, in order to develop inputs for the Conference agenda topics that would have a direct bearing on the issues of greatest concern to developing countries. Some delegations also made specific suggestions in connexion with providing additional items on the Conference agenda for the discussion of this issue.

19. In view of the expressed interest in the work of ECE on the ECE Conference on Environment—to be held in Prague from 2 to 15 May 1971—the Preparatory Committee welcomed the opportunity to hear the Executive Secretary of the ECE, Mr. J. Stanovnik, on the preparatory work for that Conference. In his progress report the Executive Secretary underlined the main issues of the programme of the Prague Conference that were of special relevance to the work of the Preparatory Committee and the 1972 United Nations Conference. Note was taken of the considerable importance that the Prague Conference might have for the preparation of the Stockholm Conference.

Basic Concept of the Conference Programme and Subjects and Topics for the Agenda[1]

20. The Preparatory Committee proposed the Conference Agenda presented below and the annotations to the substantive items of that Agenda enumerated in the subsequent sections.

Proposed conference agenda:

1. Opening ceremony
2. Election of officers
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Introductory statement by Secretary-General of the Conference
5. Constitution of Committees, etc.
6. General debate (Plenary)
7. The planning and management of human settlements for environmental quality (Committee 1)
8. The environmental aspects of natural resource management (Committee 2)
9. Identification and control of pollutants and nuisances of broad international significance (Committee 3)
10. Educational, informational, social and cultural aspects of environmental issues (Committee 1)
11. Development and environment (Committee 2)
12. The international organizational implications of action proposals (Committee 3)
13. Adoption of plan of action
14. Formal adoption of concrete measures (actions completed)
15. Adoption and signature of the Declaration on the Human Environment
16. Closing ceremony

Elements to be considered in relation to recommended agenda subjects:

A. In respect of all subjects the following factors would be especially considered in relation to action proposals:

(i) Requirements for collection, interpretation, inventory and distribution of data and information to guide decision-making; types of data and information required and sources; mechanisms for efficient collection, inventory, distribution and use.

(ii) Requirements for analysis, evaluation and research to identify problems, foresee significant future trends, help develop new solutions, new technologies and new means of improving environmental quality and assessing future quality; identification of gaps in knowledge, technology and capability.

(iii) Requirements for establishment of criteria, standards and guidelines for achievement of optimum environmental quality; development of methods and techniques for implementation and co-ordination.

(iv) Identification and evaluation of principal development alternatives; criteria and techniques for evaluating trade-offs between economic and social factors in consideration of development alternatives.

(v) Economic and financial implications of policies and programmes; alternative financial and fiscal measures.

(vi) Legislative, legal, organizational and administrative factors—harmonization of policies; requirements for national legislation to complement and support local policies and programmes; requirements for national legislation to complement and support agreed international measures; organizational and administrative requirements at national, regional and international levels for implementation and enforcement of policies.

(vii) Special concerns of developing countries; concerns of particular developing regions; possible requirements for additional financial resources; role of development assistance programmes.

(viii) Related ongoing and planned activities of the United Nations system of organization and their capacity to implement action proposals.

B. In respect of each of the six main subjects, the elements proposed for consideration in relation to the Conference Agenda are:

I. The planning and management of human settlements for environmental quality:

(a) *Comprehensive Development Planning* as a means for incorporating environmental considerations in development programmes for human settlements on national, regional and local levels; human environmental rights and socio-economic costs and benefits on fundamental criteria in planning and decision-making; avoidance of replication of inadequate and faulty environmental patterns and policies; optimum use of land and space.

(b) *Management of Settlements Development*—Governmental organization and administrative machinery for decision-making in planning, implementing and management of settlements networks: legal, economic and fiscal measures for settlements development; urban land reform as a means for environmental improvement.

When considering planning and management of human settlements the following components should be taken into account:

(i) *Population growth and distribution*—factors affecting population flows to urban areas; trends in urbanization; urban-rural relationships; integral planning of urban and rural development; social and environmental aspects of settlements patterns.

(ii) *Rural development*—Planning of rural development with special emphasis of the needs, problems and priorities of developing countries.

(iii) *Industry*—national and regional distribution of productive forces, location of industries within settlements framework. Control and incentives affecting industrial development, with special emphasis on industrial zones and cities. Environmental specifications for working places.

(iv) *Housing and related facilities.*—human requirements and developing standards; mobilization of technological, financial and human resources.

(v) *Transitional and marginal areas*—inmigrant settlement problems, improving living conditions and services in slum areas, specific environmetnal conflicts in suburban and rural-urban fringe areas; problems of central city areas.

(vi) *Recreation and leisure*—facilities and space for recreation and their environmental role within the framework of settlements networks. Environmental aspects of tourism.

(vii) *Transport and communication*—development and environmental aspects of roads, railways, urban and inter-urban transportation networks; terminal facilities (airports, docks, etc.); telecommunication as an alternative to transport.

(viii) *Water supply, sewage and waste disposal*—sources, consumption water quality standards; human and industrial waste disposal, recycling technologies; role of infrastructure in settlements patterns.

(ix) *Human health and welfare factors*—factors affecting physical and mental health; pollution and nuisances—standards and enforcement in context of urban management; problems of noise, crowding and densities of development; specifics of urban microclimate.

(x) *Social, cultural and aesthetic factors*—attitudinal and cultural factors, problems of creating sense of community; development preservation of aesthetic values; preservation and use of significant historic, cultural and natural sites.

II. *The environmental aspects of natural resources management:*

(a) Means for incorporating environmental considerations in the comprehensive planning and management of natural resources development; relationship between natural resources development, transport and utilization, and environmental considerations on national, regional and global levels.

When considering the planning and management of natural resources, the following components should be taken into account in due respect to the principle of national sovereignty:

(i) *Agriculture and soil*—use of chemicals (e.g. pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers); alternative technologies; control of animal wastes; animal productivity; plant productivity; ecological aspects of monocultures; erosion.

(ii) *Forestry*—afforestation; ecology and forest areas; implications of environmental management of forests for forest-related industries.

(iii) *Fisheries and other aquatic resources*—conservation of stocks and species; effects of land reclamation and pollution on inland fisheries.

(iv) *Wildlife and recreational resources*—conservation of wildlife; preservation and development of nature reserves and wilderness areas; national parks, beaches and other recreational facilities; implications of and for tourism.

(v) *Water*—maintenance of water quality; the environmental impact of development and utilization of Water resources; special problems of rivers and lakes as recipients and transport mechanisms for various pollutants.

(vi) *Air*—the quality of air as a resource to support life.

(vii) *Energy*—environmental consideration on production and use of energy; alternative sources and technologies; special problems related to nuclear energy and fossil fuels.

(viii) *Minerals*—environmental aspects of mining operations, location and development of processsing facilities (other than petroleum), special problems related to petroleum industry.

(ix) *Transport*—relation of transport facilities to resource development and utilization; environmental aspects of international transportation networks.

(b) Management of natural resources of special regional importance, e.g. resources common to more than one national jurisdiction—river basins, inland waters; control of pollution to prevent damage in other countries.

(c) Effect of man's interventions in natural ecological systems; special ecological problems of arid regions, tropical regions, arctic regions, marshlands and islands.

III. *Identification and control of pollutants and nuisances of broad international significance:*

(a) Most serious *sources* and types of pollutants and nuisances of broad international significance:

(i) Identification of principal sources and

[1] Including economic, financial and social aspects as well as international organizational implications.

future trends—e.g., manufacturing, mining, energy production, agriculture, water transport, air transport, land transport, with special reference to automobiles, nuclear activities, human settlements.

(ii) Identification of principal types of pollutants, their dispersion, and transformation.

(iii) Identification of economic and fiscal measures for achieving environmental quality: incentives, subsidies, penalties, compensations, prohibition, taxation, effluent charges. Discharge standards, environmental quality criteria, operational requirements, harmonization of policies, treatment of special interest groups, industrial planning.

(b) Effects of pollutants and nuisances of international significance:

(i) Transport of pollutants in the biosphere, contamination through man's food chain, contamination through water supply and air supply, criteria, standards and guides for permissible levels of human exposure.

(ii) Identification and evaluation of the principal acute and long-term effects on man's health including effects on man's genetic development.

(iii) Identification and evaluation of related effects on other living organisms and soils.

(iv) Identification and evaluation of effects on climate; changing chemical composition of atmosphere; cloud effects, released heat.

(v) Identification and evaluation of effects on goods, materials, buildings, construction, etc.; problems of corrosion.

(c) Co-operative measures for maintaining and improving the quality of global environmental media;

(i) Atmosphere—measures required to control effects of changes in composition and conditions of atmosphere.

(ii) Hydrosphere—measures required for rational use, management and conservation of water resources in relation to environmental quality; specific proposals for prevention and control of marine pollution at the international levels.

(iii) Land—measures required to identify, evaluate and control changes in composition and condition of land, soils and subsurface waters from the point of view of the environment.

(iv) Outer space—measures required for identification and control of potential hazards of pollution from man's intervention in outer space.

(v) Measures for identification and study of principal elements in planetary life-support system, application of systems approach to global environmental planning.

(d) Means of minimizing and possibly preventing hazards from natural disasters e.g., floods, earthquakes, typhoons, including the improvement of techniques for disseminating warnings to people in the path of the impending natural disaster.

IV. *Educational, informational, social and cultural aspects of environmental issues:*

(a) *Education:*

Means for inclusion of environmental and ecological principles in formal education at all levels; implications for both the substance and methodology of education.

Means for development of capable manpower through education; training to provide competence in all aspects of environmental management; type of capabilities required and most efficient means for supplying them at national and international levels.

Role of adult education, including workers and management education.

(b) *Information:*

Methods of public information, particularly for children and youth in support of environmental improvement; measures to arouse the interest and participation of young people in environmental activities; development and presentation of information to the public to enable them to understand the costs and benefits of alternative policies and actions.

(c) *Social:*

The impact of environmental considerations on relations between people; demographic and behavioral aspects of societies in relation to the environment.

(d) *Cultural:*

Cultural and quality of life implications; environment in relation to human rights; development and acceptance of an "environmental ethic".

V. *Development and environment:*

(a) Environmental policies as a component of comprehensive development planning taking specially into account the particular problems, interests, needs and priorities of developing countries; link and relationship to strategy for Second Development Decade.

(b) Environmental problems, priorities, perspectives and actions concerning developing countries.

(c) Impact of national and international environmental action on economic growth; impact of economic growth on the human environment.

(d) Means of calculating costs of environmental factors in economic transactions and of providing for allocation of such costs; development of criteria and techniques for evaluation and presentation of social factors in cost-benefit analysis of alternative policies and actions; means and criteria for relating economic growth indicators to quality of life factors.

(e) Fiscal implications of planning, conserving and developing natural resources and of environmental programmes for decontamination of air, treatment of water and elimination of industrial wastes.

(f) Environmental consideration in the choice of location of new industries on national and international level with particular reference to new industries in areas of lower industrial concentration, for example, developing countries.

(g) Resources required to meet needs for environmental quality at different stages of economic development; implications for alternative use of resources and resource flows; financing of international programmes of environmental action, technical co-operation and assistance—all with particular reference to developing countries.

(h) Implications of environmental issues for international trade, technical and development assistance, including technology transfer, its required cost and financing.

VI. *The international organizational implications of action proposals:*

(a) Consideration of functions which would have to be carried out at international level based on acceptance of Conference's action proposals.

(b) Review of existing organizational situation at the international level as it is related to dealing with environmental issues and in particular in relation to action proposals being considered by the Conference; current and planned activities and capacities of existing organizations; particular reference to United Nations system.

(c) Consideration of alternative means of meeting needs for performance of required functions with particular reference to United Nations System; means of meeting special needs of developing countries; particular organizational requirements for meeting needs at regional level.

Observations and comments

General

21. Approval of the agenda annotations was made on the understnding that not all items of the annotated agenda would necessarily appear in the form of Action Papers. Several delegations expressed concern that the actual scope of the subject matter to be considered be carefully determined within the framework of the time and priorities proposed for the Stockholm Conference. It was understood that the inclusion of respective subjects in the annotations of the agenda did not prejudge any decision or institution for their implementation. In addition, several delegations expressed the conviction that proposed plans of action should not lead to the addition or proliferation of new machinery, and that all efforts should be made to work within existing institutions and programmes.

22. One delegation requested that particular emphasis be given to the subject of water management and use in the context of subject areas (I), (II) and (III). Another delegation asked that special attention be directed to man's physical and mental health, particularly in subject areas (I) and (II).

Subject Area (II)

23. When approving the sub-item a(v) on water, some delegations indicated a desire that sufficient attention be given to the ecological repercussions of dams and reservoirs. Other delegations, however, felt that the ecological problems, even if they did not exist, were not of overriding importance in view of the magnitude of the economic benefits to the development of the respective areas.

Subject (III)

24. One delegation requested that in the preparation of the Position Paper the subject matter be organized in the following sequence: sources and types of critical pollutants, transport of these pollutants to man, the acute and long-term effects of these pollutants on man, standards, and monitoring for research and compliance with standards. Another delegation requested that the Stockholm Conference concentrate on marine pollution by agents other than oil or radioactivity, so as to avoid the unnecessary duplication of activities of existing institutions, and that agreements be initiated on a regional basis.

Subject (IV)

25. Although recognizing the importance of this subject as a topic for discussion, several delegations expressed the desire that it not be given disproportionate time and attention at the Stockholm Conference.

Subject (V)

26. In reference to item (g) two delegations expressed the concern that financing of international programmes be taken within the context of the existing budgets of international organizations. A number of delegations were not in favour of item (h) as drafted, and one delegation criticized the emphasis of the whole section.

Declaration on the Human Environment

27. The Preparatory Committee was informed that, as of 11 February 1971, 14 replies had been received to the Secretary-General's letter and questionnaire of 21 December 1970 inviting Governments to comment on the possible form and contents of a draft Declaration.

28. There was general agreement that the Declaration could represent one of the most important documents of the Stockholm Conference and should be carefully prepared by an Intergovernmental Working Group meeting between sessions of the Preparatory Committee. It was agreed that the Intergovernmental Working Group should be composed of all Members of the Preparatory Committee and such other Member States as would express the wish to participate in its work. It should be convened in New York. Its first meeting, a brief organizational meeting, should take place as soon as possible after the end of the second session; a substantive session should take place in the period May–June so that the results, including a draft Declaration, would be available well in advance of the third session of the Preparatory Committee. The Secretary-General was requested to renew the invitation to

Member Governments to submit their views on the questionnaire or as regards other matters for possible inclusion in the draft Declaration, so that the Intergovernmental Working Group could take them into account and base its discussions on a larger number of Government's replies, as well as on a summary of the discussions at the present session. The Committee urged that the Intergovernmental Working Group proceed in such a way that a preliminary draft for the Declaration could be discussed in detail at the Committee's third session.

29. The Preparatory Committee held a general discussion on the Declaration, its principal objectives and possible form and contents. There was general consensus that the Declaration should be inspirational and concise; it should be readily understandable by the general public so that it could serve as an effective instrument for education and stimulate public awareness and community participation in action for the protection of the environment.

30. Most members of the Committee felt that the Declaration should be a document of universally recognized fundamental principles recommended for action by individuals, States and the international community.

31. With regard to the structure of the Declaration, it was generally agreed that it should contain a preamble of an inspirational character.

32. There was some divergence of views on the question to what extent the Declaration should also attempt to lay down specific guidelines for action. The prevailing view, however, was that while the Declaration could outline broad goals and objectives, it should not set out a detailed action programme which would be more appropriate in the context of other action to be taken by the Conference (e.g. resolutions, conventions).

33. It was pointed out that, by its very nature, the Declaration should not formulate legally binding provisions, in particular as regards relations between States and individuals, or as between the latter, which were considered in principle to be governed by national legislation. The Declaration could, however, in the view of some delegations, make an important contribution by universally recognizing the fundamental need of the individual for a satisfactory environment which permits the enjoyment of his human rights. Other delegations were of the opinion that the Declaration could contain a separate section embodying general principles elaborating the rights and duties of States with respect to the environment. Some delegations favoured emphasis in the Declaration on the responsibilities of States and the need for solidarity in combating environmental problems.

34. The importance of international co-operation in solving environmental problems was stressed. The Preparatory Committee considered that it would be desirable for the Declaration to focus on the need for States to legislate internally to protect and preserve the environment, as well as on the need for international co-operation for the same purpose.

35. The Committee agreed that the relationship between environment and development is one of the issues of crucial importance and it would be useful to make a particular reference in the Declaration to the protection of the interests of developing countries.

36. On the question whether the Declaration should include a definition of the term "human environment", many delegations felt that it might be difficult at the present stage to reach agreement on a satisfactory definition which would not be unduly restrictive; and that an attempt to formulate a definition might unprofitably delay the preparatory work on the substance of the draft Declaration. Some representatives, however, favoured a definition as a necessary element to clarify and guide future environmental action.

Other subjects proposed for completion at the Conference (3rd level actions)

A. Marine Pollution

37. The Preparatory Committee heard presentations of the various activities of the United Nations system in respect of marine pollution from the representatives of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO and the World Meteorological Organization. Throughout these presentations, the co-operative character of many of these activities was emphasized, including, in particular, the work of the Joint (IMCO/FAO/UNESCO/WMO/WHO/IAEA) Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Pollution, the Long term and Expanded Programme of Oceanographic Research and the International Global Ocean Station System being undertaken by the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and the report being prepared pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 2566 (XXIV) on promoting effective measures for the prevention and control of marine pollution. Also mentioned prominently in these presentations, and of particular relevance to the subject of marine pollution, were the 1954 Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, the FAO Technical Conference on Marine Pollution held in 1970 and the conferences on pollution of all kinds from ships and on the law of the sea to be held in 1973.

38. The Preparatory Committee held a general discussion on the problems of marine pollution. There was general agreement, in the light of the urgency, importance and complexity of these problems, that an Intergovernmental Working Group on Marine Pollution should be established. This Intergovernmental Working Group would look at the problem of marine pollution as a whole and attempt to develop an integrated plan for dealing with marine pollution. This plan would take into due account those areas in which the United Nations system is already active as well as those areas in which initiatives may be needed.

39. It would consider marine pollution arising from land-based, bottom-based and sea based activities as well as air-borne pollutants. In this connexion, the importance of national, sub-regional and regional, as well as international activities was emphasized, as was the need for assistance to developing countries in taking action to control marine pollution. Several delegations expressed the view that, in addition to this plan, the Stockholm Conference could receive from the Intergovernmental Working Group a number of principles to be used as guidelines in undertaking future action in the area of marine pollution.

40. On the question of whether specific actions for the control of marine pollution should be taken at the Stockholm Conference, there were a number of views. Several delegations felt that specific actions should be taken at Stockholm on such problems as the deliberate marine dumping of toxic materials and the discharge of chlorinated hydrocarbons to the environment. Several delegations stated that such actions need not take the form of conventions. Other delegations felt that it would not be possible to take specific actions for the control of marine pollution at the Stockholm Conference, but it was generally agreed that the terms of reference of the Intergovernmental Working Group should be broad enough to enable it to consider specific actions and to recommend them to the Stockholm Conference if it found that agreement on specific actions was feasible. The view was also expressed that specific actions on marine pollution arising from certain marine activities should be left to the IMCO conference on pollution from ships and the Law of the Sea Conference, both of which will be held in 1973. It was however, suggested that the Stockholm Conference might specify in any plan for the control of marine pollution particular subjects which should be considered at these conferences in 1973, as well as recommended guidelines as to how they might be approached.

41. With respect to the ongoing activities of the United Nations system relevant to the problem of marine pollution, there was general agreement as to the importance of what was being done, as set forth both in the documents made available by the Conference Secretariat and in the statements of the representatives of the various parts of the United Nations system. It was, however, the general view that a synoposis of these activities was required. Such a synopsis might be prepared by the Intergovernmental Working Group, or it might be provided by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs from work already underway pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2566 (XXIV), but in either case it would include the activities of all the different parts of the United Nations system.

42. In the light of this discussion, the Preparatory Committee has reached the following conclusions:

(a) The Preparatory Committee recognizes the deep concern over the pollution of the marine environment being felt by many Governments and by many international bodies as well as by other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. It considers that this is a topic deserving full discussion at the Stockholm Conference, that international action may be appropriate on many aspects of marine pollution, and that to facilitate Conference consideration there should be a full appraisal of this subject by an Intergovernmental Working Group.

(b) The Preparatory Committee recommends the establishment of an Intergovernmental Working Group initially composed of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Iceland, India, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, USSR, UAR, UK, USA, Yugoslavia, of such other interested United Nations Member States who indicate a desire to participate and of appropriate components of the United Nations system, to consider the reviews of aspects of marine pollution now available, including the pending reports of the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2566 (XXIV), with a view to recommending, *inter alia* and in the light of the discussions as reflected in this section of the report:

(i) The extent to which any general guidelines and criteria can usefully be established to assist Governments in preventing or controlling the pollution of the marine environment;

(ii) Specific actions which might issue from:

A consideration of the extent to which any particular substances can be identified whose discharge in the marine environment should be prevented or limited because of their toxicity, persistence, accumulation in living tissues of other properties, and in the light of this to consider the possibilities for action to prevent or control pollution by these substances;

An appraisal of international arrangements in particular sub-regional or regional ones, both as a start for later actions on a broader scale and to give immediate protection to areas of the marine environment which are especially liable to dangerous pollution. Such steps may be based upon or comprise more limited measures which have already been proposed or initiated in certain regions;

An appraisal of the action that might be taken by the Conference to improve the enforcement by Governments of existing instruments or conventions relating to the prevention and control of marine pollutions and to encourage the early implementation of further instruments now being formulated or to be formulated in this field.

43. In reaching these conclusions the Preparatory Committee has considered the following documents relevant to the discussion on marine pollution provided by the Conference Secretariat:

"Progress Report on the Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 2566 (XXIV) on Promoting Effective Measures for the Prevention and Control of Marine Pollution" (A/CONF.48/PC.8/ADD.1, Annex IV)

"Possible Third level Actions in Respect of Marine Pollution" (A/CONF.48/PC(II)/CRP.4 Annex II)

"Summary of Relevant Parts of Resolutions Adopted by the General Assembly Dealing with Marine Pollution" (A/CONF.48/PC(II)/CRP.5)

"Excerpts of Relevant Parts of Debates at the 25th Session of the General Assembly (including debates in the Committee I) Dealing with Marine Pollution" (A/CON.48/PC(II)/CRP.6)

"Marine Pollution: Review of Possible Level III or Level II Actions" (A/CONF.48/PC(II)/CRP.7 and Corr.1)

"Summary of Some Selected Recommendations Approved by the FAO Technical Conference on Marine Pollution (1970)" (A/CON.48/PC(II)/CRP.12)

44. In addition, the Conference Secretariat had made the following documents from within the United Nations system available to the Preparatory Committee:

"Report of the Second Session (2–6 March 1970) of the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Pollution" (GESAMP II/11)

"Marine Pollution Problems and Remedies" (UNITAR Research Report No. 4)

"The Sea: International Co-operation in Questions Relating to Oceans", a report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Forty-ninth session of ECOSOC (E/4836)

"Marine Pollution and other hazardous and harmful effects which might arise from the exploration and exploitation of the sea bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction", a report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea Bed and Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (A/7924)

45. Additionally, the following documents were available in limtied supply:

Extracts from the Report of a Group of Experts on Long term Scientific Policy and Planning established by the IOC (first session held at Monaco, 16–25 November 1970)

Summary of a Report of the FAO sponsored Seminar on Methods of Detection, Measurement and Monitoring of Pollutants in the Marine Environment (Rome, 4–10 December 1970)

B. Monitoring or surveillance

46. The Preparatory Committee recommends that preparations be initiated so as to enable the Conference to review the adequacy of, and take any appropriate action to make full use of, and improve, present regional or world-wide arrangements for the monitoring or surveillance of certain variables of the environment that relate to the proper balance of the biosphere and the health and well-being of men. These shall include the monitoring or surveillance of environmental variables making possible:

(a) the continued assessment of those physical, chemical and biological changes in the environment that are brought about by human activities;

(b) the continued assessment of the changes of the natural resources of the biosphere;

(c) the detection of climatic changes, and

(d) the forecasting of natural disasters.

47. For the purposes outlined above, the Preparatory Committee recommends the establishment of an Intergovernmental Working Group initially composed of Argentina, Australia, Canada, Japan, France, Mexico, Sweden, USSR, UK, USA, of such other interested United Nations Member States who indicate a desire to participate and of appropriate components of the UN system.

48. The Intergovernmental Working Group should:

(a) Consider the needs and priorities of Governments for the various aspects of environmental monitoring or surveillance and, in its work, clearly define the purposes for which any monitoring or surveillance activity might be undertaken.

(b) Review and assess the adequacy and compatibility of existing regional or world-wide monitoring or surveillance activities in air, in water, on land and on man and ecosystems.

(c) Assess the value of:

(i) using, co-ordinating, and extending existing monitoring or surveillance systems;

(ii) supplementing them through the utilization of remote-sensing techniques, and

(iii) establishing new systems including early warning systems.

(d) Examine and recommend possible means for improving, where required, present monitoring and surveillance arrangements.

(e) Estimate the financial implications of any such recommendation.

(f) Consider which organs should receive the resulting data and which should evaluate them on a world-wide scale.

(g) Consider and recommend those organs to which the overall evaluations should be submitted for possible remedial action at Government level.

C. Pollutant Release Limits

49. The Preparatory Committee, having considered the question of establishing, on an international basis, guidance for the limitation of the release of pollutants, requests the Secretariat to compile information on and, with appropriate consultation with experts, to examine the feasibility of the following:

(a) The development and recommendation, in co-operation with the competent international organizations, of additional international environmental quality criteria [1] aimed at the protection of man's health and his environmental for use by Governments in limiting the release into the environment of critical pollutants;

(b) The containing review of existing criteria [1] relevant to environmental problems and the identification of areas in which new or revised criteria are needed;

(c) The identification of substances which, because of their toxicity, persistence, accumulation in living tissues or other special properties, should not be discharged into the environment when this is avoidable, or failing that, whose discharge should be limited;

(d) The development of internationally agreed recommendations for the use of pesticides;

(e) Conducting a critical review of existing practices in the transportation, storage and disposal of toxic substances and developing if necessary additional guidelines or rules.

50. The Secretariat should report to the Intergovernmental Working Group on "Monitoring" and if it makes positive recommendations in any of the above areas should submit them to the Intergovernmental Working Group on "Monitoring" for consideration.

51. The Preparatory Committee has considered the proposals for an International Registry of Potential Chemical Pollutants and considers that these proposals should be discussed at level II for the time being.

52. It requests the Secretary accordingly to seek Basic Papers from governments and appropriate governmental and non-governmental organizations, and to collate these papers in the light of discussion during the second session of the Preparatory Committee, and to present the results of its work of collation for further consideration at the third session in September 1971, when the Preparatory Committee may wish to consider initiation of possible level III preparations.

D. Conservation

I. Areas of natural, cultural or historical significance

53. The Preparatory Committee recommends that preparations should be initiated in order to enable the Governments present at the Stockholm Conference, should they so decide, to agree to establish a World Heritage Foundation under which special recognition would be accorded to certain areas of natural, cultural or historical significance, as well as to take favourable action, possibly including the opening for signature, of two related conventions presently in preparation: one on the conservation of wetlands, one on the conservation of islands for science.

54. In order to assure adequate preparation, the Preparatory Committee recommends that UNESCO together with the IUCN, FAO and interested Member States, develop a constitution for the proposed World Heritage Foundation, to define its objectives and mode of action, to settle the criteria for the selection of natural areas and sites, and to outline the meaures to be adopted by States for the conservation of trust areas.

55. For the purpose outlined above the Preparatory Committee recommends establishment of an Intergovernmental Working Group initially composed of representatives of Brazil, France, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Sweden, USSR, UK, USA, Zambia, and of such other interested United Nations Member States who indicate a desire to participate, together with representatives of UNESCO, FAO and IUCN. The Preparatory Committee recommends that this Intergovernmental Working Group hold its first meeting concurrently with the third session of the Preparatory Committee to discuss reports previously prepared by UNESCO, FAO and IUCN.

56. Additionally, the Preparatory Committee recommends that UNESCO ensure that

---

[1] In pollution control the word *criteria* has come to have a special meaning which is, briefly, the data describing quantitatively the effects of a pollutant on a variety of receptors. These data require a knowledge of the quantitative and qualitative differences in the effects of the pollutant as a result of: the chemical form of the pollutant, the target organism and the type of exposure, i.e., acute or chronic. The kinds of harm which might be considered and which may be determining include effects on human health, fauna, flora and natural resources. Knowledge of all these permits the identification of the most likely effect in the most sensitive organism.

Norms or *standards* are regulated levels of quality of a natural resource or emission rates of pollutants prescribed for specific control purposes. They are arrived at by objective and subjective judgment weighing the risks of biological damage (described by the criteria), economic, social and aesthetic factors against the expected benefits of accepting a certain level of a noxious agent or environmental pollutant. The judgment requires taking into consideration, as well as the risks of harm, local conditions, available control technology, needs of developing industries and other scientific, social and political factors.

this action process in respect of the proposed convention on islands for science is called to the attention of the South Pacific Commission at its meeting at Noumea in August 1971 and to assure that appropriate action is taken for its discussion at the Pacific Science Congress in Canberra in August-September 1971.

II. PROTECTION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES

57. The Preparatory Committee recommends that preparation should be initiated in order to enable the Governments present at the Stockholm Conference should they so decide to take positive action on a draft convention to regulate the import, export and transit of threatened species of animals and plants.

58. In order to assure adequate preparation, the Preparatory Committee agreed that it would not be necessary to establish a special Intergovernmental Working Group since a draft convention is already in preparation by the IUCN with the assistance of FAO.

59. While recognizing that present plans call for a meeting open to all Member States early in 1972 to agree on the text of a convention, the Preparatory Committee recommended that IUCN, in co-operation with FAO and UNESCO, accelerate the preparatory process in order that Governments not yet involved could be apprised of the state of the convention in time to consider associating themselves with its signature at the Stockholm Conference.

E. Soils

60. Considering that the steady and sometimes irreversible degradation of soils, followed by highly detrimental decline of productivity, is a matter of serious concern, particularly for developing countries, the Preparatory Committee recommends that preparations should be initiated in order to enable Governments present at the Stockholm Conference to endorse a Plan of Action for the purpose of strengthening and increasing the efficiency of national programmes of soil preservation and reclamation, with particular reference to wise land use, already initiated or to be proposed by Governments and competent Specialized Agencies of the United Nations acting in close co-operation with each other and with non-governmental Organizations.

61. Such preparation should permit, in particular, the determination of the most appropriate form of the measures which ought to be taken by the Stockholm Conference in this respect (e.g. an international Convention, the establishment of a Special Fund and of a permanent international group of experts to keep the situation constantly under review and recommend appropriate actions at the national, regional and international levels, etc. . . .).

62. The proposed Plan of Action should enable national authorities, with the assistance of existing international institutions and organizations, to take measures necessary to:

(a) prevent various forms of soil degradation such as:

Mechanical erosion (mainly by water flows including tidal action and tsunami waves and wind),

Pollution resulting either from deliberate (but inappropriate) use of chemical substances (such as pesticides and fertilizers) or from accidental side effects of nonagricultural activities (for example, oil pumping, mining wastes, transport and storage of fuels, etc.),

Overgrazing, fatigue resulting from too intensive exploitation, destruction caused by the use of inappropriate mechanical equipment, secondary salinization or alcalinization and, in general, all negative effects of misuse of lands,

Destruction caused by floods, earthquakes or other diasters resulting from development projects being undertaken without the careful scientific investigations necessary to forecast their short and long term consequences (impact) on the bio-geo-equilibrium.

(b) improve or restore the productivity of degraded lands, make best possible use of naturally unproductive lands and, more generally, counteract by appropriate educational and training programmes the detrimental effects of ignorance, negligence or shortsighted exploitation on the quality of the soil or unwise land use not based on sound ecological principles.

63. In order to ensure adequate preparation the Preparatory Committee recommends the establishment of an Intergovernmental Working Group to:

(a) consider proposals to be submitted by Member Governments, the FAO in close cooperation with UNESCO, the IUCN, the International Soil Society and other organizations (including possibly Regional Economic Commissions of the United Nations, the UNDP, the IBRD) whose experience and support might contribute both to the efficiency of this preparatory planning work and to the success of the future Plan of Action;

(b) prepare the recommendations to be submitted to the Stockholm Conference for adoption;

(c) consider the scientific, legal, administrative and financial implications of such recommendations;

(d) prepare the instruments (agreements, resolutions etc.) necessary for such recommendations to become effective at the time of the Stockholm Conference.

64. The Preparatory Committee, being informed that present plans of the Secretariat make provision for the preparation of basic papers on these subjects by interested specialized agencies (with FAO as focal point) and also by interested Governments and nongovernmental organizations by the end of May 1971, suggests that the Inter-governmental Working Group should meet in June 1971 in order to discuss these basic papers and elaborate proposals for immediate actions in the areas outlined above.

65. For the purposes outlined above the Preparatory Committee recommends establishment of the Intergovernmental Working Group initially composed of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, India, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, USSR, UAR, USA, Yugoslavia, Zambia, of such other interested United Nations Member States who indicate a desire to participate and of appropriate components of the UN system.

66. Concerning the contents of the Plan of Action referred to above, the Preparatory Committee considers that the following problems would require special attention:

Adoption of polices enabling farmers or agricultural communities to let the soil rest whenever necessary for its conservation or reclamation;

Stabilization of marginal lands;

Establishment of guidelines in order that economic development planning may take account of the necessity to preserve biological balances, with due consideration of the conditions (climatic, demographic, socio-economic, etc.) prevailing in various regions;

Establishment of national bodies to advise governments and local authorities and communities on land and soils survey and mapping, proper land use planning, adequate legislation, research and experimentation activities required, and to promote the necessary information, educational, training and demonstration activities;

Establishment of regional research and training centers for collecting data relating to similar ecological conditions, experimenting techniques, advising national authorities upon request and, in general, promoting regional co-operation in devising adequate soil use and reclamation policies.

67. The Preparatory Committee considers that the urgent necessity to preserve and improve the productivity of the soil required for the proper supply of future generations with food and other natural products should be one of the main principles reflected in the future Declaration of the Human Environment and invites the Secretariat to extend to the Intergovernmental Working Group in charge of the draft Declaration all advice and information required for this purpose.

F. Training

68. The Preparatory Committee recommends that preparations should be initiated in order to enable the Governments present at the Stockholm Conference to consider specific international measures for the education and training of specialists in various fields of environmental problems (including the social, economic and cultural aspects of the human environment) such as.

(a) establishment or development of regional training centres on the human environment which might be sponsored by the relevant bodies and agencies of the United Nations system;

(b) determination of means for financing these centres and provision of fellowships and scholarships for the study at these centres or other institutions;

(c) preparation, in consultation with the United Nations system and the appropriate non-governmental organizations, of programmes of co-ordination of the teaching and training activities of the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations in this field;

(d) determination of appropriate ways and means by which Governments might obtain expert services on an international basis.

69. In order to assure adequate preparation, the Preparatory Committee recommends the following action process;

(a) the Secretariat should undertake, on the basis of data made available by UN Agencies, national reports and other sources the preparation of a general outline of the status of:

(i) teaching and training programmes; bibliographies;

(ii) the availability of funds, scholarships or any financial means to support international training;

(iii) the availability of experts, in various fields of environmental problems who may serve for international teaching and consultation.

(b) This information will be available for consideration by the Preparatory Committee at its third session at which time the Preparatory Committee would recommend whether or not an Intergovernmental Working Group should appropriately be established for level III consideration.

70. In making such recommendations the Preparatory Committee at its third session will be guided by the need to determine whether the functions envisaged in paragraph 68 above can be carried out satisfactorily by existing or planned programmes in the United Nations system, and non-governmental organizations with particular regard to such proposed programmes as an "International Centre for the Environment" which, if established, might sponsor advanced educational and training programmes in environmental problems and which might also play a co-ordinating role for the regional training centres.

G. Information exchange

71. The Preparatory Committee agrees that one important objective of the Stockholm Conference should be an analysis of the adequacy of the present machinery for interchange of information on environmental matters between Governments, and a consideration of ways in which it may be improved, particularly with regard to information other than scientific.

72. To this end the Committee recommends that the Secretariat of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment;

(a) determine the needs of Governments for international exchange of information about the environment including scientific data, and information about legislative and administrative experience in the environmental field, planning, resource management, environmental aspects of economic development and human health, pollution and pollution control, and the technical and scientific methodology which has been found valuable in these fields.

(b) ask United Nations Member States, either directly or through an appropriate intermediary agency, for an assessment of the extent to which the present machinery for international exchange of information meets their requirements.

(c) ask United Nations Member States, especially in developing countries, how far inadequacies in the flow of information concerning the environment result from a shortage of bibliography, trained librarians, abstractors, and other interpretative personnel, rather than from deficiencies in the primary sources of material.

(d) review in the light of the needs of United Nations Member States the adequacy of the information gathering, storage, assessment and dissemination currently being undertaken by economic regional commissions, and by intergovernmental and other international agencies as well as the adequacy of the training of personnel referred to in section F.

(e) provide information that will allow United Nations Member States to determine how far the work in this field of the existing international agencies, including regional commissions, requires co-ordination or expansion, and, if necessary, how far it might be appropriate and feasible to organize a comprehensive system for the exchange of information on environmental matters and an adequate series of centres with expertise in this field.

(f) keep United Nations Member States informed at all appropriate stages of this work, and to report progress at the third session of the Preparatory Committee, at which meeting recommendations for Third Level action at the Stockholm Conference could be made.

H. Genetic pools

73. The Preparatory Committee, taking into account the accelerating rate of plant and animal species extinction, largely because of the destruction of suitable habitats for them; noting that the extensive use of high-yielding varieties contributes to the disappearance of primitive and other forms and earlier varieties which may be needed, for instance, for further advances in selection and breeding work, and to meet the needs of developing countries for varieties adapted to their specific ecological conditions; recognizing that the conservation and rational use of the existing diversity of the genetic resources and ecosystems of the world constitute not only a necessity for scientific purposes and ethical reasons, but can also help in selecting pest resistant varieties and thereby reduce the use of persistent pesticides, in selecting species and varieties for possible uses; recommends that preparation should be initiated in order to enable the Governments present at the Stockholm Conference:

(a) To take full cognizance of the existing activities of Member States, specialized agencies of the United Nations and non-governmental organizations in the important field of utilization and preservation of genetic resources and to evaluate progress made in this respect.

(b) To take additional measures for the rational conservation of world genetic resources including the survey and collection of these resources, the creation of additional centres of conservation in natural conditions (natural reserves and parks), in gene banks and other storage centres of genetic material, and also for strengthening their co-operation.

(c) To reinforce and co-ordinate, wherever needed, existing activities of registration, exchange of information and exchange of biological material for breeding and other purposes, eventually leading to the establishment of a world register of genetic resources.

(d) To strengthen and harmonize on-going programmes of selection and breeding of plants and animals with a view to:

(i) developing additional high-yielding varieties especially adapted to the needs and to ecological conditions of developing countries;

(ii) increasing the resistance to pest and diseases of those varieties, thereby reducing the use of persistent pesticides.

(e) To take similar measures as under (b) and (c) above regarding culture collections of micro-organisms, for example, those used for anti-biotics and for soil improvement (nitrogen fixation by rhizobia).

(f) To recommend, wherever needed, the creation of additional national and regional centres which could perform the above-mentioned general activities, especially in subtropical and tropical regions, and also some specialized institutes performing the above tasks (b, c and d) for specific crops such as rice and for domesticated animals in order to increase their productivity and resistance to pest and diseases.

74. In order to ensure adequate preparation, the Preparatory Committee recommends that interested Member Governments, FAO, UNESCO, WHO and other interested specialized agencies, as well as ICSU, IUCN and other non-governmental organizations, provide the Conference Secretariat, by the end of May 1971, with "basic papers" on the subject. The Secretariat will then ensure the compilation of these papers and prepare action proposals in those specific sectors which require urgent action, for consideration by the Preparatory Committee at its next session.

I. UN system

75. The Preparatory Committee heard a common statement of the representatives of the organizations of the UN System who expressed the hope that the Stockholm Conference would provide additional impetus and guidance to on-going or planned international activities and programmes in specific sectors directly related to the problems of the human environment.

76. The Preparatory Committee recognized that this objective should be met through the Conference preparation process itself and does not constitute as such a topic for third level action.

77. The Preparatory Committee recognizes the importance of the work underway in the UN system with respect to the problems of the human environment and of the plans and proposals already submitted, approved or in the course of submission to the respective governing bodies of these organizations. The Preparatory Committee further agrees that it is important that the fullest possible use be made in preparations for the Conference of the full potential of resources represented by the UN system and that any duplication of activities be avoided by assuring the provision of all necessary information concerning all pertinent programmes of each element of the UN system.

78. With a view to achieving the above objectives, in respect of all recommended agenda subjects, the Preparaory Committee recommends that full attention be paid to on-going and planned activities of the UN system with particular regard to action proposals for consideration at the Conference as well as to the capacity of the UN system to carry out any such action proposals.

Concluding remarks

79. Debates on the subjects proposed for completion at the Conference were based on the proposals summarized in documents A/CONF.48/PC(II)/CRP.4 and Add.1. The Secretary-General pointed out in his introductory statement that one of the most important matters to be dealt with by the Preparatory Committee at its second session would be to recommend items which should be prepared in the near future for possible completion, at least in an initial stage, at the Stockholm Conference, and to specify for each such item the nature of the action contemplated, the nature of the action-process by which the action would be prepared, and the most appropriate means by which to secure intergovernmental participation in this process.

80. At a later point in the session, after the need to establish some Inter-governmental Working Groups to prepare third level actions on specific topics for appropriate action at the Stockholm Conference had been agreed, it was further agreed that progress reports on the work of the Intergovernmental Working Group would be presented to the Third Session of the Preparatory Committee in September 1971 so that the Preparatory Committee could then consider what further guidance might be needed, whether any IWG should be terminated as well as whether additional IWG's, as noted elsewhere, are desirable.

81. It was generally recognized that in order to carry out the objectives laid down by the General Assembly it is desirable to facilitate participation by United Nations member States in this preparatory process whether or not they are members of the Preparatory Committee. A number of delegations felt that it might prove necessary to limit the size of the working groups in view of problems of support and manageability, but it was agreed that this could be left to the discretion of the Secretary-General.

82. As reflected elsewhere in this report, the Preparatory Committee recognized the need to secure maximum contribution from all components of the United Nations system in the preparations for the Conference and specifically in the level III action process. It was therefore considered highly important to obtain the participation of specialized agencies and other components of the United Nations system, as well as of certain international non-governmental organizations (e.g. ICSU and IUCN) in any IWG dealing with matters, for which they are specially qualified to contribute.

83. As requested under the terms of rule 34 of the Rules of Procedure of the Economic and Social Council and rule 154 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General of the Conference informed the Preparatory Committee that the convening of the Intergovernmental Working Groups would have financial implications but he also observed that no provision had been made in the Conference budget for financing such Working Groups. These financial implications could not be determined with any degree of accuracy until details on the venue, duration, dates and composition of each meeting were known together with their interpretation and documentation needs. One effective and practical means of meeting these additional financial requirements was for Member States to host the inter-governmental Working Groups at their expense. For the guidance of those Governments who might be prepared to host such meetings, the Secretary-General provided some cost estimate based on certain broad assumptions he had to make.

84. The Commission appealed in this connexion to the generosity of member States to assist, by hosting IWGs and by other means, to make it possible to convene all recommended Intergovernmental Working

Groups without further combination or reduction of their number. It was noted in this connexion that it may be possible in some instances, within existing financial limitations, to convene IWGs at United Nations Headquarters in New York or Geneva. It was also suggested that the specialized agencies examine whether they could, within the limits of their budgets, provide accommodation and services for the work of the IWG. In the case of the IWG on soils, it was suggested that, in order to save money, its work could be conducted in English only.

85. The view was also expressed that some member States might assist by helping finance the cost of participation by experts from developing countries; also that Governments might provide experts' services to the Secretariat for the preparation of the basic documentation to be made available to the Working Groups.

86. The Preparatory Committee recommended that the IWG on the proposed Declaration on the Human Environment be convened as a sub-group at United Nations Headquarters in New York at a time to be announced by the Conference Secretary-General after consultations with interested members.

87. Recognizing the financial and other constraints under which the Secretary-General of the Conference must act the Preparatory Committee expects him to exert his best efforts to secure necessary support, and urges Governments in a position to do so to inform him by the end of March of their ability to invite IWGs to meet in their countries. The Preparatory Committee hopes means will be found to convene each of the recommended IWGs, and to enable all member States interested in the participation to do so, and leaves the arrangements for this in the hands of the Secretary-General of the Conference together with convening States as appropriate for IWGs [1] on the following subjects:

(a) Marine Pollution

(b) Monitoring and Environmental Criteria

(c) Soils

88. As to the other proposals discussed by the Preparatory Committee, it was felt that they were not ripe for initiation of level III action at the present time.

Observations and comments

89. One delegation expressed a reservation concerning the establishment, the terms of reference, the composition and the nomination of the Inter-governmental Working Groups, expressing the view that the Preparatory Committee and the Secretary-General of the Conference are not authorized by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly 2398 (XXIII), 2581 (XXIV), 2657 (XXV), or by existing practice, to select or nominate the membership of subsidiary organs or working groups on the intergovernmental level, outside the framework of the Preparatory Committee.

III. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS WITH REGARD TO THE CONFERENCE

Conference organization and structure

90. The Preparatory Committee after debate on proposals forwarded by the Secretary-General [2] and further information supplied by the Secretary-General of the Swedish Preparatory Committee about the availability of rooms and services, arrived at a general consensus on a number of considerations.

91. Facilities would be provided for plenary discussions throughout the whole of the conference so that these could proceed concurrently with the work of the three committees.

92. The six subjects would be assigned to the committees as follows:

Committee 1

The Planning and Management of Human Settlements for Environmental Quality, and,

Educational, Informational, Social and Cultural Aspects of Environmental Issues.

Committee 2

The Environmental Aspects of Natural Resources Management

Development and Environment.

Committee 3

Identification and Control of Pollutants and Nuisances of Broad International significance

The International Organized Implications of Action Proposals.

93. Because of possible differences on the sizes of action plans for the different subject areas, there was general agreement that the work schedules of these committees should be kept quite flexible, particularly for the second week.

94. Countries would be able to rearrange the membership of their delegation on any committee in whatever manner they desired.

95. The working committees would have to constitute themselves on the morning of 7 June 1972, and begin their debate, at the latest, if not in the same morning, that same afternoon. Flexibility should also be retained for a final decision on this item.

96. The Stockholm arrangements would have to conform to the physical limitations of the Conference rooms allocated.

97. The Secretary-General of the Stockholm Preparatory Committee pointed out that, apart from other considerations, limitations of space in the meeting rooms would impose that no more than 6 persons per delegation be seated in the plenary and no more than 3 in each committee.

98. After discussing how the Declaration on the Human Environment should be dealt with at the Conference, the Preparatory Committee did not take a decision on whether it should be considered first by Committee I or the Plenary Session. It was agreed that this would depend on the state of preparation of the document at the beginning of the Conference.

Pre conference documentation, work plan and method

99. The Preparatory Committee based its debate on proposals forwarded by the Secretary-General [3] and remarks made by the Secretary-General on 15 February 1971.

100. Questions from delegations and explanations by the Secretariat illuminated the following points:

(a) National Reports should be submitted to the Secretariat by 31 March 1971 and basic papers [4] by 31 May 1971.

(b) These will be collected in the Conference Library, which will have a published bibliography which will be a Conference document.

101. The Secretariat pointed out that these deadlines were necessary for completion of first drafts of Position and Action Papers [4] prior to the Third Session of the Preparatory Committee, it was hoped by 15 August.

102. The discussion indicated that several delegations attached special importance to case studies. It was therefore agreed that the Secretariat would circulate to all member States of the United Nations a list of suggested topics for case studies as well as topics already proposed by Governments.

103. The Preparatory Committee agreed that in the preparation of Position Papers and Action Plans there should be consultations with experts and governments, as required by the Secretariat. It was also agreed that intergovernmental consultations on the action proposals were essential and that they could take place mainly at the Third Session of the Preparatory Committee, to assure completion of documents by 31 October. The Secretariat explained that this schedule was essential to meet the deadline imposed by the time required for translation, printing and distribution of the conference documents by February 1972, and for their subsequent examination by governments.

104. Several delegations advanced the point of view, during various stages of the debate in the Preparatory Committee that the subject of Development and Environment be given special consideration. The Preparatory Committee agreed that after preliminary examination by experts the subject might be later considered by an Intergovernmental Working Group.

National participation and participation of organizations other than governments and the United Nations

105. In introducing the proposals contained in paragraphs 70–74 of his report,[5] the Secretary-General of the Conference laid special emphasis on measures designed to enable developing countries to participate in the Conference. In this connection he informed the Committee that regional seminars would be organized and that they would take place in August or early September 1971.

106. Regarding the participation of organizations other than governments and United Nations intergovernmental organizations—IGOs and non-governmental organizations—NGOs, the Secretary-General of the Conference first noted the need for participation of IGOs, calling the Committee's attention to the presence at this session of the Preparatory Committee of many of these organizations.

107. Turning to NGOs, the Secretary-General of the Conference reiterated the very important role of these organizations because of the variety of talent they could give to the Conference and because of the need for governments to have the backing of public opinion. Recommendations received from NGOs would be carefully considered and consultations would be held with NGOs to clarify these recommendations. He also noted the more direct relationship with some NGOs that can make particular substantive contributions.

108. The Preparatory Committee expressed its appreciation for the various measures undertaken by the Secretary-General of the Conference in order to enable developing countries to participate in the Conference. In this connexion it was pointed out that the seminars proposed by the Secretary-General would be valuable as an expression of the regional approach and it was recognized that the ECE Conference on the Environment would be an important contribution to the Stockholm Conference.

109. In commenting on the item covering NGO participation, the members generally approved of the Secretary-General's recommendations. Several delegations felt that NGOs, particularly youth, could not find adequate representation on government delegations, while other delegations felt that representation should be left with governments.

110. It was suggested that a pre-Conference for NGOs should be held at which NGOs could make recommendations to the Stockholm Conference.

111. Some delegations, convinced of the universal character of the problem of the environment, expressed the opinion that participation in the Conference should also have universal character.

---

[1] See paragraph 55 above for "conservation".

[2] See Report of the Secretary-General (A/CONF.48/PC.8) and the Statement by the Secretary-General of the Conference (Annex IV).

[3] See Report of the Secretary-General (A/CONF.48/PC.8) and accompanying material part of which is reproduced in Annex V and the Statement by the Secretary-General of the Conference (Annex IV).

[4] See Annex V.

[5] See doc. A/CONF.48/PC.8.

IV. PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION [1]

112. The Preparatory Committee discussed the proposals set out in Annex III of the report of the Secretary-General.[2] There was general agreement that public information was of primary importance and that special emphasis should be placed on providing policy makers with adequate information on which to base their decisions and on informing public opinion in developing countries. It was stressed that action in the environmental field implied changes in the way of life and that the public had to be prepared for such changes.

113. There was some criticism of the proposals contained in Annex III which was found to be in some respects contradictory. It was pointed out that these proposals did not in themselves constitute an action plan. One delegation found that the premises for action in the information field tended to over-emphasize the global aspects of the environmental problem and also that more stress should be put on mankind's ability to overcome these problems.

114. Many delegations found it important that information activities in connection with the Conference should make full use of existing information networks, both national and international. Stress should be put on direct contacts with newspaper editors and other leaders of public opinion. All use should be made of audio-visual media with particular stress on material for television. It was repeatedly emphasized that work in the information field required a high level of professional expertise.

115. A proposal for an international film competition on the environment was supported by several delegations. In this connection it was felt by some delegations that such a competition should not be under direct UN sponsorship.

V. FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE

116. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2657(XXV) the third session of the Preparatory Committee will take place in New York from 13 to 24 September 1971.

117. At the third session, the Preparatory Committee was expected to have before it progress reports on the elaboration of action proposals for the Conference. Also the Committee would give detailed consideration to the drafting of the Declaration on the Human Environment. It was suggested that the Preparatory Committee, at its third session, could set up three sessional working groups which would correspond to the three committees suggested for the Conference itself.[3]

118. The fourth meeting of the Preparatory Committee was expected to be held in New York early in 1972.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Report on the ECA Conference of Ministers

119. The representative of the Secretary-General of the Conference to the ECA session gave a summary of the statement he had made at Tunis.

The developing countries should participate in the discussion of principles so that any decisions adopted at Stockholm would not be made only by rich countries, whose conceptions and preoccupations in the matter of environment might be different from those of poor countries.

It was obviously in the interests of the developing countries to negotiate with the advanced countries the terms of specific assistance which would enable them to deal with environmental problems in the context of their development policies.

In view of the exceptional nature of the problem of environment, it was essential for all people, whatever their material resources, and for all governments on their behalf, to agree on measures which would improve the quality of their lives on the earth.

120. With reference to the need to intensify public information activities, the representative of the Secretary-General of the Conference stated that a consultant loaned by the Canadian Government would visit some twelve countries in March and April, accompanied by a representative of the ECA secretariat. The Secretary-General of the Conference would himself visit other countries in the next few months to establish contacts at the highest level. He would also attend the meeting of United Nations Resident Representatives at New Delhi.

Preparation of a glossary

121. It was suggested that it would be useful to prepare a glossary of current terms concerned with environment in the four working languages of the United Nations. Because of the importance of avoiding misunderstandings during the preparation and discussion of documentation, work on this should begin as soon as possible.

Rules of procedure

122. The Committee agreed to consider at its next session draft rules of procedure for the Stockholm Conference and recommended that the Secretary-General of the Conference prepare a draft for this purpose.

Methods to expedite the adoption and implementation of international rules and standards for environment protection

123. At the request of the Secretary-General of the Conference, the legal Counsel of FAO presented a paper entitled "Methods to Expedite the Adoption and Implementation of International Rules and Standards for Environment Protection", which was distributed as a Conference Room Paper.

VII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

124. The Preparatory Committee adopted the above report on the last day of its second session, i.e. 19 February 1971.

[1] This section should be read in connection with paragraphs 68–70 (Training) above.

[2] See doc. A/CONF.48/PC.8

[3] See para. 92 above.

NINTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA POLL RESULTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following results from my 1971 opinion survey:

NINTH DISTRICT POLL RESULTS

WELFARE REFORM

The President has proposed a sweeping plan of welfare reform. Which of the following comes closest to your views? (*More than one choice if you wish.*)

42%—Payments should be made to families in which the father earns less than the welfare standards.

44%—Mothers should be required to work if day care can be provided for their young children.

18%—There should be a Federally-financed floor on welfare programs.

14%—The Federal government should take over the welfare program.

13%—The present welfare programs are adequate and should be continued.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Several proposals for health insurance coverage for all Americans have been introduced in the Congress. Which one of the following do you think is the BEST approach?

25%—Health insurance for all Americans through payroll deductions and Federal contributions for those able to pay, a continuation of Medicaid for those not able to pay.

19%—Health insurance through income tax credits to purchase private health insurance for those able to pay, plus Federally-financed insurance for those not able to pay.

27%—Health insurance providing protection only against catastrophic, or highly expensive, illnesses.

15%—Expansion of the Medicare program to include all Americans, regardless of age, and to include a wider range of benefits.

14%—No answer.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Would you favor an end to the practice of awarding committee chairmanships automatically to Members with the longest continuous service?

72%—Yes.

21%—No.

7%—No answer.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

The President has proposed the consolidation of the 12 Cabinet Departments into eight, to bring about better administration of Federal programs. Which one of the following comes closest to your view:

42%—The proposal will help to make the Federal government more responsive.

26%—The proposal will only create larger centers of bureaucracy.

23%—The proposal will not make any difference.

9%—No answer.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Which one of the following courses of action in Southeast Asia comes closest to your point of view?

23%—Immediate withdrawal of all American troops.

16%—Announcing, then following through, on a date for withdrawing all American troops from Vietnam.

44%—Gradual withdrawal of American troops as the South Vietnamese are able to take over the conflict.

13%—Continued presence of American combat troops in Vietnam until the Communists are defeated.

4%—No answer.

The Congress voted in 1970 to cut off funds for American ground combat troops in Laos and Cambodia. Do you think this restriction should be:

33%—Repealed.

32%—Continued as it is.

27%—Amended to prohibit also funds for air support and all military activity.

8%—No answer.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The costs of election campaigns are becoming a national concern. Do you prefer: (*More than one choice, if you wish.*)

68%—Full disclosure of the source of campaign funds and the manner in which they are spent.

72%—A ceiling on campaign expenditures for all candidates.

11%—Tax deductions or credits for persons who make contributions to political campaigns.

4%—Federal funds for specified campaign expenditures for all candidates.

THE DRAFT

The right of the government to induct certain individuals into military service expires June 30, 1971. Which one of these do you favor:

37%—Establishing an all-volunteer army.

40%—Extending the draft, but without college deferments.

17%—Extending the draft as it is now, with deferments for undergraduate college students.

6%—No answer.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Please indicate whether you feel government spending in each of the following cate-

gories should be increased, held at present levels, or decreased:

[In percent]

	Increased	Held at present level	Decreased
Defense	20	43	30
Foreign aid	1	17	76
Pollution control	69	20	4
Education	43	38	13
Health research	65	27	3
Crime prevention and control	70	23	2
The elderly	48	42	4
Farm program	19	39	35
Supersonic transport	7	18	68
Aid to cities	27	43	23
Rural development	25	47	20
The space program	10	32	54
Consumer protection	51	32	11

PARTICIPATION INFORMATION

(In percent)

1. Sex:	
Male	52
Female	45
No answer	3
2. Age:	
Under 30	17
30–45	29
45–65	38
Over 65	14
No answer	2
3. Party preference:	
Democrat	43
Republican	22
Independent	29
No answer	6

WHY THE DRIVE TO BAIL OUT BUSINESS IN TROUBLE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, an article in the May 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report clearly illustrates the part that our Government has played in assisting ailing private enterprise in the past. I present it here for my colleagues information:

WHY THE DRIVE TO BAIL OUT BUSINESSES IN TROUBLE

Rescuing ailing firms, to protect jobs and business confidence, is a top concern in Washington. Congress is looking at various ideas.

A White House proposal for financial aid to the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation has revived interest in some type of "new RFC."

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation aided hundreds of firms in the 1930s. It was generally a financial success. Now there is a feeling that something like the RFC might be needed again to aid companies and industries caught in financial straits—whether due to recession, tight money, bad management, defense cutbacks or a combination of those causes.

Eleven months ago the country's biggest railroad, Penn Central, nearly went under, and still is in perilous shape. It has more than 90,000 employes. The threatened collapse of Lockheed Aircraft could wipe out some 30,000 jobs.

At a time when confidence is crucial to economic recovery, the Nixon Administration decided it would not let either of these industrial giants go down the drain without an effort to save them.

In the first big effort, a year ago, the Administration sought legislation permitting guarantees of up to 750 million dollars in loans to hard-pressed railroads, including 200 million for Penn Central, Congress balked, however, and the Defense Department refused to back up a 200-million-dollar loan to Penn Central under the Defense Production Act. The railroad sought reorganization in the courts under the bankruptcy law.

After six months of congressional debate, President Nixon on January 8 signed the Emergency Rail Services Act, allowing up to 125 million dollars in Government-supported loans for Penn Central.

PROTECTION FOR LENDERS

The Act provides, among other things, that new lenders to the railroad, with their Government guarantees, get first call on any profits, plus the highest lien on the railroad's property should the firm fold. Old lenders, believing they are left out in the cold, now threaten to sue and challenge the Act.

Congressmen will try to avoid that lien pitfall as they work on legislation for Lockheed.

Lockheed's major creditor already is the U.S. Government. As the largest defense-contracting firm, Lockheed staggered under massive cutbacks in arms orders.

The company's troubles were compounded by cost overruns on projects for which it did get contracts.

The heaviest blow came last February when the British firm of Rolls-Royce, Ltd., producing engines for Lockheed's L–1011 TriStar commercial airliner, collapsed into receivership.

HELP FROM THE GOVERNMENT

On May 13, the Nixon Administration sent to Congress a bill to allow the Government to underwrite 250 million dollars in loans to troubled Lockheed.

Meanwhile the Defense Department had set June 7 as the start-up date for a "fixed loss" contract with Lockheed for continued production of the C-5A military transport. Thereafter, costs for the plane would be reimbursed as they are incurred until the last of the 81 planes ordered is received. The estimated total cost would be 3.2 billion dollars, leaving Lockheed still owing the Government 100 million.

The British Government also had acted. On May 10, the British said they were putting up 240 million dollars to finance completion of Rolls-Royce's RB–211 jet engine for the Lockheed jetliner. But the project is being aided "in expectation of a satisfactory agreement" for Lockheed by the U.S. Government.

The wording of the White House legislation for Lockheed aid would permit similar Government backing for other big aerospace firms suffering from the cutbacks in weapons-space plans, if Congress approves loan-guarantee authority for more than the 250 millions that Lockheed seeks.

Other bills in Congress would extend the concept of "rescue loans" still further.

Senator Jacob K. Javits (Rep.), of New York, wants guarantee authority of up to 5 billion dollars to help corporations facing liquidity pinches.

The Javits bill would allow the Government to underwrite IOU's to businesses whose failures "would result in an unacceptable curtailment of service vital to the national interest." The guarantee would run for a year and then the Secretary of the Treasury would have to make recommendations on establishing a permanent Emergency Loan Guarantee Corporation.

Another proposal calls for creation of a National Development Bank. The authors are the heads of the banking and currency committees—Representative Wright Patman (Dem.), of Texas, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and Senator John Sparkman (Dem.), of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee.

BILLION FOR LOANS

The U.S. Treasury would put up 1 billion dollars to capitalize the bank. It could incur debts up to 20 billion. Loans would go primarily for financing public works and low and moderate income housing projects, but some businesses also could get aid.

Interest rates to borrowers would not exceed 6 per cent or the Federal Reserve discount rate, whichever is lower.

The bank also could guarantee loans, at certain interest rates.

The authors maintain that the National Development Bank would not compete with private banks. Their claim: "Borrowers will be required to demonstrate that they could not obtain loans from private lending sources on reasonable terms before they would be eligible for assistance from this new financial institution."

Since the bill restricts the development bank's activity to locating and improving small and medium-sized businesses and industries in depressed areas, it apparently would have to be broadened to accommodate a company such as Lockheed. The bank is patterned closely after the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The RFC was approved Jan. 22, 1932, during the Republican Administration of Herbert Hoover.

In its lifetime of 25½ years, the RFC disbursed more than 40 billion dollars in direct loans and backed up billions of additional dollars in underwritten loans and investments made by private financial institutions.

Among the firms that came to the RFC for help was Lockheed, which in 1934 borrowed $200,000.

In 1953, under the Eisenhower Administration, the RFC Liquidation Act passed. Part of this law started the Small Business Administration, still in operation. On June 30, 1957, the RFC finally died.

The idea of Government-guaranteed loans as a financing tool, however, has flourished massively. The chart on page 41 shows how the total of such loan guarantees, plus direct federal loans, has about doubled in the past 10 years.

Another proposal to restore an RFC-type of corporation comes from Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns. He would limit federal loans to companies whose break-up would cause serious economic damage.

As of mid-May the various RFC-type plans were not expected to make much progress in Congress unless economic conditions took a turn for the worse. Highly placed officials said they saw no other "Penn Centrals or Lockheeds" on the horizon.

Even the Lockheed rescue legislation probably will not reach a decision in Congress until July, at the earliest. Votes in both houses are expected to be close. Senator Richard S. Schweiker (Rep.), of Pennsylvania, spoke for many when he refused to approve of taxpayers' backing "to bail out Lockheed for their own mismanagement."

Some Democratic Senators who opposed the SST, however, indicate they generally favor the Lockheed aid. Among them: Minnesota's Hubert H. Humphrey, California's John V. Tunney and Alan Cranston, Georgia's David H. Gambrell and Maine's Edmund S. Muskie.

Meanwhile, most leading businessmen attending the Business Council in Hot Springs, Va., denounced the Lockheed plan as a further incursion of Government into the free-enterprise system. Top executives of airplane-manufacturing firms reportedly also oppose aid to Lockheed.

General Electric chairman Fred J. Borch contended aid should be given Lockheed only if the air-bus engines are made in U.S. instead of Britain.

These and other objections insure a hot fight over the issue of aid for Lockheed or any other firm in trouble.

The biggest railroad and the biggest defense firm, however, have turned out to be emergency cases in less than a year's time. As the Vietnam war effort winds down, Congress may decide a return to the RFC approach, under some other name, would be timely insurance against future breakups.

CONNALLY: "WE GUARANTEE A LOT OF THINGS"

At a May 6 news conference, Treasury Secretary John B. Connally stressed these points—

"We should point out that there is presently invested by different parties in this country approximately $1.4 billion in the L–1011 [Lockheed air bus] program; $400 million of that by various banks throughout the country; about $350 million of that by Lockheed suppliers; a lot of it, obviously, by the shareholders of Lockheed itself . . . $240 million . . . has been advanced in progress payments by the airlines themselves [for air buses to be delivered later]."

"Lockheed . . . is the nation's largest defense contractor. It has, over all in its corporation work, 35,000 subcontracting companies. . . . 25,000 of them fall in the category of small businesses with less than 500 employes each. The impact on this economy in the event of the bankruptcy of Lockheed would be enormous in my judgment."

Asked if aid to Lockheed would set a precedent, or if the Government had done this before, Mr. Connally answered:

"Sure the Government has done it before . . . They did it in the days of RFC; in defense contracts now; in 1967, a $75 million V loan was made available to Douglas Aircraft prior to its merger with McDonnell. We do it through export-import loans, through the FDIC, we guarantee bank deposits and savings and loan deposits. We are now guaranteeing investment in the market. We guarantee a lot of things."

TRENDS IN FINANCE

Tax bite

On May 10, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States calculates, the average taxpayer started working for himself. During the first 129 days of 1971 all his earnings were equal to his yearly federal, State and local taxes.

Funds' favorites

Stocks most widely bought by investment funds in first quarter, 1971, were chemicals, foods and beverages, rails and rail equipment, autos, finance and airlines. Most widely sold: construction, drugs and cosmetics, merchandising, oil and gas, and banking stocks, according to a tabulation of 79 funds by Vickers Associates, Inc.

Dividends

Only 22 corporations cut or omitted their cash payments in March, the smallest number in any month since January, 1970. However, Standard & Poor's Corporation reports, the number of favorable actions—dividend hikes, extras and resumptions of cash payments—still lags behind last year.

Private pensions

Assets of private pension funds other than those administered by insurance companies rose by 5.3 billion dollars in 1970 to a new high of 95.8 billion, reported Commerce Clearing House of Chicago. Fund administrators increased holdings in corporation bonds by 1.6 billion dollars, biggest increase in that category since 1966.

Revenue sharing

Representative Wilbur D. Mills (Dem.), of Arkansas, has set June 2 as the date to start hearings on the Administration's revenue-sharing plan, which he predicts will die in his Ways and Means Committee. Representative John W. Byrnes (Rep.), of Wisconsin, proposed an alternate plan allowing people to deduct at least part of their State and local taxes from federal income taxes.

Credit

Outstanding consumer credit at finance companies declined for the third straight month in March to 30.3 billion dollars. A 2-million-dollar rise in auto debts was offset by a decline in other consumer goods and personal loans. At the same time, business credit outstanding rose 442 million.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL L. PATRICK GRAY III, ADDRESSES JUNIOR OFFICER'S COUNCIL, ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Armed Forces Day, May 15, my good friend the Honorable L. Patrick Gray III, Assistant Attorney General, civil division, Department of Justice delivered an address to the Junior Officer's Council at Andrews AFB, Md. It was most timely as it dealt with the recent demonstrations in Washington. I commend it to the Members of this body.

REMARKS BY L. PATRICK GRAY, III

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am pleased to be with you tonight on Armed Forces Day. In the proclamation establishing the third Saturday in May as Armed Forces Day, the President listed as one reason for such recognition that—

The Armed Forces of the United States serve as a unified team, at home and at outposts throughout the world, insuring our own security and the security of our friends abroad, and fostering the settlement of international differences by peaceful processes.

Today, we hear loud cries against the morality of the efforts made by the United States to ensure our own security and that of our friends abroad. Increasingly these attacks have taken the form of mass demonstrations. Some have been peaceful and relatively non-disruptive, designed to communicate in a visible but non-offensive way, the feeling of the demonstrators that the war in Southeast Asia should be ended.

Others, as we have seen so recently in Washington, have been planned to disrupt the ordinary functioning not only of the Federal Government, but also of all other normal business in the city, and have also been aimed at coercing people into accepting the views of the demonstrators. The disruptive approach cannot be tolerated if this country is to survive as a free society.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees freedom of speech and the right of the people to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances. These guarantees were added to ensure, as well as words on paper can ever ensure, that the free society the framers envisioned, and which had been won at great cost, would survive.

But the rights guaranteed explicitly in the Constitution are not the only rights which must be recognized and protected if a free society is to survive. Other rights were not enumerated in part because it would be impossible to enumerate all such rights, and in part because it was unnecessary since there was widespread agreement that these rights existed as an inherent part of a free society and there was widespread respect for these rights.

What rights am I talking about? The right to travel freely about the city or the country on your daily business, the right to come and go without unnecessary constraints in places where you have lawful business, the right to work without undue interference, generally these rights could be described as the right to go about your daily life without unwarranted constraints.

In the recent demonstrations in Washington, the protesters have claimed the right to exercise their First Amendment rights of assembly and speech in derogation of the rights of others to move freely through the streets, and to go about their lawful business on the sidewalks and in the buildings of our Nation's capital. This clearly is intolerable.

The rights of a minority, even to so fundamental a right as the freedom of speech, a right which has often been accorded a preferred position in our legal and political systems, cannot be exercised in such a way as to deny to the great majority of people their right to go about their business without indue impediment.

I believe in our Nation and the principles upon which it was founded. I believe that the rights of all people can be accommodated within our system of constitutionally guaranteed rights and liberties. This country has not been perfect; there have been many instances in which individuals or groups of people have been denied rights. But one of the things which has made this country great has been our ability to admit mistakes and to do our best to rectify them. I have faith in our people, young and old, regardless of race, creed or color to continue to do that in the future.

But to do that we must be in agreement on the fundamentals of our society, for a free society can endure only so long as there is agreement that the society must protect freedom for all. A society in which some people exercise unrestricted freedom which results in the curtailment of liberty for others is not a free society as we know it. As Daniel Webster put it, "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint."

What we have seen in the recent demonstrations is a breakdown of the self-restraint that has made our concept of liberty a workable system; we have seen a turning away from the agreement we have had on the meaning of freedom. The demonstrators were insisting that there should be freedom for those who wish to block doorways and streets to make their views known, but not for those who wish to use those streets and doorways to go about their lawful business. The kind of freedom they were asserting is license, not the ordered liberty America stands for.

For almost two centuries, we have enjoyed freedoms not enjoyed by any other people of the world. The ultimate shield protecting the liberty of the American people and preserving our precious rights as a free people as embodied in the Constitution and laws of the United States are the dedicated men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States, for in the last test our freedom shall endure only so long as we have the power and the will to safeguard ourselves from attacks upon our Nation which may be launched by those who seem determined to quench the fires of freedom everywhere in the world.

The single most important responsibility of our Armed Forces lies in the international arena; to provide a bulwark between the United States and unfriendly foreign powers so that our liberty may not be lost through aggression from abroad. A complementary responsibility is to help protect our friends abroad from aggression, for the free world can ill afford to give any ground to the forces of oppression.

At home, too, our liberty ultimately depends on our resolve to protect it. Neither the Executive, Legislative, nor Judicial branches of our federal system alone can protect and preserve the way of life en-

joyed by the free people of the United States against the ultimate challenge to that way of life. An Executive Order, a Legislative Enactment, a Judicial Decision cannot repel those determined to destroy the federal system under which the American people have lived so long in freedom. Those official documents have meaning only so long as they are obeyed.

In the first instance, we, the people, depend upon the consent of those subject to such orders, enactments, or decisions to obey them. However, obedience to law is becoming more and more an unknown or disregarded concept in certain segments of our society. Our reliance then must be upon the law enforcement agencies to enforce compliance. But when faced with thousands of people who deliberately choose to disobey the law, and act in a concerted manner to disrupt the normal functioning of our society, our law enforcement agencies simply do not have sufficient strength to handle the situation and we have in the past been compelled to rely upon the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain domestic order. This has been done, of course, only as a last resort.

Today, the United States is imperiled to a degree not witnessed before by any of us living today. The public debates of the 1850's present perhaps the closest analogy to the situation confronting us today in terms of the passions aroused in the nation. The basic issue is the same now as it was then: the preservation of the Republic. The protagonists have changed, but the recourse to violence has not. Then the lines were drawn between slavers and abolitionists, between free staters and federalists.

Now the lines are drawn between those who would destroy under the banners of license and those who would preserve under the banners of freedom. In our present crisis, we have seen bombings and the resultant loss of life, streets and entrances to buildings blocked, and takeovers of offices of officials of government, and of educational institutions, all in the name of freedom and peace.

Freedom and license are not synonomous, although many acts are committed in the name of freedom which really belong in the area of license. A remark by President Lincoln in 1864 seems as pertinent now as then: "The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one."

Listening to the rhetoric of the New Left revolutionaries we are told that they are fighting for peace and liberty. Yet their actions often provoke violent confrontations and serve to deny liberty to all those who do not agree with them. Those who are fighting to preserve our system of free democratic government perhaps do not use the words freedom and liberty as loudly or as often as do their opponents, but their actions are designed to secure the widest freedom possible.

A remark made by Edmund Burke long ago is worth recalling; he said,

"Because half-a-dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chink, whilst thousands of great cattle repose beneath the shadows of the oak, chew the cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make noise are the only inhabitants of the field; or that, after all, they are other than the little shriveled, meager, hopping, though loud and troublesome, insects of the hour."

Liberty is not an absolute thing. Were everyone to insist upon the absolute freedom to do exactly as he wished, only those with the power to back up their wishes would be free, for inevitably that which one man wishes to do will come into conflict with that which someone else wishes to do. For freedom to exist for everyone there must be a general agreement about the extent of individual liberty. Today, the agreement which has existed heretofore in our Nation is being challenged by various groups.

The challenge to our agreement on liberty has not come in the form of reasoned discourse as was envisioned by the framers of the Constitution. New tactics have been adopted, approaching the tactics of guerrilla warfare.

The liberties the founders of this country fought so hard to obtain are too precious to allow them to be lost in this time of turmoil. The challenge will be met. I know that the people of our Nation have the courage and dedication to face this challenge and the resolve to continue to develop and enhance the greatest form of government ever devised by the minds of men.

IMPROVEMENT IN SCHOLASTIC PERFORMANCE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, since President Nixon's education message to Congress in April 1970, he has continually attacked the various special education programs in existence and has charged that they have not measurably helped to improve the education needs of deprived children in this country.

He further stated that:

It may be necessary to wait many years before the full impact of such programs on the lives of poor youngsters can be ascertained.

Instead of properly evaluating these programs, the Nixon administration has chosen simply to abandon them in favor of his proposal on revenue sharing for education.

However, contrary to Mr. Nixon's beliefs, it has not taken "many years" for the effects of these programs to be noticed. Willlam Grant, the education writer for the Detroit Free Press, recently wrote an article in which he analyzed the success of the special reading and mathematics programs in 20 Detroit schools. I believe that this article is an important contribution to the current discussions on the future of these programs and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 18, 1971]

PUPIL'S MARKS UP IN TEST PROJECT

(By William Grant)

Children in 20 elementary schools in Detroit's Model Neighborhood area have shown sharp improvement in their scholastic performance over the last 18 months, thanks to a special federal funded program.

The average test scores for 13,000 students in the Model Neighborhood schools still fall below the national average, but they now are achieving at considerably higher levels than they were before a special program of reading and math instruction was begun 18 months ago.

The average second grade student in the program, for example, was increasing his ability to read about one-half month for each month of school before the program began. Now he is increasing his ability about three-quarters of a month worth each month.

Gains in spelling are even more dramatic; and although the students are still struggling with arithmetic, on the average they're doing better than they were without the extra help.

"This demonstrates that when the money is there we can show results," Patrick A. McDonald, president of the Detroit Board of Education, said Monday when the results were made public.

The demonstration that special education programs for students from poverty backgrounds can produce even a slight increase in achievement comes at an important point in the national debate over the value of such programs.

Only last year, in his education message, President Nixon argued that five years of special education programs for the poor had shown no results.

The special program in the 20 Detroit schools got under way in November, 1969, when the Citizens' Governing Board, Detroit's Model Neighborhood citizen participation group, authorized the school system to buy a special reading and math program developed by Behavioral Research Laboratories for use in inner city schools.

Detroit's Model Neighborhood area, part of the Federal Model Cities program, is roughly bounded by Jefferson on the south, Hamtramck on the north, Grand River on the west and Mt. Elliott on the east.

The 20 elementary schools in the area are Balch, Bunche, Burton, Campau, Campbell, Chrysler, Couzens, Duffield, Edmonson, Ferry, Ferry Annex, Foster, George, Hancock Primary, Harris, Lincoln, Norvell, Parke, Parke Annex and Williams.

In the past year, the Citizens Governing Board has spent $3.9 million of the $20.5 million in federal Model Cities money available to Detroit on the education program.

In addition to special instructional materials aimed at ghetto children, the program hired 92 additional teachers and 111 teacher aides to reduce classes to 22 students each. Teachers were given special training and were supervised by 13 curriculum experts.

The evaluation of student achievement is a result of comparison of scores on tests given in November, 1969, before the program started, and again in May, 1970, after the program was nearly seven months old.

The results showed that second, third, fourth and sixth grade students who had been in the special classes gained about 5.1 months in reading achievement in the 6.7 months the program had been under way.

Student achievement gains in spelling were even more marked. Second graders gained an average 7.3 months in spelling achievement in the 6.7 months of the program, and third graders gained an average 7.9 months.

Students did less well in math than in other subjects. The average achievement for second graders in arithmetic during the 6.7 months of the program was only 4.7 months, and for fourth graders 4.0 months.

The evaluation of the first seven months of the program was completed in January and has been circulated among school and Model Cities officials.

It was made public Monday as part of the school board's effort to get the program renewed for the coming school year.

The Citizens Governing Board has recommended that the school system be given only $815,000 next year, even though school officials say they need $2.9 million to continue the program at its present level.

"This program does not have to go on with Model Cities money," Manatee Smith, executive director of the Citizens Governing Board, said Monday. "If the school board wants it continued it can find some money from other sources."

The Model Neighborhood program will again get $20.5 million from the federal government next year, but has decided to put money into health care and other programs and less into education.

NATO TROOP CUT LONG OVERDUE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disappointed that the recent effort to cut back the number of U.S. troops in Europe failed to win approval in the other body. I believe, however, that the significant number of votes in favor of such a reduction in troop strength—more than one-third of the Senate supporting the proposed cutback—serves notice on the administration of the strong sentiment in favor of turning over to our European allies greater responsibility for their own defense.

Maintaining 300,000 troops in Europe a quarter century after the end of World War II is not an easy proposition to explain or defend. In my view, this policy is indefensible. But the hysteria following the proposal to reduce our forces there illustrates again how difficult it is to change a policy that has achieved institutional status, even when the raison d'etre upon which the policy is predicated may long since have ceased to exist.

The barrage of dire warnings unleashed by the White House and others concerning reduction of our military presence in Europe is unconvincing. Their hypothetical assumptions of disastrous consequences following such a reduction have no validity, in my opinion.

They argue that withdrawal of some of our forces would demoralize the Europeans, make them question the U.S. commitment to their defense and perhaps lead the Germans toward appeasement of the Soviet Union. Further, it is suggested that any significant reduction of our troop strength would leave Europe vulnerable to inevitable Soviet efforts to dominate the continent, that in any event, because of our NATO commitments we cannot make such a move unilaterally and that such a move would sabotage any effort to follow up on Soviet party chief Brezhnev's suggestion that a reduction of forces in Europe might be negotiated by the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries.

Quite frankly, I find the timing argument specious. For those who oppose the cutback now, there will never be a propitious time. In my opinion, it is high time now that we take this step, and, in fact, I would not be opposed to reducing our troop strength by more than half—leaving only a token force there. It is ridiculous to have 300,000 military men—including 128 generals—200,000 dependents in Europe, contributing $1.8 billion annually to the U.S. deficit in international payments. And it is significant that the chief underlying cause of the recent international monetary turmoil was the long-continued deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

Have we not heard time and again that a cornerstone of the Nixon doctrine is to encourage other nations to take responsibility themselves, relying less on a unilateral assumption of responsibility on our part? The United States has for too long borne a disproportionate share of the NATO burden, as we have in our many other international commitments. How long can the American Government tolerate the disparity between the share of its resources being committed to defense and the far smaller allocations by wealthy nations, such as West Germany and Japan?

And if a strong U.S. military presence is deemed essential to Europe's security, why does not the same thinking apply for Africa and South America, for example, both of which are far less stable militarily, politically, and economically?

The argument that we cannot reduce our troop strength unilaterally also does not hold water. Other NATO member countries unilaterally have either withdrawn completely or sharply cut back their forces in Europe. They did not consult with the United States despite the fact that we are carrying the lion's share of the burden.

I also see no merit in the suggestion that significant withdrawal of our forces would demoralize the Europeans. I have not seen much manifestation of gratitude from our European allies for all that we have done for them, and I believe retaining only a token force would serve the same purpose as the four American divisions plus support troops now in Europe.

On January 5, 1951, that most distinguished Ohioan and American, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, argued forcefully that American defense efforts ought to be matched by West Europeans. Two decades ago he predicted the inflation we are experiencing and the demoralization of troops with very little to do. The wisdom of his remarks at that time seems particularly relevant now. He said:

> It seems to me that our battle against communism is in fact a world-wide battle and must be fought on the world stage. What I object to is undertaking to fight that battle primarily on the vast land areas of the continent of Europe or the continent of Asia where we are at the greatest disadvantage in a war with Russia. . . . We must not assume obligations by treaty or otherwise which require any extensive use of American land forces.

I agree with these prophetic remarks and apparently the majority of residents of the 17th District of Ohio also question the wisdom of maintaining a huge military force in Europe. In the recent opinion poll I conducted, nearly 60 percent of those responding favored "sharply reducing the number of our military personnel stationed in Europe."

The American military presence in Europe is too large and the allied contribution too small. No justification remains for not making substantial troop cuts now.

LETTER FROM BISHOP JAMES ARMSTRONG

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following letter, received by me from Methodist Bishop James Armstrong.

MAY 5, 1971.

Congressman ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANDY: This is just a word to strongly protest the shabby treatment accorded Don Luce who has been ordered out of South Vietnam by mid-May. No American citizen has identified more closely or significantly with the plight of the *people* of South Vietnam than has Mr. Luce. His record has been sterling for more than a dozen years. It is tragic that we continue to support a government that once identified with the French and now with another alien power while penalizing those who have manifested genuine compassion and sacrificial love for a brutalized people.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES ARMSTRONG,
Bishop, The United Methodist Church,
Aberdeen, S. Dak.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES J. BONAPARTE, FOUNDER OF THE FBI

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the contributions Americans of Italian descent have made to the cause of law enforcement in America are recorded in the history of our country dating as far back as the early period of its birth.

One significant episode of history that vividly testifies to the role played by Italian Americans in law and order will be commemorated in a ceremony to be held tomorrow afternoon which is to be presided over by Mr. John LaCorte, national director of the Italian Historical Society.

The ceremony will take place in the vestibule of the entrance to the Federal Bureau of Investigation offices in the Department of Justice Building on Constitution Avenue. It will pay tribute to the memory of Charles J. Bonaparte, who, as Attorney General in the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, formed the original investigative unit that gradually grew in size and responsibility and became our present Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Charles J. Bonaparte was born in Maryland in 1851 and traced his lineage to Italy. As Attorney General, his concern for decency and order and his incisive foresight caused him to establish an investigative unit within the Department of Justice whose purpose was to cope with the increasing turmoil and crime then plaguing the country.

Ever since its founding, the unit and its men, among whom served many outstanding agents and administrators of Italian background, have compiled an outstanding record that is indelibly etched in the annals of law enforcement and justice.

In 1961, in recognition of Charles J. Bonaparte's contribution to this country's internal security, John N. LaCorte presented a monument to the Government which was placed in the main entranceway to the Federal Bureau of Investigation headquarters. Tomorrow, Mr. LaCorte, together with other dignitaries from the Department of Justice and

this body, will lay a wreath at the monument in memory of Charles J. Bonaparte and the many other Americans of Italian descent who so valiantly served with the world's best national law enforcement agency.

I join Mr. LaCorte in this salute to the founder of the FBI and I hope that the men serving in the Bureau today look to its history for both inspiration and a prospective that will do honor not only to Charles Bonaparte, but to the very principle upon which America was built—that men of all nationalities join together "to form a more perfect Union."

THE REFUGEE SITUATION IN LAOS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, recent reports from one of our colleagues concerning the refugee situation in Laos were highly disturbing. The general impression one got from the media reporting of his statements on the refugee situation in Laos was that allied bombing operations were responsible for the dislocation of substantial numbers of Laotians and was, in fact, the principle cause of the refugee problem existing in Laos.

It seemed strange to me that this should be the case in Laos when the major cause of refugees in South Vietnam was Communist terrorism. When it was brought to my attention that our colleague had seen three USIS reports concerning the generation of refugees in Laos I asked the U.S. Information Agency if they would be good enough to supply me with copies of the reports which had been made available to my colleague so that I could make my own assessment.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the material which the USIA sent in response to my inquiry. The three surveys on the refugee problem in Laos are highly interesting and recommended reading for all those who wish to truly understand the refugee situation in that nation.

The material follows:

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1971.

Hon. JOHN G. SCHMITZ,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SCHMITZ: In response to your letter of April 27 to Mr. Shakespeare, I have enclosed exact copies of the Laotian refugee survey reports given to Congressman McCloskey in Vientiane. You may be interested to know that copies have also been given to the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and will presumably form a part of the record of the recent Subcommittee hearings.

The surveys in question were conducted by USIS in Laos at the request of the Ambassador and were intended for the internal use of the Embassy. In evaluating the results, it may help you to know that this was a purely informal inquiry into refugee attitudes and opinions. Since the USIS officers involved are not professional researchers, it was not possible to use scientific sampling techniques in selecting the interviewees.

If I may be of further assistance in this matter, I hope you will not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

CHARLES D. ABLARD,
General Counsel and Congressional Liaison.

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE USIS LAOS REFUGEE ATTITUDE SURVEY

The Laos refugee survey produced two separate reports, one on interviews conducted in the Vientiane Plain area (Attachment No. 2) and the other on interviews with refugees in camps in the Ban Xon area (Attachment No. 3). The summary prepared for the Kennedy Sub-Committee (Attachment No. 1) covers only the Ban Xon interviews, but mentions the Vientiane Plain interviews in the introduction.

It is the summary (Attachment No. 1) that was inadvertently released to Congressman McCloskey in Washington. However, he had access to all three documents while he was in Vientiane.

SURVEY OF REFUGEES FROM THE PLAIN OF JARS—SUMMARY—NO. 1

In late June and early July of 1970, USIS/Vientiane American and local staff under the guidance of the Embassy Political Section conducted interviews with about 215 refugees from the Plain of Jars area of Laos on the conditions of life in the wartime Pathet Lao zone and their reasons for leaving it. (The results of an earlier survey on Plain of Jars refugees (March 1970) and a July survey of non-Plain of Jars refugees are not included in the material presented below. Both were less complete, detailed and conclusive than the survey whose results are presented; their only substantial difference was their indication of higher levels of antipathy to the Pathet Lao.) The refugees were then living in twenty settlements in the Vientiane valley. Physical obstacles such as bad weather and bad roads limited the scope of the interviewer's findings. Elaborate statistical sampling methods were not applied to the selection of interviewees, who nonetheless seem fairly typically distributed and generally representative of the population of their area in age, sex, education, occupation, and villages of origin. By comparison to the general group of refugees, these people had lived with the Pathet Lao longer than the average time. In comparison to the general population of the Pathet Lao zone, ethnic Lao, as opposed to hill peoples, predominate untypically in the Plain of Jars population.

RESPONDENT'S BACKGROUND

The great majority of the respondents left their homes in 1969, and more than 80% said they had moved one or more times before their move from the Plain of Jars to Vientiane province. Seventy-seven percent said their children were with them; 20% said their children were with the Pathet Lao. Many had had children in Pathet Lao schools; the parents appreciated the schools when they were local (three quarters of the cases), but disliked it if the children were required to leave home for schooling.

REACTION TO LIFE WITH THE PATHET LAO

"Unity" (cooperative farming and communal arrangements for looking after children) (21%) and "morality" (17%) were *positive* aspects of the refugees' experience with the Pathet Lao; forced porterage (40%) (which 65% of the respondents had performed) and taxation (35%) were the *negative* aspects most frequently mentioned.

BOMBING

Ninety-seven percent of the people said that they had seen a bombing attack. About one third had seen bombing as early as 1964, and a great majority had seen attacks frequently or many times.

The Pathet Lao, 75% of the refugees responded, had taught them to dig bunkers to avoid bombing attacks. When bombs dropped, all the villagers reported taking refuge either in a bunker inside the village (28%), in a bunker outside the village (41%), or in the woods (31%). Somewhat fewer than two-thirds of those who answered this question had seen someone killed. Usually a small number of deaths had been observed; 32% had seen only one person killed by a bomb. This applied to troops as well. Only 18% of the respondents had actually seen Lao/Viet troops killed by bombing, and 25% had heard rumors of such deaths. Isolated atypical answers to these questions were also received; one man said he had seen 112 persons killed, other individuals spoke of strikes that had killed 80, 20, 30 and 20 Pathet Lao troops respectively.

Seventy-five percent said their homes had been damaged by bombing. Most of these attacks took place in 1969. 99% of the people said bombing made life difficult for them; two-thirds holding that it made earning more than a bare subsistence living impossible in its intense periods. 88% said they had built a shelter in the woods. 71% of those questioned said that United States aircraft did the bombing; 17% said it was the RLG. But 74% of the people said they understood that the air attacks were caused basically by the Pathet Lao's waging war. 23% said bombing was directed at the people as well as the Pathet Lao. 13% said that it was aimed at the people only. 6% said the Pathet Lao had stored ammunition in their villages, while 11% had heard of this practice in other villages. Respondents divided evently, in saying that Pathet Lao troops were present or not present in the area of bombing. The refugees knew aircraft names (F–104, Skyraiders, T–28, F–4) and were remarkably articulate about types of aircraft.

REASONS FOR MOVING TO THE RLG ZONE

Forty-nine percent of the 226 who were asked the question said that fear of bombing was the reason they had sought refuge by moving away from home; 29% gave dislike of the Pathet Lao as the reason for leaving their home areas, while 15% said the arrival of the RLG, and its allowing or encouraging them to move was the primary factor in deciding to leave. 57% said they would return to their villages if bombing stopped, but this seemed associated in their minds with a complete end to the war and the disappearance of the Pathet Lao. 96% said they would not return if the Pathet Lao were still in control of their homes.

CONCLUSIONS

The USIS officer who directed the interview concluded that it was the combination of three fatcors; the bombing, the porterage, and the lack of restrictions imposed on those living with the RLG, which determined the refugees' decisions to move from the Pathet Lao Zone to the Government area of Laos.

The attached report was prepared by Pradit Srisuryochandra, based on the survey he and Lt. Bansa Chounlamense (FAR Psywar) made of refugees in nine resettlement areas on the Vientiane Plain: Ban Vounkhon, Dan Veunkham, Ban Thang Mang, Ben Thinh, Ben Vieng Kham, Ban Hat Deua, Bam Na Nga, Ban Nonsa and Ban Ylai.

As Pradit correctly points out, the validity of the responses he got was affected by the short amount of time he had to spend with the interviewees. An apparent example of this is shown by the discrepancy between the fact that the respondents said approximately 20% of all the children in their villages were with the Lao-Viets but later, when asked if they know anyone serving in the Lao-Viet Army replied negatively. In addition to their reluctance to admit knowing

anyone in the enemy forces, they were also evidently told that their children were being taken away to school, not the army. It would surely be easier to accommodate one's thoughts to a child being taken away from home to attend school than it would be to think of him being led away to fight.

Although not mentioned in his report Pradit found that the refugees were relatively content with the amount of rice they are receiving. They also seemed satisfied with the basic supplies (blankets, cooking utensiles, etc.) they have received. Some complained about a lack of medical treatment, saying that the mobile medical teams which have visited them have not brought adequate amounts of medicine with them. Pradit partially attributes this to the same feeling I have found with regard to villagers and medicine, when one person sees another receiving medicine they too want some. And the desire to have it is often not matched by a corresponding need. While this may not be true in all cases, it surely is a factor which must be taken into consideration when quissing villagers about the medical care they are receiving.

The refugees' fear of bombing points out the need for more information about it (why it is necessary, etc.) The film on the PLAF will partially fill the bill, but not completely. If we decide to go ahead with the booklet for village-level communicators, this is a question which might will be addressed.

Pradit feels there is no real understanding among the refugees of what the RLG plans to do with them. This, of course, is a patrial reflection of the general uncertainty facing the entire Kingdom in the future. Nevertheless, it is a point which might well be discussed with Bounthanaly and Noumphaeng.

In his initial effort at conducting a survey of this sort, I feel that Pradit did an excellent job. With more experience (and more time to gather the data), Pradit should be able to gain insights, based on conditions in the field, which will be of value throughout the mission.

A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDE OF THE REFUGEES RECENTLY ARRIVED FROM THE PLAIN OF JARS

Thirty refugees, 10 women and 20 men, from various refugee resettlements were picked out for the interview. The statistics shown in the report may not be hundred percent accurate for time and circumstances did not permit the investigators to get as much information as they wanted to. The time spent for each refugee interviewed was short and it usually took some time in other conversations before we could come to the point where we could start working on the questionaires. In order to get a thorough information and good statistics we must spend at least a week in each refugee center so that we would be able to gain some confidence from the refugees. The interaction between the respondents and the investigators usually took place amidst a crowd of refugees who not only liked to watch but also liked to help the interviewed in answering the questions. But it does not mean that this report is totally useless. It may help the authorities who are interested in the refugee program to have some knowledge of what the majority of the refugees feel and think and what was their background before they came to Vientiane plain. The results of the interview are as follows:

Age: The interview was conducted with the adults only. Though questions were simple the children could hardly give any information. The ages of the respondents were between 25–58 and eighty percent of the respondents were over 30 years old.

Sex: Of all the respondents interviewed 20 were men and 10 were women. Men were quite anxious to give answers in a great detail but women were reluctant to elaborate the answers.

Amount of Schooling: 4 out of 20 men had formal education prior to PL occupation but the women never had any education at all. These who had some education never went beyond 3rd grade.

Number of Children: 26 out of 30 respondents had children and about 60 percent of them had more than three children.

Where are their children? 20 percent of the children are with the PL, 5 percent joined with FAR and 75 percent are with the parents.

Number of times moved since leaving home: 80 percent of the refugees moved two times, 18 percent moved three times and only 2 percent moved one time before reaching Vientiane plain.

Amount of property and holdings at original home: All respondents owned land, cattle, buffalos, chicken and houses at original home. Each of the interviewed had more than 5 cattle or buffalos.

How much do you have now?: None.

Do you think you will ever regain as much as you once had?: All respondents thought they would never regain as much as they once had without the help of the Government. If they were sent back to their original home now they believed that they would not regain all the property except for the land. The house would have been destroyed by planes and the cattle would have been killed either by the PL or the FAR soldiers.

Did you ever live under the PL? All respondents did one time live under the PL. 95 percent of them lived under the PL more than 5 years.

Did you like it?: They all did not like to live under the PL.

Why?: They said the same thing that they were afraid of planes. Life was hard and dangerous. For many years they had to live in the trenches and never was a day when they were free from the plane attacks. They had to grow rice at night and were allowed to cook meals only in the morning. Whatever they grew they had to give 15 percent to the PL as a form of taxes. Life was rigorous and had no freedom. They had to attend several meetings though they did not want to. They had to carry supplies for the PL troop when they were called for and had to walk for many days with heavy load on the back. Their children over 13 years old were taken from them to places unknown and they never heard from their children since.

Do you know anyone currently serving in the PL army?: They actually did not see the people whom they knew serving the PL army but they heard that some people from their villages were now serving the PL.

Why did they join the PL?: They did not want to join the PL but they were taken by the PL when they were young. Since the PL took the children from the villages they never heard from them again. But they were told the children were now studying in schools.

Have you ever been to Vientiane city or plain prior to moving this time?: One out of 30 used to come to Vientiane city but it was about 20 years ago. The rest never had a chance to come to this area.

Do you have any relatives or friends on the Vientiane plain?: They all said NO.

Why did you leave the Plain of Jars?: They all said the Government asked them to move. The Government told them that there would be more fighting in the Plain of Jars and it would be safer for them to move to Vientiane plain where there was peace. They were fed up with the fighting and bombs. They would like to live in a place where it was peaceful. So they listened to the Government and moved to Vientiane plain.

Did you feel any pressure to leave?: They did not feel any pressure to leave the Plain of Jars. They were now taken care of by the Government. Whatever the Government said it must be true.

Are all of your former friends with you now?: 28 out of 30 respondents said all of their former friends were with them. The other two respondents said not all of their former friends were with them, some families were still in Samtheng and Long Tiang.

What percentage of the people in your home village are in this settlement?: About 96 percent.

Who is Ho Chi Minh?: 16 out of 30 heard about him, that he was a Vietnamese leader in North Viet-Nam.

Who is Mao Tse Tung?: 13 out of 30 respondents heard about him, that he was a leader in China.

Who is Souvanna Phouma?: 18 out of 30 said he was the Government.

Who is Tiao Saykham?: 21 out of 30 said he was the Chao Khoueng

Who is your Chon Muong?: Only one out 30 respondents knew who he was.

What province are you in now?: 26 out of 30 respondents said they were in Vientiano area.

What Muong are you in now?: Only 3 out of 30 respondents knew the name of the Muong in which they live. The rest knew only the name of the village in which the resettlements were located.

Did you ever meet a FAR soldier?: They all met a FAR soldier just when and before they moved to the Plain of Jars.

What did you like best about him?: The FAR soldier was good, he helped them to be able to come out from the PL.

What did you like least about him?: None said nothing against him. But they mentioned that they saw their cattle being taken by the FAR soldiers.

When did you last meet a RIG civilian official before moving from the Plain of Jars?: They met a RIG civilian official when they arrived in the Plain of Jars.

What did they do?: They helped them to find place to stay and gave them food.

How far is it to the Plain of Jars from here?: They all said it was very far.

Do you think it is possible for you to return?: They all depended on the Government. If the Government wanted them to go back they would do so.

Do you want to return?: 8 out of 30 respondents wanted to return if there was peace at home. The rest depended on the Government' decision to decide their future.

Have you ever seen a North Vietnamese soldier?: They all saw Vietnamese soldiers at their original homes.

What did he do?: They did not do anything. They came to the village with PL soldiers.

What would you do if he came to live in this village?: They did not know what to do. It was up to the Government.

Do you have a radio?: 2 out of 30 respondents had radios.

What station did you listen to?: Long Tiang Radio station, Lao National Radio Station and Thai station.

What was the last program you listened to?: Lao and Thai modern songs. Mohlam. (While they were with the PL they were not allowed to listen to news and commentary).

What is your favourite program?: Lao and Thai modern songs and Mohlam.

Do you listen to the news on the radio?: While they are here they used to listen to the news. But under the PL they were not allowed to listen to the news and commentary.

From what source do you receive most of your information?: They received information the meetings arranged by the PL and word of mouth.

Can you read?: 6 out of 30 respondents could read but not very well.

When did you last read a newspaper or magazine?: When they were with the PL. The Chinese and Vietnamese newspapers and

magazines in Lao were available for the villagers to read.

SURVEY OF REFUGEES FROM THE PLAIN OF JARS—NO. 3

In the past week our three interviewers have talked with 97 refugees. Most of them are now living in the Ban Na Sou-Ban Xon area (site 272). The majority are from Muang Hiem in Luang Prabang Province and Muang Son, Hua Panh (Sam Neua). Some are Xieng Khouang Lao from Muang Kham (around Ban Ban) who are now living at Ban That, near Phone Hong. And a few are Meo whose original homes were southwest of Muang Sen in North Vietnam, in the tit that protrudes into Laos just off Route 7; after leaving North Vietnam they had moved to Muang Mok (site 46) and then to their current home at Ban Than Peup (TF 7693). The same factors that limited the report on the Plain of Jars refugees—lack of time, bad weather conditions, the interviewers' lack of experience—hampered this operation too. Nevertheless, it gives some notion of what the people interviewed have experienced and are thinking about. Some findings:

(1) Type of people interviewed:

The male-female ratio was 60 percent vs. 40 percent.

Seventy percent of the people interviewed had never attended school.

Seventy-three percent were ordinary villagers, not holding any position in the village hierarchy.

Eighteen percent were *Nai Bans*.

Ninety-two of the 97 were married, and 88 of the 92 had children.

Seventy-nine percent of those with offspring said their children were still with them, and of the children who had left home, 15 percent are now with the Pathet Lao and 6 percent with the RLG.

(2) The largest group, 22%, left their homes in 1967, 19% in 1969, 15% in 1966. Since leaving their homes, 41% have moved twice, 28% three times, and 13% only once.

(3) 50% of the people said they left their homes because they did not like the Pathet Lao, 28% because they feared bombing, and 22% because they wanted to be away from the war and when the government troops came they went with them.

(4) 79% said the areas in which their original homes are located were controlled by the Lao-Viet while they were there. The interviewees from Sam Neua had been with the communists since 1953, for they were caught up in the resistance movement against the French.

(5) The interviewers could get only 22 people to respond favorably about their experiences with the Pathet Lao. Of the 81 who answered the question "What did you like best about living under the Pathet Lao?", 59 (73%) said they did not like anything. The lack of favorable comment on the Lao-Viet may be attributed in part to fear of reprisal. However, the fact that the same interviewers got many favorable reactions from the PDJ refugees about their experience with the Lao-Viet suggests that the 97 people interviewed this time do have some genuine feelings of dislike for the communists. A partial explanation may be found in the terrorism employed by the Vietnamese troops when first introduced into Laos in large numbers in 1963. Another factor, of course, is that most of the people spoken with are not settled and seem reasonably happy with their new homes. (54% said the land they are now on is as good as, or better than, the land at their original homes. A few of those from Sam Neua spoke wistfully about the profits from growing opium "back home." But they conceded that the land around site 272 is better than their previous holding for highland rice.)

Of the many undesirable aspects of life under the Pathet Lao mentioned, the highest number (48 of 133 items) centered around forced porterage. Following that was taxation (33). The other 52 negative responses fell into six categories.

(6) 25% of the respondents said they first saw bombs dropped near their villages in 1964 and a higher percentage (37%) had heard of bombs being dropped on other villages in that year. 69% said they had seen bombs dropped frequently (48 out of 70). 60% said they hid in the woods during bombing attacks.

(7) 25% (24 of 97) had seen people killed by bombing, although only one had witnessed the death of over seven people. The majority of those who had seen people killed (58%) had seen two or more deaths (29% had seen two and an equal number had seen three).

(8) 69% said there were PL troops in the area being bombed, although only 18% had seen enemy troops killed by air attack. A slightly higher percentage, (24%) had heard of enemy casualties being caused by bombing.

(9) 82 people said the bombing made life very difficult for them—80% of this group saying they could not eke out more than a bare subsistence living after the attacks started. A point of some interest here is that only 7% said they feared death by bombing.

(10) 57% of the respondents said they had seen T-28s bombing and 40% mentioned having seen jets. 49 of 92 (53%) said they thought the bombing was done by Americans; 30% listed the RLG as the responsible party; and 17% said they did not know who was doing it.

(11) Although 28% of the respondents said they had left their homes due to fear of bombing, 23% said they would return home if it were stopped. But 98% of all respondents said they would not return to their homes even if the planes stopped bombing, as long as the PL were still there. Reasons given were fear of continued war, dislike of the communists, and satisfaction with their present situation.

A BILL TO CORRECT AN INJUSTICE TO SOME CITIZENS OF THE MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT IN NEW MEXICO

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to correct an injustice to some of the citizens of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District in my congressional district.

In the summer of 1966, the board of directors of this conservancy district were informed by the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of Interior, that the Bureau intended to offer for public sale certain small tracts of land which had been considered privately owned by the State of New Mexico and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District at the time of its formation in 1927. On many of these tracts private citizens have been assessed for taxes for many years and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District had, since its formation, levied assessments against their property. The records of the District, on its organization in the middle twenties, including the maps which were prepared, identified practically all of these tracts as privately owned. The private parties occupying the land also believed that they owned the land and sold and traded the same.

Because of existing legislation, the Bureau of Land Management cannot convey title directly to the people now occupying the land. But the district, as a political subdivision of the State, can acquire this property under a congressional act as a conduit for the title to the individual property owners. The bill includes the sum of $5,626,450 to pay for the administrative work involved and it would be paid by the property owners themselves. Any substantial charge would be a bitter pill for the various landowners or occupants of this land to swallow when they believed they have owned this land all these years.

Therefore, I recommend that this bill be given early consideration and that these citizens be allowed to have clear title to the land they have always believed was theirs.

THE MEN IN THE MIDDLE

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, at ceremonies observing Peace Officers' Memorial Day, held in my district at city hall in Norfolk, Va., last May 15, I was privileged to speak to the assembled members of the Norfolk police force.

Peace Officers' Memorial Day provides an opportunity for the public to reflect on contributions of and attitudes toward law enforcement personnel, and for the public's defenders to look at their past to guide a course for their future.

Law enforcement is a complex and demanding occupation, requiring a professional approach. The remarks I made may be of interest to my colleagues and those interested in the duties of a peace officer. I include the text of the speech at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

August Vollmer, former Chief of Police of Berkeley, California, once said:

"The citizen expects police officers to have the wisdom of Solomon, the courage of David, the strength of Samson, the patience of Job, the leadership of Moses, the kindness of the Good Samaritan, the strategical training of Alexander, the faith of Daniel, the diplomacy of Lincoln, the tolerance of the Carpenter of Nazareth, and finally, an intimate knowledge of every branch of the natural, biological, and social sciences. If he had all of these, he might be a good policeman."

Of course, there is no such person either within or outside of police departments. On the other hand, I contend that with the turbulent mood of the nation today, in most cases policemen are acting with extraordinary kindness, humaneness, and understanding.

I would cite the recent days of "anti-war protests" in our nation's capital, led by Chicago Seven defendant Rennie Davis.

While apprehension was felt on the part of many residents of the Capital and its suburbs concerning what might transpire between the young people and the police, a massive mobilization of officialdom handled

the potential threats skillfully and peacefully for the most part, outmaneuvering and outguessing the young protesters with a minimum of violence.

I realize that there are many problems in our society today, and I have always believed that young people can contribute in a positive way toward indicating weaknesses in the system. In fact, we need the young and enthusiastic outlook of the college student to help us acquire the proper perspective. During my 18 years as a college professor and Dean of Students at Old Dominion, I stressed to students that they had every right to petition their government and make their views known. From my experience with the students, I know that they are a thoughtful group for the most part and are capable of incisive perceptions. But I always cautioned these students that they must do their petitioning through legitimate channels to be effective.

However, those in Washington, calling themselves the Mayday Tribe, chose to disrupt traffic in hopes of shutting down the capital city of our country. They actively and indiscriminately slashed tires, ripped out wiring in cars, and carried cars into intersections, in hopes of stopping traffic.

Park benches were rolled over steep embankments to stop the flow of traffic on roads below. Trash was thrown into the streets and the trash barrels used in an attempt to obstruct cars from passing.

You simply cannot tear down a structure and hope to find something better in the ruins. These young people were misguided to think that such tactics would create any sympathy for the cause that most of them were sincerely demonstrating for, however bizarre the methods.

I am relieved that the Mayday demonstrations were handled within the law, and that enforcement officers displayed such restraint and patience, on the whole. The lessons of the Mayday demonstrations in Washington, D.C., and of the other forms of social turmoil, are evidence of the impact with which the 20th century has descended upon this nation. Now, more than ever before, the individual lawman has a great burden of responsibility upon his shoulders. The law is only as effective as the man who enforces it.

The true spirit of professional law enforcement means a great deal more than simply having a code of ethics. It also extends beyond the receipt of a degree in police science or public administration.

It involves each man's knowing that these are important tools of his trade, and then applying these principles in combination with the other vital factors of judgment and common sense with which he is equipped.

Law enforcement is as complex and demanding an occupation as any you can name, and the skills demanded by it are more varied than those demanded by practically any other job. Further, the police function frequently borders on the edge of disaster, where a wrong decision or an untrained response can be a matter of life or death.

Law enforcement today requires a professional approach to every incident, as each event adds to the overall image. I might point out, however, that few people realize the extent to which policemen literally lay their lives on the line to protect the public.

We gather together today on Peace Officers' Memorial Day, so designated by the late President Kennedy in 1962. We gather to pay tribute to those who have honorably served the law enforcement profession. Peace Officers' Memorial Day is becoming more significant every year in view of the increase in the number of police officers slain every year.

The FBI Uniform Crime Reports for 1969 reveal that 86 law enforcement officers were killed in that year by felonious criminal action. This was a 34% increase over 1968, when 64 officers were killed. During the ten-year period of the '60's, 561 city, county, and State policemen lost their lives in the line of duty. I was surprised and concerned to find that 178 officers were assaulted locally from February through December, 1970.

Certainly police officers are confronted by danger today. They are assaulted verbally and physically by the disorderly elements of our society. Therefore, I was interested in a recent survey of the cities where serious crimes declined last year, seeking the reason for such a decline. The survey showed that the reduction generally was achieved through a substantial increase in the police force, and through new social and anticrime efforts, ranging from community relations programs to sophisticated alarm systems.

However, on a national scope, these cities were so few in number and the rate of decline so marginal that, thus far, both national and local efforts against crime have had little overall effect on the crime picture.

In the 22 cities of 100,000 or more residents where the number of serious crimes reported declined last year, there had been either an increase in the number of policemen employed or a concentration of police squads in high crime areas. And in most of the cities the pay and training of policemen had been upgraded, community relations programs had been instituted to reduce antagonisms between residents and the police, and other positive steps had been taken to enhance enforcement.

A city about ⅓ the size of Norfolk, Reading, Pennsylvania, provides an example of what is involved. Police Chief Bernard J. Dobinsky cited a long list of reasons: a special police platoon patrols high crime areas from 7 PM to 3 AM; policemen are given sensitivity training and courses in psychology; and an intensified community relations program keeps the police in constant touch with neighborhood groups.

Other innovations in Reading include a telephone police watch for residents who leave their homes for a few days or weeks. A device fits on the cradle of the phone, and if there is any noise in the house it will be amplified in the Police Bureau. The device is so sensitive that, in one home, scampering mice brought police to investigate.

Because of Reading's extraordinary precautions, Chief Dobinsky said, the number of robberies last year decreased from 113 to 81, assaults from 101 to 66, burglaries from 817 to 639, auto thefts from 321 to 244, rapes from 26 to 6, and murders from 4 to 2.

The police in the United States—some 420,000 people working for approximately 40,000 separate agencies that spend more than $2½ billion a year—are only part of the criminal justice system, however, and not solely responsible for any decline or increase in the crime statistics. The entire system is composed of courts, corrections, and the police, each charged with enforcing the law and maintaining order. Because the police have the responsibility for dealing with crime minute by minute as it occurs, there is a tendency on the part of the public to think of crime control almost exclusively in terms of police work. As noted in the report of the President's Task Force Report on the police:

The fact is, of course, that even under the most favorable circumstances the ability of the police to act against crime is limited. The police did not create and cannot resolve the social conditions that stimulate crime. They did not start and cannot stop the convulsive changes that are taking place in America.

They do not enact the laws that they are required to enforce, nor do they dispose of the criminals they arrest. The police are only one part of the criminal justice system; the criminal justice system is only one part of the government; and the government is only one part of society.

It is high time that the general public gave proper respect to the job of law enforcement and the man who chooses this admirable profession. In the past few years, great strides have been made in the upgrading of law enforcement—National, State, and local programs, costing millions of dollars exist, to equip, prepare, and train law enforcement officers and to modernize police facilities. Federal money is provided by the Title I program of the Omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968, which has an appropriation of $480 million for fiscal 1971. Just under $700 million has been requested for fiscal 1972. Securing more money for the police is essential. It is the responsibility of government, of course, but ultimately it is the responsibility of the public.

I would close by citing another heartening indication that people do indeed care about the police.

An ad now appearing in newspapers and magazines shows the picture of a police squad car, a bicycle protruding from its trunk, and the copy reads, "If your 8-year-old's not home by 9 PM, who'd you call by 9:15?" This ad campaign for the police is offered as a public service by Motorola, Inc., and it represents the feeling of a majority of law-abiding Americans who depend and rely upon the police.

The policeman is the man in the middle today, in our cities, on our campuses, attempting to mediate in problems he did not create. Yours is a job requiring great skill and courage, and we are all in your debt. Thank you.

THE NEED FOR TRADE AWARENESS

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I could not help being a little surprised to learn from a recent poll that most Americans favor free trade. Unfortunately, this indicates a lack of information on what the true state of current U.S. foreign trade is. The fact of the matter is that trade is only free so far as the United States is concerned, which allows its own products to be undercut by slave-wage competition from abroad even as it is prevented from competing in markets abroad. It is cruelly ironic that the competition which is killing American industries one by one comes from countries which American skill, know-how, and good will helped to get on their economic feet in the first place. These countries, let it be said, have no trouble with the whole idea of restricting such competition from America as would threaten their own prosperity. A good example of this is to be found in the close cooperation between the Indian textile manufacturers and their government, as reported in the Indian Textile Journal of November 1970, on page 95:

AWARD FOR IMPORT SUBSTITUTION

Mr. V. Thakur of the Excelsior Trading Co., Bombay, is the recipient of a national award of Rs. 5,000 for developing two machines, one for rag tearing or pulling and the other for fibre cutting, which had hitherto been imported.

It was in 1960 that Mr. Thakur, who had come to the city in search of a job, had occasion to see the working of these imported machines in one of the woolen mills where he was employed.

Initially, Mr. Thakur, who wanted to manufacture the machines indigenously, had to content himself with the fabrication of the fibre cutting machine for want of sufficient finance. After successfully making the machine in 1964, he put up a small workshop of his own in 1965 and took up the manufacture of the rag tearing machine. After satisfying themselves about these machines, the Government banned their import in September 1966.

The company has the capacity to make 12 rag tearing and 24 fibre cutting machines. It helps the country to save foreign exchange of about Rs. 14 lakhs. Until June 1970 the company had supplied 85 fibre cutting and 26 rag tearing machines, thereby saving nearly Rs. 40 lakhs in foreign exchange.

The machine is used for opening textile wastes from woolen, worsted, cotton, silk and chemically produced fibres, including rayon acetate or synthetic nylon dacron and "Terylene". The rag tearing machine costs Rs. 19,000 against Rs. 80,000 for the imported unit while the fibre cutting machine is priced at Rs. 6,000 against over Rs. 27,000 for the imported machine.

What India can manufacture for itself, India will not import—a far cry from free trade. Thus America increasingly finds itself driven out of foreign markets even as it becomes a dumping ground for foreign products. This is an intolerable situation not confined to textiles alone, but also to be found in our steel, ceramics, plastics, electronics, citrus, and other major industries. As a consequence, America is fast becoming a wasteland of warehouses and distributing centers.

We must turn this country around before it is too late. America is the only country which allows many products to be imported without restrictions. The American people must realize that international trade is neither free nor fair as it is practiced on the United States. They are the losers in this hoax.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND MONEYS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in 1956 there was established by the Congress a large-scale Federal highway program. It was backed by the administration and the entire highway community due to the needs of the times as well as in the interest of the national defense, and the economic and social welfare of the entire United States. The Congress, in its wisdom, put the burden of financing this highway program upon the owners of automobiles, trucks, and buses, to be sure that this fund would go solely to the national highway program. There was established a firm and supposedly binding trust agreement whereby every nickel of these funds was to be placed in trust for the sole and only use of this greatly needed and important program. Some of us at the time were fearful that the money might be dissipated for other purposes but we were assured that under the terms of the trust no moneys would be dissipated in any way for any program other than the national highway program.

We all realize that in times of need, it is so easy for those who want more money to spend to look to easy sources of revenues. Now it is shocking to see the present administration advocate that this true fund in part be dissipated and put into other uses. It is shocking—almost unbelievable—and I want to here and now assert my wholehearted opposition to such a scheme and/or program and to call upon the Members of Congress to see that this recommendation of the administration is not only rejected out of hand but is also so overwhelmingly defeated that never again will such a proposal be submitted to the Congress. I pledge my all-out support in such an effort.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday morning, May 19, I had an opportunity to attend a meeting of the Virginia Motor Vehicle Conference composed of outstanding organizations throughout Virginia representing a wide variety of businesses. They are a dedicated group to good government, good highways, and good transportation. The Honorable E. H. Williams presided. Judge Williams, as he is affectionately called, made a splendid statement at the opening of the meeting outlining the concern of and the position of the Virginia Motor Vehicle Conference regarding the proposal of this administration. In addition, we read a statement setting out fully the position of the Virginia Motor Vehicle Conference regarding our highway trust fund and the highway program.

The statements are clear and concise and I include along with my remarks Judge Williams' statement and the statement of the position of the Virginia Motor Vehicle Conference and commend it highly. I hope that every Member of the House and Senate will read same. The statements are as follows:

PROPOSED STATEMENT OF POSITION, VIRGINIA MOTOR VEHICLE CONFERENCE

The Virginia Motor Vehicle Conference does not take exception to the general concept of "revenue sharing". This is a matter that should be considered by Congress on its overall merit with respect to the welfare of the entire country.

However, we do feel the "revenue sharing" proposal as it pertains to the transportation funds is not in the best interest of the general welfare of this Nation nor that of the individual States.

The interconnecting road systems in this country are now and will remain one of the most legitimate responsibilities of the federal government. Not only do they form a vital link in the system of "common defense", but they also serve as "post roads"—two clearly defined functions assigned by the Constitution to the federal government. Moreover, the ABC (primary, secondary, urban) system, as well as the Interstate, form the major arteries for interstate commerce throughout the Nation. The proposed "revenue sharing transportation fund" poses the question of whether Congress is willing to abrogate a portion of its Constitutional responsibilities.

When the Interstate System is completed, hopefully within the next few years, the level of expenditure from the Trust Fund should be substantially reduced. With the emphasis then shifting to the improvement, upgrading, and maintenance of present facilities the financial needs for highways in the future will lie with the states. Thus we recommend:

1. Upon completion of the Interstate System, the Congress should reduce the special highway user taxes which it levied to finance the construction of the Interstate system in direct proportion to the reduction in expenditures for that purpose.

2. That the states be encouraged to reassume primary responsibility for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of their highways and to utilize such portion of the reduced Federal user levies as will be determined necessary.

3. The Highway Trust Fund shall be retained and established as a permanent instrumentality for funding the federal portion of the national highway responsibility.

The remaining federal highway user taxes would provide adequate revenue for financing the decreased federal responsibilities in the area of highway transportation. It would also assure adequate coordination at the national level with respect to the federal road system.

The federal aid highway program stands not only as an exemplary demonstration of State-federal cooperation on solving a national problem but also as a highly successful experience in revenue sharing. Furthermore, the firm fiscal controls established through the Highway Trust Fund have given every American taxpayer the best bargain he ever received in the form of a federal program.

By law, the Highway Trust Fund is self-liquidating and can incur no debt. Its administrative costs are established by law not to exceed 3¾% of the funds apportioned the States. Its revenue is derived exclusively from federal use taxes on motor vehicle owners and users and thereby, affects no other federal endeavor in any adverse way. From this fund comes all federal contributions to the federal highway program. This arrangement has not only given the Nation the finest highway transportation system in the world but has saved thousands of lives and untold millions of dollars through sound financing and business like management.

The plan proposed here would not change the principal of this ideal program except to extend the present degree of "revenue sharing" and return the state-federal relationship largely to its pre-Interstate 1956 status. It would assure protection from future controls and vicissitudes of federal administrative authorities while preserving Congressional influence in highway matters of genuine national interests. All essential aspects of the present program would be retained except it would make available to the states a tax source currently preempted in part by the Federal government. This would effect the finest form of "tax sharing" yet devised.

Lastly, it retains the traditional legislative control over the financial management of tax revenue. The Administration's proposal would place the entire budget in the hands of federal administrators and the governor of each state to the exclusion of legislative influence. We do not feel this is in the best interests of the Nation since it circumvents the direct influence of the citizen in an essential function of the government.

STATEMENT OF JUDGE WILLIAMS

Gentleman, we are here today in behalf of what might be described as the entire highway community of Virginia, representing some 30 organizations—ranging from the Automobile Club to the Horticultural Society.

In a few moments I will be privileged to read to you a statement reflecting our concern and our position with, respect, to a very important matter.

This statement is couched in diplomatic language and, from the standpoint of some of us, might he considered a little bland and mild.

Therefore, before reading the statement, I would like to summarize it very briefly,

in language which is, perhaps, necessarily diplomatic, and I hope, not too bland.

Gentlemen, it boils down to this: In 1956 the Congress decided that there was a need for a large-scale federal highway program, in the interest of the national defense and the economic and social welfare of the entire United States. The Congress asked the owners of automobiles, trucks, and busses to pay every dime of the cost of that program. To assure that there would be no monkey business, they established a trust fund to assure that the highway, special taxes to be imposed would, in fact, go for that highway program. On that basis, the entire highway community in the United States went along with and supported the program. We did so with some reservations because it was feared that one day an effort would be made to breech this contract and spend the money for other purposes.

As all of you know, great pressures have developed for doing just that—and the administration, itself, has sent to Congress a proposal which would be the first major step in that direction.

The position of the highway community can be stated very briefly and very simply. If the Congress, in its wisdom, believes there is a continuing need for a large-scale highway program, now and in the future, the people who are now paying these taxes are prepared to pay them for as long as such need exists. But, if the highway program is to be curtailed, or phased out, then we believe very strongly that the special taxes should be curtailed or phased out accordingly.

The other needs for which some would divert these highway taxes are the problems of the entire nation, and not the special burden of the owners of private and commercial motor vehicles. If funds are needed to meet these other needs, then taxes should be levied that would apply not alone to highway users but right across the board.

MAJ. ED HICHEY CONTRIBUTED MUCH TO COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in perusing the pages of the Washington Post the other day, I came across this article which mentioned the great contribution which Maj. Ed Hichey has made to collegiate athletics. Major Hichey was my first appointee to the Military Academy and he has served credibly, reflecting admirably both upon the Army and upon the coaches and participants of college hockey. I ask my colleagues to read this article about a man whose activities in the world of sport have been exemplary.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1971]

HOCKEY HIGHLIGHTS

(By Bob Addie)

Like spring, it may be a little late for hockey at the moment—but not if you're following the Stanley Cup playoffs which pit the Chicago Black Hawks against the Montreal Canadiens in the best-of-seven series starting tonight in Chicago.

Chicago seems to have much to celebrate these days such as the semifinal victory by the Black Hawks and the four-game sweep of the Senators by the White Sox over the weekend. Maybe it's about time for the Windy City to be notorious for something other than Mayor Richard Dailey and the Chicago Seven.

There was one interested spectator Sunday when the New York Rangers were eliminated by Chicago. That was Dick Patrick whose dad, Muzz Patrick, is a member of the board of directors of the Rangers. Anybody who knows hockey knows of the Patrick dynasty, as blue-blooded a line as there is in thoroughbreds.

There were two brothers who were National Hockey League pioneers—Lester and Frank Patrick. Lester, who is in the NFL Hall of Fame, had two sons, Muzz and Lynn, both of whom were stars with the Rangers when their dad was the coach.

It follows that Dick Patrick must be quite a hockey player himself—and he is, but on a different level. Patrick, a Dartmouth graduate who attends Georgetown University Law School, plays for the Washington Chiefs who have dominated the best amateur hockey teams in the U.S. and Canada for the past three years.

Patrick performed the "hat trick" twice for the Chiefs in the 1969–70 season and once again this past season. The hat trick, of course, is the term used when a player scores three goals in one game.

There is no evidence that Patrick performed a "hardhat" trick on the Georgetown University campus yesterday where the protesters established their command post.

The hockey Chiefs are something like the Darts used to be when that soccer team was an all-amateur organization. They also are something like the Washington Rugby League, another group of amateurs, who love their sport.

But there is bad news for the followers of the Chiefs who play their games at the Washington Coliseum and, without much publicity, averaged about 2,000 people a game during the past season. The coach of the Chiefs, Maj. Edward Hickey, who has been with the Army Materiel Command here, learned yesterday he is leaving for Vietnam in a few weeks.

Hickey, a West Pointer, was an All-Eastern defenseman while captaining the Army team in 1957. He later was named the West Point hockey coach and served for two years. In 1960 he helped Jack Riley coach the Olympic hockey team which shocked the world by winning the first (and thus far the only) gold medal for the United States since the Winter Olympics started in 1924.

A tall, rawboned cowboy type, Hickey has had little trouble recruiting players for the Chiefs. Like the Peace Corps, the pay is not much and the hours are long. This past winter the Chiefs practiced twice a week at the Coliseum, from 9:30 p.m. to 11 p.m. That wasn't easy when you consider the bread-and-butter jobs the players have.

The list includes law students, engineers and even the legislative specialist for the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. That would be Austin Sullivan, who with Jim Langlois, who works for a cement firm, was an outstanding defenseman. Another defenseman, Gene Daly, a Harvard graduate, is a deep-sea diver and vice president of a salvage firm.

There is wingman Jonas Milton, a young black player who is a product of the Capitol Boys Hockey Club, a project dear to the hearts of Hickey and his players. The Chiefs have put on numerous clinics for area youngsters.

"There is tremendous interest in hockey in this area," says Hickey. "We have done what we could to give the youngsters equipment and teach them the sport. It has been most satisfying for us because the junior program has produced some fine players such as Milton and Greg Parker, one of our goalies."

Under Hickey this past season, the Chiefs had a 16-3-2 record. But Washington's most successful sports team went virtually unnoticed. The Chiefs were the National Mid-American Amateur Hockey Champions in 1968–69 but nobody gave them a ticker-tape parade or even the key to West Potomac Park.

"All of us play for the fun of it," Hickey says. "But we hope that some day Washington will have a suitable arena and we can attract a major-league hockey team here. Meanwhile, I hope next season Washington will support the Chiefs."

EXILES CELEBRATE CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over the years Cuba and its people have undergone tumultuous changes since that fateful day in 1902 when Tomas Estrada Palma was inaugurated its first President. When he took his oath of office it broke centuries of oppressive Spanish rule, but in little more than half a century Cuba was under another oppressor's rule. The thumb of tyranny still presses hard.

I come from an area of the country, south Florida, which has become "a home away from home" for many Cubans who were exiled after Fidel Castro took power. About one in every four Miami residents is now a Cuban refugee, and although some residents have found fault, most Cubans have become a major asset to the community.

The Cuban refugees have worked hard with a common bond among them to make new lives and careers in America. Theirs is a determination and capacity for hard work, which is best exemplified by the fact that Cubans living in Miami have started new businesses and now control nearly one-third of the city's businesses.

Conditions for these refugees are not always ideal, but I feel that most would readily admit that they would rather live in over-crowded conditions in the United States as free people, than live in Cuba as Communists. Many Cubans now living in America dream of the day when they can return to their native land—as free Cubans where they can once again pursue their goals and enjoy their culture with peace of mind.

In the past I have called upon our Government to recognize and support a free Cuban government-in-exile which I feel would be an overpowering force to liberate the people in Cuba from the Communist despotism under which they now live.

Acknowledgment of a free and democratic Cuban coalition outside Cuba would be a major breakthrough in wrenching the country from the Communist stranglehold of Fidel Castro. It would be the first step in reestablishing the freedoms and liberties those still in Cuba once enjoyed.

Perhaps the commemoration of this Cuban Independence Day—May 20—will help to remind thousands of Americans that it was not very long ago that Cuba

fought bravely to be a democratic republic.

This remembrance would keep alive the hope in the hearts of the hundreds of thousands of Cuban exiles in the United States and elsewhere that their homeland will once again be free—and it may also stir the minds of Americans who take our precious freedoms for granted.

Again, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my highest praise to the many Cuban refugees living in Florida, and throughout this country. The adjustment they have made to living in a foreign country is not only admirable, but in many instances phenomenal. The contributions they make daily to our society are constantly growing and always appreciated. I only hope that all Americans will continue to make our friends from the south feel welcome and show them the great respect they deserve.

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ADOPTS RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF QUALITY EDUCATION AND DEPLORES BUSING OF PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS OUTSIDE THEIR RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS TO ACHIEVE RACIAL BALANCE IN THE CLASSROOM

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, at its meeting on May 7, the Tennessee Board of Education adopted a resolution in support of quality education for every boy and girl, man and women in Tennessee, and in so doing, expressed the belief that quality education can best be achieved in the pattern of neighborhood schools and therefore, deplored the efforts to bus Tennessee public school students outside their residential neighborhoods to achieve racial balance in the classroom.

Because I take the same position, I have joined with several of my colleagues this week in the introduction of a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment, which states in all simplicity:

No public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school.

The Tennessee Department of Education's resolution affirms the need for an amendment like this, and I would expect the departments of education of other States where busing has deteriorated the quality of education will follow suit.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I present the text of the Tennessee resolution. I trust it will serve as a guide to other States who are like minded in their determination to get relief from the busing ruling of the Supreme Court.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Tennessee State Board of Education is dedicated to providing quality educational training to all Tennesseans regardless of race, creed or color, and subscribes completely to the doctrine of integration of our total educational society with equal opportunity for all; and

Whereas, The Tennessee State Board of Education is supportive of complete compliance with law, executive order, and judicial decree necessary in a regulated society; and

Whereas, Forces in government and society now tend to press upon us a policy of busing students outside their residential neighborhoods to achieve a measure of racial balance in our schools; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Tennessee State Board of Education, while recognizing its obligation to obey the law, does hereby express its belief that quality education can best be achieved in the pattern of neighborhood schools and that it deplores the efforts to bus Tennessee public school students outside their residential neighborhoods to achieve racial balance in the classroom.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of Tennessee, the two United States Senators and the Congressional Delegation of this State.

Adopted by the Tennessee State Board of Education in regular quarterly session assembled May 7, 1971.

TWO CHINAS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, an interesting viewpoint on the "Two Chinas" issue has been expressed in a letter sent recently by Frederic C. Smedley, an authority on international law, to Ambassador H. E. Max Jakobson, head of the delegation of Finland to the United Nations.

Mr. Smedley, a resident of New York, has been advising the Formosan independence movement for the past 3 years. He advocates a UN-supervised plebiscite among the people of Formosa to allow them to decide their own destiny. It is his belief that a majority would favor becoming an independent nation with membership in the UN, with the present membership in the UN under the name of China transferred to the People's Republic of China.

The complete text of Mr. Smedley's letter follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 6, 1971.

H. E. MAX JAKOBSON,
Delegation of Finland to U.N.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR AMBASSADOR JAKOBSON: With all due respect, I submit that your recent statements concerning the problem of China and Taiwan, as reported in the press, are tragically ill-founded and most unfortunate. In my judgment, they make a mockery of the principle of self-determination that is embodied in the United Nations Charter.

In 1954 the Princeton University Press published a demographic study of Taiwan and its people written by George W. Barclay under the title of "Colonial Development and Population in Taiwan." It is quite readable and less than 300 pages long. What it says is still true with a few changes that point still more strongly to the practicality and justice of Taiwan becoming an independent nation entirely unconnected with China, having its own indigenous government, eminently qualified to become a UN member applying for such membership with no claim to a permanent seat on the Security Council.

That result should be brought about as follows:

(1) prompt removal to Formosa of all forces now stationed on Quemoy and Matsu, together with all civilians who elect not to remain thereon, including children whose parents or guardians so elect, together with all such persons' movable possessions;

(2) organization of a UN team to set up and conduct an impartial plebiscite in Formosa and the Pescadores wherein all adult residents may, by secret ballot or voting machine, vote for their preference among: (a) remaining under their present form of government; (b) becoming a part of the Peoples Republic of China under its form of government; (c) becoming a part of Japan; or (d) becoming an independent nation under the guidance and protection of UN, eligible to apply for membership therein, while the present membership in UN under the name of China, with permanent membership on the Security Council, is transferred to the Peoples Republic of China.

I believe that if my government were to notify the government at Taipai that unless it consents to and agrees to cooperate with the above steps within as short a time as my government deems reasonable, my government will withdraw all support for the government at Taipei, such consent and agreement would be forthcoming.

Chiang is 83 years of age. He is trying to insure that his son shall succeed to his powers on Taiwan and his claim to the right to use Taiwan as a base and its people as most of the army with which to re-conquer the mainland. Since Formosans obviously would prefer to have as few contacts as possible with mainland Chinese, whether they be followers of Mao or Chiang, it seems to me equally obvious that any attempt to carry out the plans of Chiang after his death would cause a revolt of the Formosan armed forces, the majority of which are now Formosan draftees. If, instead of that, the procedures suggested hereby are implemented and Formosa is under its own duly-elected government that would have no interest in attempting to reconquer mainland China, I submit that Mao or his successor or successors, thus relieved of a danger of being attacked from Formosa and thereby placed in a stronger position to deal with any threat to their country from Russia, would accept the situation, especially if the prebiscite showed, as I am certain it would, less interest on the part of the people of Formosa in joining the Peoples Republic of China than in any of the other three alternatives, and most interest, probably by a substantial majority, in alternative (d).

If you try to imagine how your countrymen would feel if Finland were occupied by a defeated faction in a Russian Civil War against Stalin, which promptly killed off your country's political leaders on the spurious claim that they were Stalinists, and then proceeded to rule Finland in a dictatorial manner for almost a quarter century while stating that it would use Finland as a base to reconquer Russia, with your country's occupiers and the government at Moscow both claiming to represent "One Russia." I think you will see what a monstrous injustice a "One China" solution would do to the people of Taiwan and Penghu, which Japan did not cede to anyone at the end of World War II, but simply renounced its sovereignty over that territory and its people. Just as your country and its people are and of right should be free, independent and self-governing and not part of "One Russia," I submit that Taiwan and its people should be free, independent and self-governing and not part of "One China."

If you think it would be helpful to you and your chances of succeeding the Secre-

tary General on his retirement, to discuss this matter further with me, I would be glad to go to your office for that purpose at our earliest mutual convenience.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the State Department for Secretary Rogers' attention on his return from his present mission, and to the Secretary for External Affairs in the "Shadow Government" of World United Formosans for Independence.

Respectfully submitted,

FREDERIC C. SMEDLEY.

THE HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD'S 1971 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in representing Michigan's Fifth Congressional District, I have found it helpful to obtain a sampling of my constituents' views by sending out an annual questionnaire.

I have begun mailing out my 1971 questionnaire. My questionnaire is so drafted as to take the pulse of the people in my district on the most important issues of the day. To make the questionnaire as objective as possible, I have based it on questions suggested by political science professors at colleges in my district.

The questions cover a variety of subjects, ranging over both domestic and foreign policy. With the thought that other House Members may be interested in the questions I am asking my constituents, I include my questionnaire at this point in the RECORD:

JERRY FORD 1971 QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you favor Federal deficit financing to stimulate the economy?

2. Should the Federal Government impose strict controls on wages and prices?

3. Should the Federal Government expand efforts to control air and water pollution even if this costs you more in taxes and prices?

4. Should the Executive Branch of the Federal Government be reorganized and the number of cabinet departments reduced from 11 to eight?

5. Do you favor Federal legislation requiring "unit pricing" of food items so you can compare the cost per pound, ounce, etc., of the various brands?

6. Should food stamps be made available to those idled by a labor-management dispute?

7. On Vietnam, what is the best policy? Pick one.

A. Increase our military effort in hope of achieving "victory".

B. Withdraw U.S. troops on a monthly basis while continuing negotiations aimed at a political settlement.

C. Withdraw all U.S. forces from Vietnam by a fixed date regardless of the effect on negotiations.

8. Should we keep a residual force in Vietnam until all American prisoners of war are released?

9. On health insurance, which do you favor?

A. A Federal Government program, financed with increased payroll taxes.

B. An improved nationwide private health insurance system with employers paying the bulk of the premiums and with insurance companies placed under Federal regulation and control.

C. Income tax credits for the cost of buying private health insurance.

D. No new legislation in this area.

10. On State and local problems. what is the best answer?

A. Return a percentage of Federal income tax revenue to the States and local units to hold down local taxes and help solve local problems.

B. Increase State and local taxes and cut Federal income taxes.

C. Increase the funding for over 550 Federal grant programs, with local government matching funds required.

D. Have the Federal Government take over all welfare costs and pay this cost from Federal taxes.

11. On welfare, which is better?

A. Keep the present system.

B. Adopt a Federal minimum income for families with children and enact a work or job training requirement.

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE IN BUSINESS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the recent vote to continue Government sponsorship of the supersonic transport, and with current consideration of Federal involvement in the railroad and airline industries, I believe it is time to pause and reflect on the function of Government in America today.

I have consistently and repeatedly stated since coming to Congress that the free market should be permitted to operate in these areas—and that Federal subsidy of American industry is a dangerous trend.

This is the subject of an article by Mr. Lindley H. Clark, Jr., which appeared in the May 14 issue of the Wall Street Journal. I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be shared by my colleagues and the public.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 14, 1971]

SPEAKING OF BUSINESS—THE WORKADAY GOVERNMENT

(By Lindley H. Clark, Jr.)

At the moment Congressmen and others are debating moves to involve the government more deeply in the workaday world of business. The administration is urging Congress to help Lockheed Aircraft Corp. with $250 million of loan guarantees. The textile industry wants the lawmakers to protect their market with tighter quotas on imports. On its own the House voted this week to revive federal support for a supersonic transport plane.

Whatever the merits or demerits of the individual proposals, they appear to be ignoring a lot of national history. There may be advantages in trying to run government more like a business, but businesses run like a government seldom have functioned very well.

When government moves into business, it usually starts out cautiously. Private enterprise, after all, is still private enterprise, and government officials generally proclaim they intend to preserve it. But somehow or other, one little thing seems to lead to another.

The railroad industry provides a wretched example. In the late 19th century rail operators were really operating, chopping up each other when they could and often damaging the public in the process. So it was at least understandable that the government set up the Interstate Commerce Commission to police the industry's more dubious practices.

The ICC apparatus grew and extended itself to nearly every facet of rail operations. At the same time federal agencies took on an increasing role in settling labor disputes between the lines and their employes.

In recent years few disputes have been settled or even postponed without direct federal action, usually on some sort of improvised basis. The Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, sneering at a proposed 43% wage increase as inadequate, now threatens to shut down the railroads next Monday, and apparently only some sort of ad hoc federal law can stop them.

The federal involvement has grown enormously through years in which the reason for initial intervention has dwindled greatly. With trucks, buses, airlines and barges around, the railroads no longer have the monopoly power they once had, and the rigidity of federal regulation has made it ever more difficult for the rail lines to compete. In trying to run the railroads the government is in danger of ruining them.

Instead of learning from the experience the government is now well on its way toward doing much the same damage to airlines. With a usual government lack of logic, the airlines have been subjected to much the same regulation of rates, routes and labor relations as the railroads.

Always the rationale is the "public interest." The nation needs the products or services an industry produces, it needs the jobs it provides. But questions come up as to where the public's interest really lies.

There still are questions, for instance, in regard to those oil-import quotas that Congress enacted more than a decade ago. The nation needs a viable oil industry, the reasoning ran, and to remain viable the industry needs protection of its domestic market.

Whatever the validity of that contention, quotas surely involved the government in a messy operation. During most of the period imports have been cheaper than domestic oil, so the permits for imports have been tickets to coin money. The result has been a continuing squabble over quota allocations. And now, more than a decade later, you still hear talk of the nation's "energy crisis."

Predictably enough, numerous other industries have also asked quota protection for their domestic markets.

The textile industry already has quotas on cotton goods, and Japan has agreed to some restrictions on other items. The U.S. industry, though, wants much tighter curbs. As noted, one little thing always seems to lead to another, or at least a demand for another.

Restrictions on competition, foreign or domestic, always lead to upward pressure on prices, the kind of thing that hardly appears to serve the general public's interest. But how about all those jobs in oil, textiles and other industries, those jobs that the protectionists claim are in danger of being exported?

Neither a company nor a country can afford for very long to freeze its manpower and material resources in producing goods and services that can't meet the test of free competition. If an industry, or any part of it, is no longer competitive, it's time to start looking for more promising jobs for the workers employed in it, as well as for the other resources involved.

Lockheed Aircraft Corp. or any other private company needs more than government-guaranteed money; it needs, for one thing, skillful management. If Congress comes up with the cash, thus involving the public credit, and things still go sour, will the government feel compelled to intervene even more deeply?

The saga of the supersonic transport should give Lockheed pause. (Lockheed,

you'll remember, tried hard to win the prime SST contract and was bitterly disappointed when the award went to Boeing; in Lockheed's inner councils there is thus one bit of recent history to be a little happy about.)

Congress this year voted emphatically to stop federal development of the SST, or at any rate everyone thought it did. On Wednesday, the House voted to pick up the project again. Once the government gets into business, it's difficult to get it out.

In these days of huge government and huge corporations, the two can hardly function entirely independently. But if the government actually is committed to private enterprise, it's going to have to start doing more to let private enterprise function—or fail, if it comes to that.

Some government regulation of business is necessary, if the public's interest is to be protected, but the exsting system is badly in need of overhaul. Wise antitrust enforcement is needed to promote freer competition. And responsible government financial policies are certainly needed to curb the inflation that has hobbled businessmen, and everyone else, so much in recent years.

The government, in sum, should be spending less time planning new ways to get into business and more time planning graceful ways of getting out.

INDIANA LABORERS' TRAINING TRUST FUND GAINS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to note that the Indiana Laborers' Training Trust Fund has recevied national recognition in the February issue of Manpower, a publication issued and distributed by the Department of Labor throughout the United States. Industry in an expanding economy must find good manpower and make good use of it. Contractors and union officials in Indiana have taken action to meet future needs for manpower training. The results of their outstanding cooperative efforts merit note by this body. The Manpower article follows:

[From Manpower, February 1971]

STRONGER FOUNDATION FOR CONSTRUCTION LABORERS

(By Higdon C. Roberts)

(NOTE.—Mr. Roberts is assistant professor of labor education at Indiana University.)

Construction laborers are no longer merely pick-and-shovel men. The growing mechanization of construction work requires them to handle, maintain, and sometimes operate increasingly sophisticated machinery. Fork-lift trucks, powered wheelbarrows, jack drills, and similar expensive equipment now supplement raw muscle. To aid the craftsmen engaged in the building industry, laborers need a broad knowledge of construction methods, materials, and operations.

Yet, a laborer usually has no formal training. He picks up his skills through experience on the job. This informal arrangement encourages labor turnover, hampers the industry's productivity, and retards the development of a ready pool of work-trained manpower. It also fails to recruit the unemployed and underemployed on an organized basis and holds back workers already in the industry who could upgrade their job qualifications if they had the chance.

The situation may get worse before it gets better. Employment requirements are expected to rise rapidly during the 1970's, not only to meet the housing, business, and residential needs of a growing population but also the demands of the country's expanding highway system. These needs, coupled with continuing technological advances, will place additional pressure on the industry to find good manpower and to make good use of it.

Contractors and union officials in Indiana, however, are not waiting for things to get worse. They are taking action now. They have established an imaginative program that in 2 years has placed some 772 men in upgrading and training classes and graduated 490. The number of trainees is expected to increase sharply next year because of more generous funding and the experience gained from 2 years of trial and error.

In April 1968, representatives of the construction industry in Indiana and the Indiana State District Council of the Laborers International Union established the Indiana Laborers Training Trust Fund.

The Fund is administered by a 12-man board of trustees composed of an equal number of union and management representatives. Management representatives are selected by the 35 contractors' associations and employer groups supporting the program. The union trustees are chosen by District Council 57 of the Laborers. Each trustee serves without pay and for no fixed term.

The current chairman is a management trustee, J. William Kepler, president of a Terre Haute construction firm. Union trustee Virgil Morris, secretary-treasurer of the Indiana State District Council and business manager of the Terre Haute local, is secretary-treasurer.

The original agreement called for employers to contribute 2 cents per man-hour to the fund as a fringe benefit for every member of the Laborers Union on their payrolls. This year the contribution rises to 7 cents, which should yield about $1 million annually.

Staffing of the Training Trust Fund began in August 1968 with the appointment of Thomas O. Stigall as project director. Now 51, Stigall for 23 years was industrial relations manager for Indiana Limestone Co., Inc., the Nation's largest producer of building stones. Though he comes from management, he had negotiated labor agreements with many union leaders over the years, including several with Morris, and was acceptable to the union trustees. Stigall is backed up by a permanent staff of five, plus four to eight instructors hired on an as-needed basis for the various training programs. One instructor is a former trainee. The project is headquartered at Bedford.

By the end of 1968, four separate training programs had been established: Adult basic education, blueprint reading, arc welding, and laborer job skills. The first three are strictly night and Saturday classes and are reserved for upgrading union members. Laborer job skills training is aimed mainly at new recruits, all of whom are guaranteed jobs and union memberships upon completion, but the classes also are open to upgrades.

Basic education emphasizes reading, writing, and math, with some instruction in the sciences and social studies. Classes, conducted through the public school systems, began in December 1968 in Fort Wayne and Evansville. Arc welding and blueprint reading classes began at the same time and to date have been held at New Albany, Terre Haute, Evansville, Richmond, Lafayette, Tell City, and Fort Wayne. All but one were conducted through the public school systems.

All these classes, which enrolled 371 men and graduated 169, were conducted entirely at the expense of the Fund. No stipends were paid participants since they all had full-time jobs and were studyiing in their spare time.

But the Fund found it necessary to use Federal money for the laborer job skills classes. Participants were required to attend classes full time for 8 weeks, followed by 4 weeks of on-the-job training. Training expenses were met by the Fund, but living allowances of $40 to $70 a week were paid students under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). Under two MDTA on-the-job training contracts totaling more than $178,000, the Fund conducted a pilot program in Bedford during the summer of 1969, a class last winter at Camp Atterbury, two more at LaPorte this past spring and summer, another at Fort Wayne, which was completed in December, and another in Evansville to be completed this month. All these classes enrolled 339 men, of whom 259 finished the training.

Trainees in the Camp Atterbury project studied and lived in barracks formerly belonging to the Army but now used by the National Guard. As part of their training they repaired a gym, blacktopped roads, built curbs and gutters, cleared timber, and did some demolition. The other three job skills classes were for commuters, many of them hard-core unemployed recruited by the State employment service, who reported for training daily from the surrounding communities.

All instructors for the job skills training are former laborer foremen and union members. The curriculum is thorough and complete. It includes job orientation, safety, first aid, relationships with fellow workers, scaffolding, masonry, rockdrilling, field drilling, explosives, excavation, compaction, sand blasting, and use and maintenance of a variety of tools and machines, among them forklifts, conveyors, concrete mixers, jack hammers, chain saws, cutting tools, and post-hole diggers.

The Fund also has conducted management training. In December 1969, 17 construction superintendents were trained in management skills in a 2-week class at Indiana University's Bloomington campus. A 2-week class in union administration was held for 23 union leaders by the university at Bloomington in March 1969, and 23 more were trained in a similar class in March 1970.

Further classes in basic education, are welding, and blueprint reading opened last fall at Kokomo, Tell City, and Terre Haute, and in the latter city advanced instruction in these subjects is also being offered.

Meanwhile, the Fund is experimenting with more in-depth training. A 9-month class now is underway in leased facilities at Bedford with 46 enrollees. They are scheduled to receive 450 hours of basic education, 270 of prevocational training, and 720 of job skill training. Each man will be in class 8 hours a day, 5 days a week for 37 weeks, and will receive regular MDTA allowances. The project has been federally funded for $123,995. The enrollees will be both new entries and upgrades and will be trained by the Fund's staff.

As it has developed in Indiana, the Laborers Training Trust Fund has several advantages over traditional labor-management job training agreements and Federal, State, and local governmental programs. First, it guarantees a steady source of money. This enables long-term planning with an emphasis on continuity and provides for a competent professional staff with a reasonable degree of security. Although outside funds are needed and welcomed, the program remains basically in the hands of those closest to the needs of the industry and the problems within the State.

Second, programs are highly flexible and can respond to both current and future needs rapidly. The professional staff has been given great leeway to develop and maintain relevant instruction. The project director must clear certain alterations and expenditures with the trustees, but approval or nonapproval can be obtained quickly. There is no agonizing period of indecision familiar to

many working with other kinds of training and retraining programs. Since all of the trustees are from the industry and closely attuned to its particular needs, there has been an excellent working arrangement between them and the professional staff of the Fund.

Third, technological innovations can be maintained and perhaps accelerated without incurring the fear of employees. Workers who know they are being trained or will be retrained for existing jobs have a strong tendency to stay with the industry and contribute to its growth and development. When growth and change also mean higher wages and better working conditions, the prospects for a stable and highly productive work force are increased.

Fourth, the union is primarily responsible for guaranteeing jobs to graduates. It attempts to place a worker with contractors in his home area. Failing this, a job will be found for him elsewhere in the State. Economic and seasonal conditions can, of course, severely limit job opportunities. But no one is trained for obsolete or soon-to-be-outdated job skills. In the thinking stage for the future is a centrally located job referral system. This would be in essence a statewide hiring hall to match workers to jobs in any area in the State. This could be the most efficient and rapid means of increasing overall industry productivity while providing workers with steadier and more satisfying work arrangements.

Fifth, because the Fund is not tied to a single structural arrangement, it can either create its own educational facilities or use existing ones, including publicly supported local and State schools and private academic, technical, and vocational training institutions. Part of the Fund income goes to a building program and plans call for an adult education and training institute to be built in the near future. This project would be a basic residential unit that would continue to be augmented by the use of other facilities.

Two additional advantages seem evident at this point. Trainees can move from one program to another, from basic education to blueprint reading, welding, or the job skills courses. There is a loose integration that enables progressive upward moves that have been used already by several students. Six graduates of the Camp Atterbury job skills course, for example, moved into apprenticeship training. There is no limit on the number of courses an individual may take. It is thus possible for students to progress through the several programs, then return at a later date for retraining. This is particularly relevant for older workers who wish to maintain and improve their employability as the years go by and new building processes are introduced.

As a 59-year-old welding graduate at Terre Haute said, "I never had a chance to learn welding right in the past; now I've got one more thing that will help keep me working steady. I'm getting along but I've still a ways to go before retirement. I wish we had these courses when I was a younger man just getting started."

The original Bedford job skills program was an experimental project designed to determine the curriculum and needs of students and instructors. The course probably never will achieve any final form since the training will correspond to the changing needs of industry and to local construction conditions. The techniques developed at Bedford have proved readily transferable to other areas of the State where similar programs were operated.

Only about one-fifth of the students enrolled in job skills programs were members of the union. The others were individuals who lacked basic educational or technical qualifications needed for employment. The average age has been 23 years with an interesting sprinkling of older workers. Only the union upgrades have had previous experience in the construction industry. What little experience the new entrants have had was in low-paying, low-skill, dead end jobs. Most trainees from urban areas have been blacks who previously worked as janitors or casual laborers.

Most participants from the smaller towns and rural areas have been whites with backgrounds in farmwork, logging, or as part-time gas station attendant. Normally they have not had steady work, nor made a wage near the $2.00 per hour bracket. At most they have had 2 or 3 years of inadequate, unsatisfactory high school education and no job training or skills.

One 21-year-old Bedford graduate, a ninth grade dropout with two children, said, "I was working at logging and sometimes at farmwork, but nothing steady and no decent money. I just couldn't see a way to do any better. There aren't too many good jobs around here but when I went for them I just didn't have any of the things they always wanted like education or a skilled trade. This program is giving me a new chance. I'm learning things here that will give me a crack at a good job with good pay. The future looks a hell of a lot better for me and my family."

In addition to the employment service, nonunion candidates are recruited through church groups, community action organizations, and other social welfare agencies. In line with MDTA requirements, more than 65 percent were individuals classified as hard-core unemployed. More than 40 percent belonged to minority groups.

Interviews with 11 local union officials throughout the State showed nearly unanimous support for the project. "This education and training is one of the greatest things we've been able to get for our members," said John Soucie, business manager for the Evansville area. "It gives the young guy coming in a better chance to make a go of it and also gives the older worker a chance to keep up. The way things are going today the need for education, training, and retraining is more important for our people than ever before. I can't say enough good things about it."

Management reactions are similarly positive. "The program provides a much needed approach to alleviate construction bottlenecks that occur frequently because of a lack of manpower in certain skilled areas," said Larry L. McIlwain, executive director of the Indiana General Contractors Association. "This kind of cooperative effort between management and progressive union leadership will enable the industry to grow and prosper without huge cost increases."

HEARINGS ANNOUNCED TO PROBE CORRECTIONS PRACTICES

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary, under my chairmanship, is about to embark on an inquiry concerning faults and deficiencies of corrections practices in the United States. After probing the shortcomings of the system which play an increasingly critical role in our society, the subcommittee hopes to propose remedial legislation.

Public hearings will begin at 10 a.m., on Wednesday, May 26, in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

UW SCIENCE IS ON THE SKIDS

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the May 16 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, Harry Pease, the science and space exploration writer for the newspaper, gives his personal views on the science programs at the University of Wisconsin. His article, entitled "UW Science is on the Skids" shows the refusal of professors at the University of Wisconsin to seek truth and knowledge.

Since I believe that this article will be of interest to my colleagues, I am having it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article by Mr. Pease follows:

UW SCIENCE IS ON THE SKIDS

(By Harry Pease)

Commitment to political causes apparently has begun to erode the quality of science at the University of Wisconsin and deny the state a service it is entitled to expect.

The Navy may build a giant radio transmitter, identified as Project Sanguine, in Wisconsin. Some people think it may damage the environment. A number of UW scientists belong to, or advise, a group that calls itself the "Stop Sanguine Committee."

How many of them responded last November when the Navy offered to finance ecological research to be done on the campus by university scientists?

None.

A UW administrator asks: "What kind of scientist is it that says, 'I'm against it but I don't want to know the facts'?"

The situation is rooted in opposition to the Vietnam War, which has burgeoned into unqualified hatred of anything military.

Wrought up by the Cambodian campaign of 1970, some of the university's 200-odd departments voted never ever to do anything for the Department of Defense. If any summary ever was compiled, it is not available now. However, both zoology and botany took the pledge.

The actions were taken in separate rump meetings that included faculty and students. No roll was called and no identification was demanded. W. C. Burns, zoology department chairman, says he is sure some undergraduates who voted were not even taking a single zoology course.

The decision probably is unenforceable, but he regards it as a moral commitment, he says. Grant Cottam, botany chairman, concurs.

"There was money available to work on Sanguine but the faculty didn't want to do it," he says.

In a sense this was an extension of an established university policy.

On Nov. 1, 1968, Robert L. Clodius, then university vice president, notified all faculty members that they were to do no classified research without the express approval of their deans, the director of research administration, the chancellor and the university president. "Classified" means that the results are not to be generally circulated without government review to determine that they would not aid potential enemies of the United States.

No voice was raised to protest this patent infringement of academic freedom. Such silence stood in marked contrast to the outcry over loyalty oaths a few years ago, when some people on public payrolls were asked to certify that they did not advocate forcible overthrow of the government of the United States.

Little if any of the ecological research on Sanguine would have been classified.

The UW defection was not quite complete. Two soil physicists in the College of Agriculture teamed up on a proposal. A group at Parkside offered to make two studies.

Charles Richard Van Hise was the UW president who formulated what has come to be known as "The Wisconsin Idea," the notion that scholars owed a duty to use their specialized abilities to serve all the people.

"Following truth wherever it leads, without regard to its bearing on persons or nations, is the spirit which the university must not yield," he declared.

Wisconsin needs trustworthy information on the effects of Project Sanguine. Self-righteous, militant anti-militarism from the academic community we support is a sorry substitute.

NOISE ABATEMENT AND NEW YORK STATE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, for too long, noise has been a stepchild of the environmental movement. Noise has been regarded as merely a nuisance—unpleasant, but relatively unimportant when compared to the problems of air, water, and land pollution.

However, noise is a very serious environmental hazard. It is a direct threat to our physical and mental health. Excessive noise can inflict damage on the ear, resulting in temporary or even permanant hearing loss. It disrupts sleep, causes annoyance, interferes with speech. Research has shown that noise can affect mental health, physiological activity, and even a worker's efficiency. And it certainly can make our cities and towns far less pleasant places in which to live.

Though modern technology professes an eagerness to make life more pleasant, it has saturated the homes of America with a steadily rising riot of sound: blenders, juicers, hairdryers, vacuum cleaners, garbage grinders. It has choked our streets and highways with bumper-to-bumper automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles. It has added to the strain of the working day with the clatter of typewriters, mimeograph machines, and mechanical equipment. It has overwhelmed the quiet of our buildings with a host of entertaining equipment with which neighbors drive each other deaf. The din of construction equipment endangers workers' hearing and renders unfit for habitation the area surrounding the construction project. Over countryside as well as city, the jet scream of military and commercial aircraft is virtually inescapable.

Yet, while the level of sound in our environment has been steadily rising—having doubled since 1955—very little has actually been done either on a local or a Federal level to control this widely prevailing environmental pollutant.

Therefore, I have introduced in the Congress a comprehensive legislative package for the establishment of a tough, realistic Federal program for the control of noise. This program is set forth in my Noise Abatement and Control Act of 1971 (H.R. 6986 and H.R. 6987), my Noise Disclosure Act (H.R. 6988 and H.R. 6989), my Occupational Noise Control Act of 1971 (H.R. 6990 and H.R. 6991), and my Office of Noise Abatement and Control appropriations bill (H.R. 5043, H.R. 6984 and H.R. 6985). This package would provide much needed funds for the newly created Office of Noise Abatement and Control within the Environmental Protection Agency and would greatly expand that Office's responsibilities and functions. It would direct the head of the Office to set noise standards for machinery in order to protect the public from the hazards of excess noise. It would provide funding for local and State programs of noise research and control. All noise-producing machinery would be required to be labeled so that the consumer could make purchases in a more noise conscious way. It would direct the Federal Government to use its tremendous procurement and purchasing power in a manner to promote a quieter environment. And it would provide greater protection for the working man and woman from the hazards of on-the-job noise.

Certainly, such a Federal program of noise control and abatement is desperately needed. However, even the most stringent Federal standards and enforcement alone cannot solve the noise crisis. States and local governments must undertake their own programs of noise abatement.

I am pleased that the State of New York has recognized the need for a State noise abatement program. In testimony before the ad hoc congressional hearing on noise pollution which I conducted in New York City on February 8, New York State Commissioner of Environmental Protection Henry Diamond put forth the State's plan for noise control. He stated:

The need for a noise abatement program was recognized by the 1970 legislature because of increasing noise levels in our community, added noise sources, and increases in population requiring more services and devices which produce noise.

We are formulating a comprehensive statewide noise abatement program to prevent further noise encroachment and reduce existing excessive noise. Official operations, purchases, and construction projects by New York State will lead the noise abatement program by reflecting these policies. The impact of noise on the environment during the construction phase as well as the operational phase of State construction projects will be considered.

Budget requests have been submitted to the 1971–72 New York State Legislature for funds to organize and fill manpower requirements to establish a Bureau of Acoustics and Noise Abatement within the Department of Environmental Conservation. This Bureau will take on increasing responsibility and importance as it develops model codes, standards, rules, and regulations. Its functions will expand to include all areas of acoustics and noise control such as aircraft noise, highway noise, consumer products, industrial noise, architectural acoustics, room acoustics, building codes, community noise, and research into the effects of noise on hearing, speech communication, annoyance and other physiological effects.

Studies will be conducted with the cooperation of other State agencies to develop criteria, standards, and measuring procedures, utilizing the latest technology, including computer applications. In order to establish a unified statewide noise abating program, jurisdiction for noise abatement should be under one agency of the State.

It is my view that it is through such State and local efforts, in conjunction with stern Federal regulations, that we will be able to meet the problem of noise and its hazards. I am hopeful that other States will take note of New York's recognition of this very serious problem and its attempts to deal with it.

At this point, I include an article by Vincent A. D'Aprile from the April–May edition of the State of New York Department of Environmental Conservation's magazine the Conservationist. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

NOISE—AN EMERGING HAZARD

(By Vincent A. D'Aprile)

Perhaps you have heard the old brain-teaser: If a tree falls in a forest and there is no one around to hear it, does it make any noise?

The physicist would say "yes." He would point to his text book and measuring instruments and tell you all about sound being a wave that travels much like a wave through water—so it doesn't make any difference if anybody hears it, there's still a noise. The physicist would probably go on to tell you how sound alters pressure in the air, pushes air particles around, speeds them up, and makes things vibrate.

Faced with the same question, the psychologist would probably say there was no noise. He is more concerned with whether a sound is perceived by a human brain. So while the psychologist would admit all the physical phenomena the physicist talks about, he would probably say it doesn't mean anything unless that sound wave strikes an ear drum and sets in motion the extremely complex process we call hearing.

NOISE IS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

For those of us concerned with the problems of noise and noise pollution, the viewpoints of both the physicist and the psychologist are important. We need the physicist's viewpoint because we have to be able to measure sound, to analyze it—for without this kind of scientific precision, how can we ever objectively talk about such a seemingly subjective subject as noise? The psychologist is important because we must know the effects of noise on man's mind. The medical doctor's judgment is needed because noise can affect the body too. Similarly, the politician plays a vital role because without his understanding and without adequate legislation, we can never control noise.

So you see, noise starts to become everybody's business. But before we start to zero in on the problems of noise, let's talk a little more about sound.

Sounds familiar to all of us are the cooing of a baby, the voices of birds and animals, human speech, and music. These sounds are always pleasing to many people, occasionally to some, and never pleasing to others. The tomcat's cry at 2 a.m. may be acceptable to his mate, but hardly to a man who had a hard day at the office nor to the nesting robin in the nearby tree. A blaring rock band in the local hangout may be music to a teeny-bopper, but not to the senior citizens in the adjacent block.

Sounds not acceptable are considered to be noise, or unwanted sound. What is one man's music, may be another man's noise.

The government's concern with noise could be said to date back to the Constitution of the United States where reference is made to "domestic tranquility." If one were to relate our present noise environment with that point in history, we would compare the horse or stagecoach with today's auto, bus or jet

aircraft; the frontiersman's ax with a chain saw or bulldozer; a scythe to a lawn mower.

We have noise sources today which defy comparison—jack hammers, pile drivers, compressors, and snowmobiles, just to name a few. The analogy is made to indicate that although the noise sources of Colonial days were minuscule compared to ours, our forefathers valued "domestic tranquility" enough to make it a consideration of the Constitution.

But one can ask: "Should the noise levels of our environment be permitted to continually increase?" "Are these continually increasing noise levels the cost we must pay for progress?"

The answers to both of these questions, in my opinion, is no.

SERIOUS EFFECTS

The effects of noise on people can be divided into three major categories: (1) damage to hearing, (2) interference with speech communication, (3) annoyance. Studies are also underway to see if noise causes other physical and emotional problems. Included are loss of sleep, narrowing of arteries, dilation of pupils, increase in pulse rate, paling of mucous membranes, and increase in respiratory rate. Continued research is needed in the latter categories to determine how great these effects are and to formulate guidelines for their measurement.

Let's first discuss hearing damage. There are many causes of hearing loss—injury or disease to the auditory system, malfunction of the auditory system at birth, and hearing loss resulting from exposure to intense noise. Hearing loss can be temporary or permanent. An individual exposed to a high intensity sound—say a blaring air jet for one-half hour—will suffer a temporary hearing loss when removed from this environment. Practically all recovery will be attained within 24 to 48 hours after exposure.

The ear consists of three sections. The outer ear which leads to the eardrum; the middle ear, which is mainly a series of tiny bones; and the inner ear where sensitive nerves pick up sound and send it to the brain.

Permanent hearing loss can be caused by a loud explosion which may rupture the eardrum or by long-time exposure to intense noise such as encountered in industry. In the latter type the eardrum is rarely affected. Damage occurs to the inner ear and the noises causing permanent damage are far below that which would cause rupture of the eardrum. This type of noise-induced hearing loss occurs after exposure to noise over many years, resulting in destruction of inner ear nerve endings. It cannot be corrected by use of a hearing aid. After this damage, sound may be transmitted to the inner ear satisfactorily but it cannot be perceived or interpreted. This type of hearing loss is irreversible. Hearing sensitivity levels vary with the individual, as does the susceptibility to damage.

MEASURING SOUND

Earlier, we mentioned the need to be able to measure sound—more particularly noise. Two main units of measurement are used. One is called Hertz (Hz). It doesn't have anything to do with renting cars. It was formerly called cycles per second and it is, of course, the basic measurement of frequency. How fast sound is making the particles in the air vibrate is another way of expressing it.

We can, for example, normally hear sound waves whose frequencies lie between 20 and 20,000 Hertz—although the car is most sensitive in the range between 1,000 and 6,000 Hertz. An ultrasonic dog whistle can't be heard by man because its frequency is too high.

The second important unit of measurement is the decibel—or the dB. This is the unit used to measure sound intensity, although strictly speaking decibels only express a sound intensity ratio. Here are some examples:

At zero dB intensity, sound is barely perceptible.

An average whisper produces an intensity of 20 dB four feet from the speaker.

Normal conversation at a distance of three feet is usually at an intensity between 60 and 70 dB.

A pneumatic drill 10 feet away makes a 90 dB noise.

A loss in hearing speech is best predicted by the average loss at 500, 1000, and 2000 Hz. Hearing loss begins at higher frequencies and spreads downward. Man's ability to hear in the 4000 Hz area is a good indicator of hearing loss.

Because conservation of hearing at speech frequencies is of maximum importance, most criteria and laws are set up on this basis. In October 1956, the Air Force issued a directive which states "Ear protection is recommended for continuous exposure to a sound pressure level above 85 dB in any of the four octave bands between 300 and 4800 Hz. It is mandatory for exposures above 95 dB." That is in the range of a pneumatic drill 10 feet away.

The Federal government in May 1969 revised the Walsh-Healy Act establishing 90 dBA as a maximum criteria for preventing hearing damage in the working area of contractors with Federal contracts of $10,000 or more. The A-scale for decibels is a weighted network on the sound level meter which approximates the response of the human ear. Studies indicate that the value may be too liberal.

SPEECH INTERFERENCE

The second major category of how noise effects people is interference with speech communication.

In everyday life we have many sounds reaching the ear at the same time. We know for example, it is harder to hear at a football game than it is in a library. In a noisy area, those sounds of weak intensity will be drowned out by higher intensity sounds. This phenomenon, known as "masking," is the interference with detection of a sound by the presence of a second sound. Low frequency sounds have a much greater masking effect on high frequency sounds than highs have on lows. There is very little masking effect of lows by highs. Obviously, this plays an important role in speech communication. This is especially true at cocktail parties, I might add.

Speech is composed of vowel and consonant sounds and occupies the range of approximately 100 to 7000 Hz. It normally has an intensity range of 30 to 40 dB. Of course, there are variations between individuals, and the male voice is concentrated in lower frequencies than the female voice.

Vowels contain a larger portion of acoustic energy and are of a lower frequency than consonants. Consonants are of a higher frequency and contain less acoustic energy, meaning that they can be more easily masked out. To further complicate the problem, most of the information of speech is contained in the consonants. An interesting experiment is to have someone show you a sentence with all the vowels removed. You'll probably figure it out. Not so, if all the consonants are removed.

The speech interference level is computed by taking the arithmetic average of the sound pressure level measurements in the octave bands of 500, 1000, and 2000 Hz. In order to carry on a reliable conversation in a normal voice at a distance of 3 feet, the speech interference level should not exceed a value of 55 dB. We have learned to adjust to noisy conditions in airports or subways for example. By using other cues—if we're familiar with the subject we're hearing about—our minds fill in the missing sounds.

The third major category in the effects of noise on man is annoyance. There is a great deal to be learned about annoyance effects. There are many parameters, some of them psychological, which enter into the judgment as to whether or not a noise is annoying. Generally speaking, high intensities are more annoying than low intensities. There are exceptions, however, like a dripping faucet, the intensity of which is hardly measurable. There are people who cannot stand to hear the ticking of an alarm clock. They have to bury it in the dresser drawer before they can get to sleep. Ironically, the same person who hides his alarm clock may have been enjoying Beethoven on his hi-fi rig at 110 dB 30 minutes before retiring to bed. Similar examples can be cited which has no apparent reason.

Loudness is a subjective attribute which is chiefly a function of sound intensity level as well as frequency. A 1000 Hz tone and a 200 Hz tone of equal intensity would not be judged as equally loud. It would be necessary to increase the intensity of the 200 Hz tone above the intensity of the 1000 Hz tone before they would be judged equally loud. A rough rule of thumb concerning loudness states that a 10 dB increase in intensity level is required for a sensed doubling of loudness. At any rate, our ears are telling us there is too much noise around. What's being done about it?

WHAT'S BEING DONE?

Need for a noise abatement program was recognized by the 1970 State of New York Legislature when it passed the Environmental Conservation Law. This law mandates that the environment be conserved, improved, and protected in order to enhance the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the State. It defines pollution as the presence in the environment of conditions and/or contaminants in quantities or characteristics which are or may be injurious to human life or property or which unreasonably interfere with comfortable enjoyment of life and property. Noise is considered to be a pollutant and the law charges the Department of Environmental Conservation with the responsibility for its prevention and abatement.

Constantly rising noise levels in our community, ever-increasing noise sources, and the growth in numbers of people requiring the services and devices which produce noise, have created the need for a noise abatement program. Aggravating the problem are modern building techniques and materials which do not provide for sound isolation comparable to that of the past.

To meet increased production demands, industry has required larger and higher speed machinery which produces noise of increased intensity. The consideration of noise was given little design priority in many cases, however. Noise levels in industry have been increasing without adequate efforts to reduce them either for the welfare and comfort of the people working inside the plant or neighbors adjacent to such noisy operations.

TRANSPORTATION MAJOR NOISE SOURCE

A favorite term of acoustical engineers is ambient noise. That's the sort of noise that surrounds us, that always seems to be in the air.

Highway noise is a major contributor of community ambient noise. Trucks contribute the highest levels. Motorcycles, some sports cars, and automobiles contribute decreasing amounts of noise in that order. The manner in which the vehicle is operated can significantly alter the noise output. High rates of acceleration and spinning tires on dry pavements are familiar examples. Faulty equipment and the alteration of standard equipment, such as the gutting of mufflers, are also common problems. As noted previously, the Walsh-Healy requirements establish a maximum level of 90 dBA for continuous ex-

posure. The noise level from some vehicles at a distance of 25 feet often exceeds this.

Noise from airplanes in the vicinity of airports has been a source of complaints and the subject of lawsuits. Recently, the Federal Aviation Administration set noise requirements as part of the certification of new airplanes. The problem of retrofitting existing airplanes for noise abatement is under study by the F.A.A., but has not been resolved.

The Federal Government, through the F.A.A. has preempted the control of aviation, leaving limited approaches for control by state and local municipalities. Operators of airports can control noise to some extent by excluding aircraft which emit noise in excess of criteria which the operator might establish.

Noise levels emitted by home power equipment such as lawn mowers, snow blowers, chain saws, and other devices both indoors and outdoors, often exceed 90 dBA. The potential hearing damage risk, as well as the noise encroachment on the neighborhood and community, should be eliminated. But how?

Other than the Multiple Dwelling Law applicable to cities of population in excess of 500,000, no noise control provisions exist in the building codes of the State on a statewide basis. Too often, lack of privacy in dwelling units is realized after the project is completed. This is then reflected in low occupancy figures for the housing complex.

Public buildings, office buildings, and industrial offices are often constructed with the same lack of privacy. Auditoriums, lecture rooms, and classrooms are not used to their capacity or for as many functions as they could be because of unsatisfactory room acoustics and inferior isolation from outside noise sources or building equipment.

Another contributor to community noise is construction and demolition equipment. The intensities of the jack hammers, rock drills, pile drivers, and other typical construction and earth-moving equipment are substantially above 90 dBA. The noise of these machines is frequently spilled into the atmosphere with little or no muffling.

CONSTITUTION MANDATES NOISE CONTROL

Like the United States Constitution, the New York State Constitution considers noise. Section 4 Article 14 of the State Constitution declares "the policy of the State shall be to conserve and protect its natural resources and scientific beauty and encourage the development and improvement of its agricultural lands for the production of food and other agricultural products. The Legislature, in implementing this policy, shall include adequate provision for the abatement . . . of excessive and unnecessary noise . . ."

Although New York State has a limited number of laws relating to specific numerical limitations, there are laws controlling noise, in a general sense, such as nuisance type laws. Legal power for abatement of noise can be found in state and local statutes.

The penal law deals with this nuisance in various forms and the general business law deals with prevention of noise which unreasonably disturbs the peace on Sundays.

The Vehicle and Traffic Law requires vehicles to be equipped with mufflers and exhaust systems to prevent excessive noise. In 1965, the Vehicle and Traffic Law was amended by specifying the maximum quantity of acceptable noise from a motor vehicle. The limit established was 88 decibels and the A-scale when measured at a distance of 50 feet at a maximum vehicle operating speed of 35 mph. That's still a pretty loud VRROOM. But anything more is against the law.

In 1970, the New York State Legislature passed a law controlling noise from snowmobiles. That law made no provision for existing snowmobiles; however, it specified that no snowmobile manufactured after June 1, 1972 will be sold or offered for sale unless it is equipped with a muffler that limits engine noise to not more than 82 decibels as measured on the A-scale at 50 feet. After June 1, 1974, this noise level limit is reduced to 73 decibels on the A-scale at 50 feet.

There are many noise control bills on file in the 1971–72 New York State Legislature. They range from inspection of mufflers to consideration of supersonic aircraft noise.

As far as local governments are concerned, a bill has been filed to amend the general city, village, and town law permitting local governments to establish regulations in which noise emission is limited to specific levels.

ENCOURAGE LOCAL REGULATIONS

I personally, would recommend that local governments be encouraged to make regulations restricting excessive noise in their communities, providing their regulations would not compromise nor conflict with functions of the State in establishing a comprehensive statewide noise abatement program. I would also hope that the local regulations should permit adoption, on a local option basis, of model codes, rules or regulations which the State may establish. Local regulations should be equal to or more stringent than codes, rules, or regulations which the State establishes. In formulating local noise regulations, it is important to include specific noise limits in terms of decibels.

A comprehensive statewide noise abatement program for our State is needed now. The program should prevent further noise pollution in the State and concurrently, systematically reduce existing excessive noise levels. State operations, purchases, and projects should lead the noise abatement program by reflecting these policies.

NEW BUREAU

Budget requests have been submitted to the 1971–72 New York State Legislature for funds to establish a Bureau of Acoustics and Noise Abatement within the Department of Environmental Conservation. The Bureau will take on increasing responsibility and importance as it develops model codes, standards, rules and regulations. Its functions will expand to include all areas of acoustics and noise control such as aircraft, highway and mass transportation noise, consumer product noise, industrial noise, architectural acoustics, building codes, community noise and research into the effects of noise on hearing, speech communication, annoyance and other physiological effects.

Studies will be conducted with the cooperation of other State agencies to develop criteria, standards, and measuring procedures, utilizing the latest technology—including the use of computers.

The progress and development of our society can and must continue without being hampered by noise pollution. Needed, however, is a new approach to noise and its effects on people in the design and use of products; in the administration of services; and in the construction and use of buildings and residences.

A limited amount of noise abatement effort has been put forth in some areas of design and construction, but noise abatement has been disregarded in far more areas. The government must establish a noise abatement program which gets down to specifics.

Supplementing this program is the need for educating the public about noise and a need to enlist industry to help. A program which encourages the joint efforts of all elements of our society can be most effective in the solution of the problem. The main impetus must come from the State and federal governments who should establish specific requirements for their respective areas of control. Local regulations should supplement those set by other levels of government.

THE BASIS FOR SECURITY ASSISTANCE

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, ever since foreign assistance became a basic part of U.S. foreign policy, we have sought to help friendly countries enhance their security against external attack and internal chaos resulting from subversion. It has been argued, and rightly so, that such aid bolsters the security of the United States.

Security assistance traditionally has been part of the total aid legislative package. Indeed, for a good part of the past quarter of a century, this had made sense.

It continues to make sense, but we must change our methods, to reflect changes which have taken place in the relationships among nations. The techniques of security assistance and those of developmental assistance do not always coincide in today's world. And there is, as one writer has put it, "a tangle of authority and administration" when security assistance and development assistance are tied in one package. Nearly every recent study of our foreign aid program has recommended that security assistance and development assistance be separated.

The legislative proposals before us recognize the changes on which such a separation should be based. When we first initiated the policy of military assistance in the late 1940's, the cold war was a monolithic fact. This has changed. Today, both the Soviet Union and mainland China are nuclear powers. The Communist nations vary widely in the rigidity of their ideologies. There is a great difference between the international philosophies of Albania and Yugoslavia, for example. We are also beginning to see some modification of our manner of dealing with Communist China. We are talking arms limitations with the Soviet Union. We are increasingly trading with, and visiting with, the peoples of the Communist world.

Twenty years ago, Western Europe and Japan were weak and ravaged, vulnerable to aggression. Our direct assistance was necessary. Today, these countries are stronger, more able to defend themselves, and, in fact, more capable of aiding the less-developed countries. And there are a number of developing countries which have grown stronger economically and militarily, able to make the necessary military decisions and to implement them with a minimum of outside help.

Such changes call for a new approach. The proposed security assistance legislation implements this new concept. It would embrace the several facets that today are so diffuse. Military assistance, military credit sales, supporting assistance and public safety would be contained in one act, separated in authority and administration from economic development.

This would remove much of the con-

fusion of purposes of the U.S. foreign aid effort. It would be a step toward more efficient and more effective administration. It would provide a basis for imaginative and flexible strengthening of this type of assistance. It would further the spirit of partnership and negotiation called for by the President for these changing times.

POWER IRONY

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, three articles appeared side-by-side in the May 18 edition of the Portland, Maine, Press Herald which, taken together, suggest the imminence and potential impact of widespread electrical power failure, and at least one means of averting much of the magnitude of the coming crisis.

The articles appear below. The first is an Associated Press dispatch regarding the prediction by the President's Office of Emergency Preparedness of a nationwide summer electric power crisis. The second is a United Press International story relating the Nova Scotia government's concern over rising power costs and increasing power shortages in the Northeast United States, and that Government's apparent need to radically change its stance on the development of its own hydroelectric power source. The third article concerns a proposed New England hydroelectric facility which was authorized by the U.S. Congress 6 years ago, but for which planning funds have yet to be fully allocated.

Would that we could order our resources to meet pressing needs as well as the Portland Press Herald arranges its news items.

The three articles follow:

UNITED STATES REVEALS PLAN TO CONSERVE POWER

WASHINGTON.—The federal government, predicting an electric power crisis in some areas this summer, announced Monday a nationwide campaign to conserve electricity.

A report issued by the President's Office of Emergency Preparedness indicated that brownouts and blackouts are likely to occur in some areas, as they have in other recent summers.

"The electric power supply situation in parts of the United States appears to be worse than last summer," the report said.

Electric generating capacity is too low for adequate safety margins in most areas except the West Coast, it said, and such safety margins as do exist depend largely on new equipment that could be delayed and on old equipment prone to breakdowns.

Fuel supplies appear adequate, the report said, but the generating capacity just isn't there, and breakdowns coupled with summer heat waves may overtax the system.

"At the present time," said the report, "the most feasible way to avoid an emergency power situation this summer is an extensive conservation program to be exercised by the government, industry and the public during the critical summer months."

It said conservation during times of peak usage is the key to avoiding major power interruptions this summer.

George A. Lincoln, director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, said power conservation has received little attention until now.

"We could build better insulated houses and use less fuel and electric power," Lincoln said. "We could use lower-powered and less polluting cars and less gasoline. We could have less ostenatious and wasteful lighting in many places.

NOVA SCOTIAN SAYS FUEL SHORTAGE SHOWS NEED TO HARNESS FUNDY TIDES

BOSTON.—The shrinking supply of pollution-causing fossil fuels has strengthened the case for harnessing tides in the Bay of Fundy for power, Prime Minister Gerald A. Regan of Nova Scotia said Monday.

Regan said an international consortium, headed by Baron Edmund de Rothchild, is exploring the Fundy project in light of new cost developments.

The Northeast's thirst for electric power, the advance of technology and the continuing depletion of fossil fuels, the prime minister said, "makes development of our vast tidal power reserves inevitable and perhaps imminent."

In reopening the arguments on Fundy, Regan said the conditions have changed radically from a year ago when a Canadian study found the project unfeasible.

"At that time, it was felt that the costs of harnessing the Fundy tides were prohibitive in the short run, especially in view of the existing rates on borrowing money," he said.

"However, the rising costs and shortages of power in the Northeast U.S. have developed at a much more rapid rate than anyone had anticipated," Regan said.

The prime minister was visiting Boston on the Portland, Maine-based Prince of Fundy, a cruise ferry which operates between Portland and Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.

He noted that electrical demands will double every decade until the year 2000.

DICKEY-LINCOLN FUNDS SOUGHT BY HATHAWAY

WASHINGTON.—Rep. William D. Hathaway protested Monday that the United States has helped build a $28 million hydroelectric dam in Laos while refusing to allocate funds for a public power project in Maine.

Hathaway, stepping up his campaign to secure an $800,000 appropriation for the controversial Dickey-Lincoln School power project, pointed to recent reports from Laos where the massive Nam Ngum hydro project is nearing completion.

The congressman said the U.S. and eight other western nations had helped put up the money. He also said American observers in Laos had predicted that its benefits will fall as much to the Communist Pathet Lao as to the U.S. allies.

"The American government," Hathaway said. "should assure its own people benefits that are at least equal to those it is helping provide our enemies in Southeast Asia."

The Nixon budget contains no allocation for continuing the planning work on Dickey which has been rejected for the past four years by Congress. Hathaway said he will try to get the money added to the public works bill this year.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

Twenty years ago 2.4 million people in the United States were enrolled in colleges and universities. Now, there are 6.7 million working for degrees and another 600,000 learning occupational skills.

ELECTIONS SINCE 1965 IN REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a great deal of interest developing in the forthcoming presidential and vice presidential elections in the Republic of Vietnam. This being the case I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a chronology of the elections which have taken place in the Republic of Vietnam since 1965 as pertinent background material.

The chronology follows:

CHRONOLOGY OF ELECTIONS IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM SINCE 1965

May 30, 1965—Province Level Elections. These elections were conducted throughout South Viet Nam for provincial and municipal councils. Government of Viet Nam officials and ARVN personnel were prohibited from running. Throughout South Viet Nam, 1,000 candidates contested 471 seats. Of the 4.7 million registered voters, 3.5 million, or 74% cast ballots. To make voting easier for those who read with difficulty, each candidate chose an identifying symbol to emblazon on his campaign posters. The major organized laber confederation elected 13 of its 16 candidates. In the central provinces, candidates associated with Buddhist organizations made strong showings. Foreign press observers termed the elections the most honest Viet Nam had ever had up to that time.

September 11, 1966—Nationwide election for a 117-member Constituent Assembly brought out some 4.3 million voters, representing 80.8 per cent of the registered electorate and over 55 per cent of the estimated population of voting age, despite a major Viet Cong effort to disrupt the elections.

September 27, 1966—The Constituent Assembly convened and prepared a democratic Constitution which was promulgated on April 1, 1967. Constitution provides for a modified presidential system, a bicameral legislature, an independent judiciary, a basic bill of rights for citizens.

March–June 1967—The first round of village and hamlet elections held. These elections were bitterly opposed by the Communists, who killed six and kidnapped 18 candidates, killed 15 and kidnapped 38 voters, in 555 terrorist incidents. Despite Viet Cong attempts to frustrate the elections, 2,511,543 voters (77.6 per cent of those registered) elected officials in 984 villages and 4,600 hamlets.

September 3, 1967—Election of President Nguyen Van Thieu, Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky, and 60 members of the Upper House of the National Assembly. There were 8,824 polling stations in the 50 provinces and municipalities of Vietnam. Out of the 5,853,251 registered voters, 83.3% went to the polls. There were 11 candidates for the Presidency and 480 candidates for the 60 Senate seats. The Thieu-Ky slate received 34.8% of the vote, twice as much as the next closest slate which received 17.2%. Eighty percent of the voters went to candidates who advocated no

compromise with the Viet Cong. In addition to 116 official observers, more than 600 foreign correspondents, cameramen, and TV crews, representing the world's major news services overwhelmingly concluded that the Government of South Viet Nam had made every attempt to hold an honest election, that voting officials had demonstrated a high level of efficiency, and that the elections themselves were free and fair by any reasonable standards.

October 22, 1967—Election of a 137-member Lower House with representation based on population and including deputies from minority groups. Seventy three percent of the registered voters of South Vietnam selected 135 men and two women for the Lower House membership widely representative of both national and local political interests. The major religious groups were widely represented with about 65 Buddhists, some 35 Catholics, and the remainder split among the various other religious groups: Hoa Hao, Cao Dai, Confucianists, and others.

October 31, 1967—Inauguration of President Nguyen Van Thieu and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky. Several of the defeated Presidential candidates take positions in the national government.

March 1969—Village and hamlet elections took place in more than 3,600 communities throughout South Vietnam on four successive Sundays in March. Over one million men and women, representing nearly 90% of the eligible electorate, went to the polls and elected 7,741 leaders—village council members, hamlet chiefs, and deputy hamlet chiefs. These March elections, together with rural elections held in 1967 and 1968, brought elected councils to 1,693 of South Vietnam's 2,130 villages and elected chiefs to 7,867 of its 10,755 hamlets.

June 1969—Almost 90% of the eligible voters turned out to choose 1,121 hamlet chiefs and 1,092 village council members in rural elections held on the first four Sundays in June. It was the second phase of the Government's program to hold country-wide rural elections before the end of 1969. Combined with previous election results, these June elections brought fully-elected councils to 1,891 of Vietnam's 2,130 villages and locally-elected chiefs to 8,776 of its 10,775 hamlets.

July 11, 1969—President Thieu proposed elections in which "all political parties and groups, including the 'NLF' . . . can participate . . . if they renounce violence and pledge themselves to accept the results of the elections." To provide special guarantees to ensure fairness, he proposed the establishment of an electoral commission with NLF participation, and an international supervisory body—in his six-point proposal for a political settlement of the war in Vietnam.

March, April and May 1970—Village Council elections. By early 1970 council elections had been held in more than 2,000 of the 2,300 villages of South Vietnam. In March 1970 the three-year terms of the councils elected in March 1967 expired and by May 1970 more than 900 second round elections had been conducted. Elections will continue over the next three years as the three-year terms of the councils expire. Voting percentages averaged about 85 percent of the registered voters, versus 78 percent for 1967. There was a major turnover in village council membership, averaging around 50 percent. A significant percentage of those elected were local officials, Regional and Popular Force and Revolutionary Development personnel.

June 28, 1970—Province/Municipal elections. Elections were held for city councils in the cities of Saigon, Vung Tau, Dalat, Cam Ranh, Hue and Danang and provincial councils in each of the 44 provinces. Seventy-three percent of those eligible cast ballots. Increasing interest was demonstrated in these elections by political parties and religious associations, but most candidates ran without publicizing party affiliations.

August 30, 1970—Upper House Elections. Sixteen slates of ten men each contested for the thirty seats up for re-election in South Vietnam's Senate. The leading ticket in the balloting was the Buddhist slate. (The opposition Buddhists had boycotted the 1967 elections.) The second winning slate was an Independent Opposition slate and the third leading slate was a ticket generally in support of the present South Vietnamese administration and its policies. More than 65% of the eligible voters of the country participated in the voting. Representatives of the 13 losing slates described the elections as the most honest they had ever experienced.

August 1971—Lower House elections scheduled.

October 1971—Presidential and Vice Presidential elections scheduled.

August 1974—Upper House elections for one-half of the Senate.

The above record of competitive and increasing progressive political development in the Republic of Vietnam stands in sharpest contrast with the totally restrictive Stalinist pattern imposed as a monopoly of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party in North Vietnam.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE THOMPSON

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, success, it is said, has many fathers but defeat is an orphan.

Today I wish to join many of my constituents from Ponca City in paying tribute to a man who was defeated Wednesday, but only in the technical sense.

Mike Thompson, who only 4 years ago was whizzing fast balls by opposing teams for Ponca City High School, made his major league debut last night, pitching for the Washington Senators against the world champion Baltimore Orioles.

He has a great tradition to uphold. Oklahoma, after all, has sent such greats as Mickey Mantle, Allie Reynolds, Johnny Bench, and Warren Spahn to the majors as well as others too numerous to mention. In fact, I would place our alltime, all-star team against any other State.

Mike, understandably nervous, walked four batters in the first inning, but then settled down and blanked the Birds for the next six innings on only one hit—a remarkable achievement.

Had it not been for an unearned run in the first, Mike would have had a 1–1 tie. As it was, he left trailing 2–1 and the Orioles eventually won, 4–1.

But he made a remarkable showing for a 21-year-old making his first start, of great promise for things to come.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my Maryland colleagues for their great Baltimore team and their victory last night. But I also wish to give them fair warning. They will yet rue the day Mike Thompson left the Ponca City school system and signed a Senators' contract.

COL. WALTER J. RILEY, 95-YEAR-OLD BANKER CELEBRATES 62D ANNIVERSARY AS INDIANA'S NO. 1 PIONEER BANKER

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet industrial region of northwest Indiana is proud of its oldest active pioneer banker and businessman, Col. Walter J. Riley of East Chicago. I include with my remarks an article from the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune for Friday, May 14, 1971, lauding the career of Colonel Riley:

COLONEL RILEY OBSERVES 62D BANKING ANNIVERSARY

Col. Walter J. Riley, honorary chairman of the board of the First National Bank of East Chicago, observes his 62nd anniversary in banking today.

A lively 95 years old, he is still actively interested in all phases of the bank's operations and community affairs.

He was vice president of the newly organized First Calumet Trust and Savings Bank, near the corner of Chicago and Kennedy Avenues, when it opened on May 14, 1909, with one teller's cage.

The first published statement of condition showed capital of $50,000 and deposits of $75,371.24. The successor bank today has total resources of more than $135 million.

Riley erected a two-story building and organized a bank at Main and Broadway in the Indiana Harbor section in 1912. In 1916 he put up the building at the northeast corner of Chicago and Kennedy and moved the original bank into it. The structure now houses the Riley Company, engaged in all forms of insurance.

In succeeding years, he opened a bank in a seven-story building at Main and Broadway, and the First National Bank of East Chicago in the two-story structure at the corner of Chicago Avenue and Indianapolis Blvd. The former now is the Indiana Harbor office of the First National Bank of East Chicago, and the latter is the East Chicago office.

Mr. Speaker, I further include with my remarks an article from the Hammond, Ind., Times of Sunday, November 29, 1970, when Colonel Riley celebrated his 95th birthday:

[From the Hammond (Ind.) Times, Nov. 29, 1970]

COWBOY, SALESMAN, JUDGE, ARMY OFFICER, HUMANITARIAN, BANKER

On December 9, 1970, Colonel Walter J. Riley marks his 95th birthday. He is Honorary Chairman of the Board of First National Bank of East Chicago, Indiana . . . his lifetime is a colorful mosaic of experiences spanning the century.

COWBOY

First career for the adventuresome Irishman born in Chicago was on the plains of Colorado and Wyoming, as a cowboy and then as a stagecoach driver. He had been severely afflicted with asthma, so badly his parents sent him to Colorado. On advice of the family physician, he lived and slept in the open air. Included in the intrepid youth's "stagecoach run" was the famed gold mining town of Cripple Creek during the height of its boom.

While a storekeeper in Gypsum, Colorado, young Riley received his first acclaim when, at the risk of his life, he took part in a

daring rescue that saved the life of the engineer following a railroad wreck in Glenwood Canyon.

He returned to Chicago, where he became acquainted with Charles W. Hotchkiss, who left a lasting influence on Riley's career. Railroad executive, promoter and capitalist, Hotchkiss' plans for building a belt railroad and ship canal at Indiana Harbor to develop industry so impressed Riley that he went to work for him selling real estate in the raw new community.

Thus did a 65-year love affair between a brash, confident youth and East Chicago begin.

SALESMAN

As a commission salesman in a town full of salesmen, he knew he had to work hard. "Most of them caught the train back to Chicago every night," he recalls. "I stayed here and kept working."

Hotchkiss and Riley overcame many obstacles to build the Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad and the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal. Hotchkiss developed a plan whereby the New York Central Railroad purchased 60% of the stock of the Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad, while the Milwaukee Road and the Chicago & North Western Railway each acquired 20% of the stock. The East Chicago Company with Hotchkiss as its president built the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal with no financial assistance from any individual, firm, corporation, or governmental body, after six or seven engineering firms had failed. Completion of the railroad and the canal set the stage for East Chicago's dramatic industrial development. The Colonel and Hotchkiss together personally were responsible for bringing almost all of its industrial might to East Chicago, the world's largest steel producer and the nation's largest oil refiner. Colonel Riley served for 55 years as head of the East Chicago Manufacturers Association.

Earlier, the thirst for knowledge grew. Riley responded in the only way he knew: hard work. And it was through hard work, attending law school at night, that he graduated as valedictorian of his class.

JUDGE

Lawyer Riley became Judge Riley in 1910 when East Chicago grew large enough to have a city judge and the Democratic Governor Tom Marshall named "the man best qualified for the position", although Riley was a Republican.

Many friends call him Judge Riley today, and a few address him as "Six Months" Riley, a name earned through his relentless and consistent sentencing of wife beaters.

BANKER

In 1909, ex-cowboy, salesman, Attorney Riley became Banker Riley with the formation of the First Calumet Trust and Savings Bank, in conjunction with Hotchkiss. Hotchkiss told Riley to run the bank and run it he did. "I never had a day's vacation in four years."

Hotchkiss made me work. But he was the best boss in the world. Unfortunately for me and the people of the Calumet Region, Mr. Hotchkiss died at an early age in 1916." Through mergers and changes, this bank eventually became the First National Bank of East Chicago, Indiana, which grew in resources from $125 thousand to $125 million.

ARMY OFFICER

During World War I, Governor Goodrich appointed Riley a Colonel in the Indiana National Guard and the new Colonel's office was liaison headquarters for War, Navy, Justice and Treasury Departments in the Calumet Region, where thousands of workers were engaged in the production of munitions.

The Colonel was never far from the business of business. In those days he was president of O. F. Jordan Company, a manufacturer of heavy duty railway track maintenance equipment, and founded The Riley Company, an active insurance and real estate firm.

Colonel Riley the banker enjoyed an era of world travel and pleasant living . . . until the "hard times" of the Thirties struck. Through his determination and the financial assistance of the community's industries, the Riley bank held fast. No depositor lost a penny.

HUMANITARIAN

He was the first benefactor of the Carmelite Home for the Orphans and throughout the years a "Friend of the Orphans," and he was the originator of Saint Catherine's Hospital, both in East Chicago.

On his 95th Birthday Colonel Riley remains active in the bank he founded and in the community he loves.

The story of the pioneer hardships endured by young Walter J. Riley at the turn of the century should be good reading for the youth of today especially the few young people who spend so much time denouncing their Government. Our Nation offers far more opportunities to modern American youth than existed at the turn of the century when Walter J. Riley fought almost insurmountable harships and long hours of work and took advantage of the freedoms and opportunities a free Government extends to its citizens.

MAYDAY'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL ARRESTS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the illegality and the unconstitutionality of the arrests here in Washington during the first week in May is daily becoming clearer. Many distinguished members of the Nation's legal community and countless citizens outside the legal community have expressed their deep concern and outrage over the callous disregard exhibited by Federal authorities for the most fundamental cornerstones of our liberty and freedom—the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. In addition to the many expressions of concern and substantiated personal statements regarding despicable conditions in the jails, the highly questionable manner of the arrests, and so forth, we are now learning the facts about the disposition of the legal cases. I call the attention of my colleagues to a particularly illuminating article from the Washington Post of May 19, 1971 summarizing the results of the disposition of the first 2,000 cases. In only one case could Federal authorities present sufficient evidence in order to obtain a conviction. A complete statistical breakdown is included in the following article.

The week of Mayday activities revealed a great deal about the way this Nation of ours has become in recent years. In the eyes of much of the world we are a Nation too often afraid of legitimate dissent, of constitutionally guaranteed disagreement and protest over the policies of our Government. What is more, we are a Nation governed by an administration that would freely violate the rule of law for political expediency and gain. For many of our citizens this revelation is not a new one, such feelings have been articulated by the young and the not so young for many years now. Because of the eloquence of its analysis of this reminder, I offer for your consideration the advertisement placed in the May 17, 1971 Washington Post by the American Civil Liberties Union of the National Capital Area.

The article and advertisement follows:

COURT DISMISSES MOST OF 2,000 PROTEST CASES

The overwhelming majority of the first 2,000 Mayday antiwar demonstrator cases processed through Superior Court were thrown out, official Court figures show.

The figures, made public yesterday by Arnold M. Malech, Court executive officer, showed that only one demonstrator was found guilty after a trial in the disposition of the initial 2,000 cases.

By contrast, a large majority of the defendants were cleared of the disorderly conduct charges against them without a hearing.

According to the statistics, charges were dismissed in 712 cases while the D.C. corporation counsel's office did not file charges in 420 other cases and decided not to prosecute in another 131 cases. In addition, 55 demonstrators who stood trial were acquitted.

Although court records show that 588 persons were found guilty, almost all of these—a total of 584—entered pleas of nolo contendre (no contest). Three others pleaded guilty.

Of these, 347 were released on the basis of time spent in jail while waiting trial, 218 were given suspended sentences, and 22 were given fines. Another 93 chose to forfeit collateral rather than come to court.

With disposition of these cases, which total 1,999, the Court still has 5,200 demonstrator cases pending, according to Malech's report.

About 2,700 other demonstrators have posted collateral—an amount paid to insure court appearance—and are expected to stand trial. No court papers have been filed yet in their cases.

More than 12,000 people were arrested during the Mayday demonstrations here. Most of those not scheduled in court initially forfeited collateral.

The American Civil Liberties Union said yesterday that in two days it had received 449 personal or telephone responses to its call for documentation of "illegal arrests and detention" during the Mayday war protests.

Of these, 79 people had already completed affidavits, it said.

THE VIETNAMIZATION OF AMERICA

In the aftermath of the Mayday disturbances in Washington, the President of the United States and his Attorney General are congratulating each other on their handling of the crisis. They have no reason to do so. They botched the job. They had the problem of enforcing the law against traffic disruptors through legitimate law enforcement methods. They had advance notice, resources, manpower and the experience of previous disturbances at hand, and they still made a mess of it.

They have jubilantly told the American people that they kept the traffic moving. What they haven't told us is the terrible price we paid for traffic control. They achieved their "victory" by suspending the rights guaranteed to us all under the Constitution and by imposing on us a domestic version of the techniques used on the helpless people of Vietnam:

The Free Arrest Zone: Like the free fire

zone in Vietnam, the objective was to pick several areas and arrest everybody in them, including the bystanders and people on the way to work. The maneuver netted lawyers, government workers, students, newspaper reporters, medical observers and children. We say categorically that the majority of those arrested were not committing any offense whatever, and the government knew it when they swept them up and knows it now.

The "Gooks": Anybody with a beard, long hair or unconventional dress was marked for immediate arrest, no matter where they were or what they were doing—or not doing. They were the "enemy" just as all civilian Vietnamese—North or South, men, women and children—are the enemy—"gooks," "slants," and "slopes."

The Body Count: We've gotten used to the routine falsification of records in Vietnam. Now it has been brought to America. Police didn't bother with field arrest forms; after they herded those arrested into detention centers, they simply made up the forms. They used the names of six or seven policemen on a rotating basis as the arresting officers. **These arrest records are false.**

The successful adaption of Vietnamization to America reached its peak when more than 7,000 American citizens were illegally penned into detention centers without shelter, adequate food or water, sanitary facilities or medical attention, without the chance to notify their families or call a lawyer. Thousands of them were held without arrest forms, without any possibility that they could be connected with the disturbances, let alone prosecuted and convicted.

IT DID HAPPEN HERE

There have been police excesses before—in Chicago at the Convention and here in Washington after the assassination of Dr. King. This was different. There can be no excuse of "over-reaction" or "pressing the panic button." This time, the violations of the law and of the Constitution were carefully planned and coldly executed.

Above all, it wasn't necessary.

The same amount of planning could have produced a workable method for apprehending only the actual wrongdoers. Instead, the President and the Attorney General made a calculated decision that it served their political ends to escalate a troublesome disturbance into a massive show of governmental power. Now the Attorney General is encouraging police officers all over the country to follow his lead in jettisoning the Constitution and ignoring the law.

WE DON'T INTEND TO LET THEM GET AWAY WITH IT

The ACLU will challenge every violation of the Constitution by the police and the government. We are preparing damages suits on behalf of those swept up in the police dragnet and held incommunicado under inhuman conditions. We will file an injunction suit against the police, the Justice Department, the custodial authorities and the courts to prevent the massive breakdown of our system of justice again. We will pursue these legal remedies with whatever it takes, for as long as it takes.

WE NEED YOUR HELP

We have already collected scores of accounts of illegal arrests and detention. We need hundreds more. We need evidence—carefully documented facts—and we need it fast.

If you were arrested during the disturbances, please let us know.

If you know anybody who was arrested—even people who have since left town—please give us their names and addresses.

If you witnessed sweep arrests without cause, or any other police misconduct, please let us have your story.

Just call the special numbers below, or come into the ACLU office and talk to us, or mail in the coupon.

WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT

The fight to restore the Constitution as the law of the land will be a long, uphill task. It will take all the energy, talent and resources we have. Above all, it will take money. We will fail without the support of thousands of citizens who care about what happened here, and who are determined that they won't let it happen again.

We ask you to send your contribution now—as much as you can—to give the American people their day in court.

American Civil Liberties Union of the National Capital Area: James H. Heller, Chairman, Florence B. Robin, Executive Director, Ralph J. Temple, Legal Director, ACLU Fund.

American Civil Liberties Union Committee, To Protest the Vietnamization of America:

Philip Sorsenson, Milton Viorst, Judith Viorst, Hon. Parren J. Mitchell, Bruce Terris, Rev. Channing Phillips, Roger Kuhn, Topper Carew, Hon. Bella Abzug.

Richard Barnet, Julius Hobson, Fr. William Wendt, William Simons, Hon. Ron Dellums, Monroe H. Freedman, Rev. David Eaton, Allison W. Brown, Jr., Rev. Thomas B. Allen, Jane F. Allen, Hon. Charles B. Rangel, Donald A. Brown, Ann W. Brown, Rev. Joel L. Gipson.

Dr. Allen Lenchek, Philip J. Hirschkop, Russell B. Stevenson, Jr., Hon. Louis Stokes, Dr. Earl Callen, Addison M. Bowman, James M. Johnstone, Mrs. Jerome Jacobson, Polly Shackleton.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr., David Carliner, David H. Marlin, Jacqueline Marlin, Stuart H. Johnson, Jr., Barbara S. Heller, Hope Eastman, Rev. Edgar Lockwood, John Vanderstar, Elizabeth M. Stern, Sam Smith, Ralph H. Dwan, Jr., Rabbi Eugene Lipman, Glen Carroll, John R. Risher, Jr.

Annette Klayman, Robert A. Klayman, Barbara Raskin, Marcus Raskin, Hon. Herman Badillo, Dr. Mary Coleman, Robert Choate, Rev. Philip R. Newell, Jr., Hon. William F. Ryan, Howard C. Eglit, Hon. Walter E. Fauntroy.

Marvin Caplan, Lola Johnson Singletary, Joseph Forer, David Rein, Hon. William Clay, Michael Ambrose, Reed Whittemore, Dorothy Butler Gilliam, Hon. Donald Fraser, I. F. Stone, Hon. Richard L. Ottinger, Betty Ann Ottinger, Philip A. Stern.

If you were arrested, call 483–3832 or 483–3833, or come to the ACLU office or return this coupon . . .

I was/know someone who was — arrested — a witness.

Please send — affidavit form(s) to:

Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip:

Mail to: American Civil Liberties Union of the National Capital Area, 1424 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

If you want to help . . .

Here is my check to help stop the Vietnamization of America.

Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip:

Mail to: American Civil Liberties Union of the National Capital Area, 1424 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Committee information, American Civil Liberties Union, Edward J. Ennis, National Chairman, Ramsey Clark, Chairman, National Advisory Council, Aryeh Neier, Executive Director.

THE NEED FOR A FEDERAL PRIVACY ACT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to our colleagues' attention the attached article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times. It reports the alleged use of the Boy Scouts of America by the FBI as informers. Frankly, I do not know whether reports from the Boy Scouts or other such groups are being placed in dossiers maintained by Federal agencies, but if H.R. 854 were passed, we would know.

That bill would provide that each Federal agency maintaining records concerning an individual must:

First, notify the individual that such a record exists;

Second, notify the individual of all transfers of such information;

Third, disclose information from such records only with the consent of the individual or when legally required;

Fourth, maintain a record of all persons inspecting such records;

Fifth, permit the individual to inspect his records, make copies of them, and supplement them.

Exceptions would be made in cases specifically required by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of national security or for cases awaiting prosecution. The President would be required to report to the Congress each year on an agency-by-agency basis the number of records withheld for the above reasons.

There are now 121 House cosponsors of the bill. On the Senate side this legislation has been introduced by Mr. BAYH.

The best way to combat reports such as this one, and to quell the fear and suspicion that permit them such wide credibility, is to pass the Federal Privacy Act.

The article follows:

ROLE OF ROCHESTER SCOUTS AS "INFORMERS" IS BELITTLED

(By Homer Bigart)

Are Boy Scouts being used as "informers" by the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Well, certainly not in a snooping sense, said a statement yesterday from national headquarters of the Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J.

The statement denied that 20,000 Boy Scouts in Rochester had ever been recruited as "extra eyes and ears" of the police, as reported in a document said to have been stolen from the F.B.I.

All the Rochester Scouts were asked to do was report to police agencies suspicious acts or incidents that endangered life or property, exercising the same surveillance that is the duty of any citizen, Scout officials said.

Reports of the alleged F.B.I. document inspired visions of Cub patrols spying on "suscicious" persons, eavesdropping on conversations and keeping a wary eye on strangers instead of following the more Scoutly pursuits of tying knots and studying Indian lore.

The document, which a group called the Citizens Commission to Investigate the F.B.I. says it stole from the Media, Pa., office of the Federal agency, praised the Rochester experiment as a "positive program" to reduce crime.

But the national Scout officials said the Rochester program amounted to nothing more than the distribution of a pamphlet at a 1969 Scout rally suggesting that Scouts keep alert for about 60 signs of trouble. There was no "follow-up," and no organization of a parapolice agency among the Scouts, the officials said.

In Rochester yesterday, Gene Cruse, the local Scout executive, said the pamphlet had been prepared by the Rochester Emergency Services Committee, which included the local and state police, the Fire Department, the sheriff's office, the Coast Guard, the F.B.I., the

Poison Control Center and Civil Defense.

Mr. Cruse said the Scouts had been asked to report such things as faulty traffic signs, blown-out street lights, fires, youngsters playing with matches, trees blown down, flooded viaducts, suspicious strangers in neighbors' homes and suspicious strangers loitering about schools.

Asked if the Scouts were required to "snoop," he said: "Hell, no, they would report to police only as participating citizens."

In New Brunswick, Alden G. Barber, chief executive of the Boy Scouts of America, explained:

"With our emphasis on citizenship and character building, the B.S.A. does help boys be prepared for emergencies. This includes having a boy know where he can go or call to get help for emergencies like fires, traffic accidents, break-ins or vandalism which endanger the lives and property of parents and friends. We consider this an important job for any citizen."

PANEL DISCUSSION ON PESTICIDES

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Committee has had several bills under consideration this Congress which would change the regulations surrounding the use of agricultural chemicals.

Shortly after the conclusion of our public hearings, I was invited by the Chamber of Commerce to participate in a panel discussion centering on pesticides. Mr. Dean Parsons, a wheatgrower from South Dakota, two gentlemen from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Arch N. Booth, the executive vice president, and Mr. Donald Lerch of Lerch & Co., member of the chamber's agribusiness and rural affairs committee, and I took part in the discussion.

I am inserting a copy of the transcript of that discussion in the RECORD today, Mr. Speaker, in order to make available to all of my colleagues the informative and enlightening comments of these men:

PANEL DISCUSSION ON PESTICIDES

What's The Issue"—Pesticides.

Broadcast Date—April 8, 1971.

Moderator—Arch N. Booth.

Guests—Congressman Graham Purcell (D-Tex.); Dean Parsons, Wall, South Dakota; Donald Lerch, Lerch & Co., Washington, D.C.

Mr. BOOTH. Today's program is about pesticides. The American public is becoming more and more concerned about the chemicals used to accomplish a variety of things—mainly about steps that are being taken to prohibit the use of pesticides that are harmful to human health and the environment. The pressure for Federal controls over all factors of our environment is increasing. There is the Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the latest step is the proposed Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1971, contained in companion bills in the House and the Senate.

To discuss the subject, we have invited a Congressman, a farmer, and a consultant, who will tell us what we are facing and perhaps suggest some answers. Our guests are: Representative Graham Purcell of Wichita Falls, Texas; Dean Parsons, who operates a 7,000 acre farm in South Dakota; and Donald Lerch, who conducts an agribusiness consulting firm in Washington, and who is a member of the National Chamber's Agribusiness and Rural Affairs Committee.

Representative Purcell, let's start with you. How serious is the problem of pesticides as you see it? Now, we are familiar with Rachael Carson's book, "Silent Spring." Other various writers have had frightening things to say about poisons that may be getting into our food supply. We'd like to get the subject into perspective, so—how serious is the situation today?

Congressman PURCELL. I think the situation is quite serious, in that there are many, many people across this country, many of whom are not directly connected with agriculture or the chemical industry, or in any way involved in the agribusiness phase of pesticides. But these people are genuinely afraid—have been made afraid—for their health and environment. To me, one of the most significant things that this Congress will consider this year is this bill that you have just referred to. Some way, the Congress has to get a balance. In my judgment, we cannot abandon the scientific progress that has been made through the cooperation between governmental agencies, the industry that is involved in manufacturing pesticides, and above all, the farmers who use them. No one wants to damage our environment to the point of hurting people or destroying things; but we just have got to have a balance.

A substantial number of very well-intended, but truly misinformed people who have come before the committee are very adament in their stand against the use of any chemicals. Many of them want to outlaw—or regulate to the point of no possible use—some of the most useful chemicals that we've got. Some of these chemicals have proven to be the least harmful to the environment. And so, I think it is very important that we work together to have the public understand, and to continue scientific progress.

Mr. BOOTH. Mr. Lerch, I'd like to talk about some of the remedial steps that might be considered. As Congressman Purcell has said, there are many people who think the situation is serious enough to have some drastic steps taken by the Federal government. On these bills before Congress, what remedial steps are proposed?

Mr. LERCH. There are several, Mr. Booth. In the first place, the new bill, as I understand it, would make it illegal for a farmer to use pesticides not in accordance with the label. Up until this time, it has been assumed that the label contained instructions and that the farmers and all users, be they people in households, cities, or whatever, would follow the label. The industry for years has had educational campaigns to read and follow the label. Now as I understand it, Mr. Purcell, this new bill would make it illegal for anyone to use a pesticide not in accordance with the label, which means there could be fines and I believe in one case, if its willfully done, there even could be an imprisonment for a year.

The second part of the bill which I believe is particularly significant proposes "use" controls. Never before have we had "use" controls. In this connection, the bill would subdivide the pesticides into three categories; I believe, Mr. Purcell, this is an extremely controversial provision of the bill. The three categories are: "general use," "restricted use" and "use by permit only." My understanding is that those pesticides that do not have a long-lasting effect upon the environment and have no danger of toxicity to people or animals would be in the "general" category. A second category, "restricted" would include the products primarily which are highly toxic to the individual; and the third category would be those that primarily would cause—or could cause—long term questionable, possible harmful effects to the environment.

Now the bill also proposes a pesticide consultant. A farmer for instance, producing wheat or corn, if he wanted to use a pesticide in the "permit only" category, which might be a long lasting pesticide in the environment such as DDT, would have to get a written permit from a so-called, "pesticide consultant" to number one, use that particular product; and number two, to get another written permit every time he wanted to use the product. Now, these are a few of the questions, Mr. Booth, which Mr. Purcell and members of the House Committee on Agriculture are considering now; and I believe that these are some of the points over which there is considerable debate. Just one other factor. The pesticide industry, for which I consult, has accepted in principle the idea of making it illegal to use a pesticide not in accordance with the label, although I'm not sure they agree with the provisions of penalty. They also accept the ideas of use control, but not as specified in the bill.

Mr. BOOTH. Mr. Purcell, what reasons have been given to your committee for dividing pesticides into these different categories?

Mr. PURCELL. The reasons generally given are the "dangers that exist in using the various pesticides." Now those who are strong for extreme controls feel, based on the experience we've had, that some of the most toxic or long-lived chemicals should be limited to the "use by permit only" type of handling. This would be like getting a Dr.'s prescription for medicine that is otherwise poison. Such pesticides would then be used as directed by the consultant who would be trained, hopefully, and who would be knowledgeable in all areas. Now, this of course, is an Administration Bill that has been introduced by Mr. Poage, the Chairman of the committee and Mr. Belcher, the ranking Republican member, in order to get the matter before us. I do not pretend to speak for anyone except myself, but it's my judgment that the Committee should not be tagged as being for the bill as written, because these are extreme regulations and will have extreme effect on the use of progressive farm science. I don't know what will happen in Committee, but I think that there will be much study even yet, pertinent to these particular categories, and particularly to the "use by permit only" category.

Mr. BOOTH. Mr. Parsons, as a wheat grower, if you were required to obtain a permit or a prescription for the pesticides you need, would there be any complications in getting one that would affect your style of operation in any way?

Mr. PARSONS. Well, Mr. Booth, I can't help but see many dangers in this area. If we were sure that the man who would make the determination was accurate in his prescription, as you might call it, and understood the critical conditions, it would help some. But agriculture today is a big business, it's complicated, and we must have answers and have them immediately. I can't imagine the manpower that it would take to organize and operate a complicated scheme such as this. I think there are ways of protecting the environment and the people. We as farmers, are as concerned with this as anyone else. We're closer to nature than many people, I feel, and we're concerned about this. I'm sure that this will lead us into a terrific problem from the point of how many dollars it costs us to get the job done, the effectiveness of control, and the timeliness of control. We can't in this high-powered agriculture of today, take these chances with people who we're not sure really have the right answers.

Mr. BOOTH. Now could you produce wheat of high quality and in sufficient volume without the use of pesticides?

Mr. PARSONS. I really don't think so, Mr. Booth. Year to year and season to season, we have problems cropping up that need correction. We have bean bugs, grasshoppers, the brown wheat mite, the western cutworm,

all these different things that come along, and it would severely cripple the wheat industry if we didn't have some of these chemicals and methods of control.

Mr. LERCH. Mr. Booth, if I might inject a comment here, in view of what Mr. Parsons just said about his difficulty in producing a crop without the use of some of these chemicals. It seems to me that in some of these discussions we have been hearing about the web of life, which is nowhere more apparent than in agriculture. This is because agriculture, really, is a series of interrelated, biological life processes, and to interrupt the process in Mr. Parson's production of wheat by not letting him control certain insects or weeds or diseases or other factors could cause a real disaster. And it would be a disaster to the most productive part of our environment—agriculture.

Mr. BOOTH. We are in the Rayburn Office Building on Capital Hill in Washington, D.C., talking with three experts in the field of environmental control, particularly the use of pesticides. They are: Representative Graham Purcell of Texas, Dean Parsons, a South Dakota wheat farmer, and Donald Lerch, an agribusiness consultant. The National Chamber is holding its 59th Annual Meeting in Washington Sunday, April 25 through Tuesday, April 27. Delegates from 50 states will meet to discuss the most pressing problems facing the American people: health care, environmental quality, welfare, guaranteed annual income, business and the consumer, and many other subjects. For information, call or write the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Washington. Now back to our guests and the subject—pesticides and their use and control.

Representative Purcell, you've held hearings on this matter. Have the witnesses before your committee brought out both sides of the story? There must be considerable differences of opinion on the use or control of pesticides.

Mr. PURCELL. Both sides of the story have been very thoroughly brought out. In my ten years' experience in the Congress, I believe I've never heard such depth of evidence as we've had brought before us. Both sides have been very detailed in their defense of their own positions. But I believe it is correct to say that never before have I seen hysteria or fear appear to be one of the real criteria that is used by some people who feel very sincere, but in my judgment have not been scientifically oriented or informed of the real effect of what they are saying, or the real effect of the chemicals that are being questioned. I've never seen a situation in which the evidence varied so completely. There is literally 180 degrees difference between those of the scientific community and those who have taken it upon themselves to protect our environment at any cost. There are of course, some very highly qualified scientists who want strict controls, but the ones we have heard have been much smaller numbers.

Mr. BOOTH. I take it that what you are saying is that some of the enthusiasts probably don't understand the web of life that Mr. Lerch has just talked about.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, may I just inject here that, in my judgment, this is not really understood. The food chain, as its referred to, is not really understood. But I would say that the ones who would suffer, if the desire to have no chemicals used for agriculture is ever allowed to become reality, would be the consumers of this country. The consumers are really those who pay the bill, whatever the cost is. They pay the taxes. We're all consumers, we're all interested in our own health, and yet, if those who are most extreme in their desire to do away with chemicals have their way, the experts that we have had before us—and the best experts we can find—say that the cost of food would go up 300%. Really, the consumer is the one that I have more concern for than I do even for the farmer. Now I'm interested in the farmer, as he is a necessary link in this very important chain. He produces all of our food, but he has to sell his product, as difficult as it has been many times in the past, at some kind of a profit. And the amount of land that would have to be put back into cultivation, the amount of just complete destruction of food that would occur from uncontrolled insects, would in our judgment up the price of food 300%.

Mr. BOOTH. Mr. Lerch, what additional comments would you have on the proposals to restrict the use of certain pesticides.

Mr. LERCH. I can just add a postscript to the comments made by Congressman Purcell. Many of the folks who advocate restrictions on pesticides clearly point out that they would want to make sure there is a continuing supply of pesticides. On the other hand, some of the proposals that they propound would be such that the farmer might not have the pesticide he needs when he needs it, and agriculture is still based on the old adage "there's a time to plant and a time to harvest." So you could completely disrupt agriculture while at the same time, you could honestly say that you had not restricted a large number of pesticides.

Many of the pesticides over which there is so much debate—and this gets into your question, Mr. Booth—are those which are so-called "persistent." And this gets down to the question of "zero." During the 1960's the methods of measuring substances improved dramatically; so now you can find a part per million in the environment easily. You can find a part per billion with a little extra work, and in the laboratory, you can find a part per trillion. But as it was brought out in some hearings in the Senate during the 1960's, being able to identify a substance, and being able to interpret what the significance is, are completely two different things. So, people say that we find a part per million or a part per billion of a substance in a fish or in a man or in a bird, and this is carte blanche evidence that we are disaster bound. I think we need to be able to identify what it is, and to be able to say whether this is or is not safe. Somehow, if we are going to make progress scientifically, we have to be able to understand "zero", and that the "zero" is unobtainable, as scientifically related to pesticides today. Therefore, we are going to live in an environment which will be polluted either in a matter of minutes or hours or days or years in varying amounts of various residues. So that when you try to prescribe controls over these, I think it gets back to the scientific argument, and I think Mr. Purcell, that these are some of the questions your Committee is getting. What is the scientific foundation for this controversy? What are the factors involved?

Mr. PURCELL. There are two factors involved. First, we must determine whether some small residue in fish, or the fatty tissue of red-blooded animals or whatever it might be, has any bad effect on human beings or on animals, because there are animals that do have residue in their bodies that are healthier now than they ever were before. And then, the small amount of residue that is found—and your reference to a part per million or a part per billion is so infinitesimal—that it's my judgment at this time, having heard all the evidence, that we must be very cautious until we know that these very minute amounts of residue are harmful. Actually, we're finding the same kind of evidence from water, soil, and from meat tissue that never was exposed to pesticides. There must be some of these chemicals in our environment to start with, through natural processes. And then, to close my statement here, two parts per billion, billion spelled with a "b," can be related in this way. If we have a football field with U.S. pennies stacked eight feet high all over that football field, and in that group of pennies there were two of a different kind, that would be two parts per billion. Now, that's how infinitesimal these trace elements of various chemicals are. We have damaged ourselves in being so restrictive and if this law were to be passed, it is my judgment it would be regression of the worst kind. We must have good use, we must have good understanding, and we do not want to damage our environment, but we do not want to regress from progress that science has provided us either.

Mr. BOOTH. Mr. Parsons, your state of South Dakota is famous for pheasant hunting, deer hunting, etc. Some environmentalists feel that this game ought to be protected through limiting the use of pesticides. Do you think that pesticides have an appreciable effect on wild game in South Dakota?

Mr. PARSONS. No, as a farmer in western South Dakota, I don't believe this. We have more deer, more pheasants, and wildlife today, in my estimation than we have ever had. I do experimental work with the University on my farm and I probably have used more pesticides and chemicals than anyone else in my neighborhood. If pesticides are threatening the survival of wildlife, I don't see why I should have an abundance of wildlife and game on my ranch.

Mr. BOOTH. Mr. Lerch, is there any danger that restrictions on pesticides will become so effective that they will discourage the research and development of new products, which may be needed to combat new infestations of insects?

Mr. LERCH. Yes, Mr. Booth, there is. As a matter of fact, six or seven of the major U. S. corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange already have either completely dispersed their research in this area, or have severely cut it back. Just one further point. Every pesticide on the market that now has a label to be marketed in interstate commerce, has had thorough research and testing before it is ever released. Today, this costs anywhere 3 to 5 or even 10 million dollars, and may take from 2 to 5 or 6 years to accomplish. So we are not flooding the environment with chemicals that are unknown. They have to be thoroughly researched at the very frontier of science before the Federal Government will ever accept them for marketing.

Mr. BOOTH. Well thank you, gentlemen, for putting into perspective a subject about which there is a great lack of understanding. We have been talking with Representative Graham Purcell of Texas, Dean Parsons of South Dakota, and Donald Lerch of Washington, D.C. about the use of pesticides and proposals to restrict some of those used by Federal Regulation. Each week this program brings you a discussion of the choices facing free America. This is Arch Booth, speaking for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and inviting you to join us next week at this same time.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County, Mich., has been selected by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, as one of only two sites for a major, national traffic safety program.

The reasons which representatives of the Administration gave for their selection were numerous, but emphasized primarily that, first, there existed a

unique, computerized traffic data system which will be important in the program evaluation; second, the unusually progressive and enlightened posture of Oakland County's traffic authorities; and third, the existence of the Traffic Improvement Association, a private, nonprofit citizen support group.

For the past 4 years, the TIA has served as an effective catalyst in our area, channeling the traffic safety contributions of hundreds of Federal, State, county, and local agencies into a better coordinated, more uniform, better managed system of highway crash prevention.

It has been my pleasure and honor to serve as a member of the advisory council to the national demonstration program. Next month will mark the first anniversary of this 2-year project. We are pleased to report outstanding progress in our efforts to design, implement, and evaluate new and innovative management systems along with projects of substance which we are convinced will bring about measurable improvements in the country's total highway crash experience. This work in Oakland County will serve as the model for subsequent development of traffic countermeasures and management systems for cities and counties throughout the Nation.

In consideration of the selection of Oakland County as a traffic safety demonstration site, and because of the unique beginnings and innovative programing of the Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County, the managing director of this association, Mr. Bruce B. Madsen, was recently invited to testify before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Public Works Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the RECORD portions of Mr. Madsen's testimony:

STATEMENT BY BRUCE B. MADSEN

THE ORIGIN AND OPERATIONS OF THE TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION OF OAKLAND COUNTY, MICH.

In 1964, over 200 persons were killed in traffic accidents in Oakland County. Over 15,000 persons were injured. This represented close to 10 percent of the state's total traffic casualties that year.

A substantial increase in traffic accidents and fatalities—such as that which we experienced—has, many times in many places, resulted in an aroused, concerned public. All too often, hastily established organizations have emerged to deal with the problem. As a result, the programs and solutions that are developed are usually based upon little or no knowledge of the *real* traffic problems and needs.

We wanted to make certain that this would not happen in Oakland County. So, in what has been described by traffic authorities as a unique approach, we set out to identify Oakland County's *specific* traffic problems as a prelude to program development. The chancellor of Oakland University, the chairman of the Oakland County Board of Commissioners, representatives of the Oakland County Road Commission, and about 20 outstanding community leaders and public officials worked with traffic experts from Michigan State University. They set out to develop a comprehensive survey to reveal just how well the county was doing in the various aspects of traffic accident prevention. Over 200 citizens and public officials volunteered to serve on the seven separate study groups which were formed.

Their efforts resulted in a summary report containing 92 specific traffic safety recommendations. One priority recommendation called for the establishment of the Traffic Improvement Association (TIA) of Oakland County—to be staffed with professionals who would devote full time to meeting other well-documented needs outlined in the report. That first recommendation was met with the establishment of the TIA in 1967.

There are a number of priorities to which the TIA is currently directing its attention. These have been placed into four major categories of need. What TIA has done and plans to do to fill the gaps in each category is outlined below.

Documented need No. 1

There was an urgent need in Oakland County for a countywide system or procedure which would allow for better identification of accident causes at specific locations; and for a means by which communities could evaluate their *own* accident prevention efforts.

To meet this need:

The TIA has established a computerized countywide traffic data center to process and *use* accident data. According to a representative of the National Highway Safety Bureau, the TIA data center is the only one of its kind in the nation.

A location referencing system which can locate an accident to within five feet of its actual occurrence anywhere in the county, combined with computerized traffic flow data, is now being used for setting traffic engineering improvement priorities.

Detailed traffic violation information has been added to the center's data bank. When used in conjunction with accident data by location, this information can provide a base for a comprehensive, fully computerized selective enforcement system for each of the communities in the county.

The TIA staff is now working with state and local authorities to develop a "self-inventory" system which will enable traffic authorities to measure and improve upon their own accident prevention efforts.

The TIA is also now launching a program called "Roadway Identification and Surveillance." This will provide for a continuing and systematic watch of the county's entire street and highway network, so accident problems related to highway design and traffic engineering can be promptly identified.

Documented need No. 2

A second major area of attention is directed to the need for—"increased public awareness of the seriousness of the traffic accident situation; greater understanding and support for local traffic programs; and improvement in driver knowledge, skills, and habits."

To meet this need:

TIA helped establish and worked with an organization called CAR—Citizens for Adequate Roads—in a campaign to create public support for urgently needed road and traffic engineering improvements.

A number of communications approaches were employed in a campaign to better acquaint the public with the importance of driver education and the problems confronting those now carrying out this function.

TIA has recently conducted an intensive program of public education for safety belt use. This in-depth, "saturation" program has also served as a national demonstration model. According to scientifically designed "before" and "after" surveys, this program resulted in approximately 16,500 "converts" to safety belt use. It is conservatively estimated that a savings of over one million dollars resulted from the reduction of personal injury losses.

TIA is now developing a program to acquaint Oakland County citizens with the function of traffic engineering and its vital role in accident prevention.

TIA has provided media, on a continuous basis, with releases on current accident statistics and trends and causation, and periodically supplies the local press with educational feature stories and editorials.

"Driver Safety Schools" for use by courts in re-training repeat violators and problem drivers have been established and are supervised by TIA.

Documented need No. 3

Oakland County is comprised of 63 separate governments and municipalities in which there are 38 police departments, 25 local courts, 39 high schools, and a sizeable number of professional associations, civic and service clubs, and other private organizations. Helping to provide greater coordination and uniformity in the traffic safety work of these groups is the third major area of attention of the TIA.

To meet this need:

TIA has established a countywide association for over 350 driver education instructors in the county.

The TIA will initiate a series of regularly scheduled countywide conferences of traffic officials. During these conferences TIA intends to disseminate information on such items as pertinent traffic research findings, latest operating techniques and procedures, new resource materials, traffic legislation, and the availability of funds and direct assistance from national and state traffic agencies.

TIA is also assisting in the establishment of a coordinating unit of police traffic command personnel. Also, it has been invited to work with the existing Oakland County organization of district and municipal courts on traffic court matters.

Documented need No. 4

Among the traffic officials and leading citizens of Oakland County who surveyed our traffic improvement needs, there was unanimous agreement that many things could be done to help upgrade the level of performance of traffic agencies throughout the county.

To meet this need:

TIA initiated, sponsored, and assisted in conducting three one-week courses in the fundamentals of community traffic control for persons having traffic engineering responsibilities.

TIA assists local officials by serving as a traffic resource center through which technical data, materials, and publications are distributed.

The staff of TIA worked with field representatives of the Northwestern University Traffic Institute in developing and conducting a course in traffic records. This has served as a prototype for similar courses now being presented throughout the country.

Approximately 500 traffic authorities have thus far attended a continuing series of one-week courses in traffic engineering, accident investigation, traffic records management, and basic law enforcement, all of which are provided through the auspices of TIA.

Staff of TIA has provided direct field assistance in such things as the establishment of traffic record systems, selective enforcement programs, model systems for the management of the traffic engineering function, and the like.

Selection of Oakland County as demonstration site

The record of this relatively young traffic organization can be measured, in part, by the fact that Oakland County was selected by the Department of Transportation as one of only two sites for a major national traffic safety program. TIA developed the proposal for and was named to administer this three to five year program. Its purpose is to design, implement, and evaluate new and innovative management systems and countermeasures which will attempt to bring about

measureable improvements in the county's total highway crash experience.

The results of this program will serve a three-fold purpose. It will—

Enable Oakland County to identify major traffic safety needs and undertake substantial, long range programs having significant potential for accident prevention;

Result in a management system which will allow traffic authorities to plan, implement, and evaluate accident prevention programs on a continuing basis—for years to come; and

Serve as the basis for the subsequent development of traffic countermeasures and management systems for cities and counties throughout the nation.

The status of TIA in the community

The Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County is not an official, nor even quasi-official agency of any level of government. It is a non-profit, non-political, self-governing *citizen support organization.* However, the Oakland County Board of Commissioners and other county officials have provided and are providing support for the TIA in many ways. The County Board of Auditors worked very closely with TIA staff in setting up bookkeeping and other office procedures during its formative months. TIA's 29-man Board of Directors includes the chairman and one member of the Board of Commissioners. The county has made its highly sophisticated computer services available to TIA—at cost—for the operations of the traffic data center. And, the Board of Commissioners, along with the Oakland County Road Commission, has provided financial support to TIA. However, the majority of TIA income is derived from private business and industry.

A review of the persons serving on the TIA Board of Directors and on the several program committees will show an unusually effective melding of citizen interest and professional activity. TIA enjoys the active support of a number of the most influential business and community leaders of the country.

OBSERVATIONS REGARDING OBSTACLES CURRENTLY ENCOUNTERED BY COUNTIES IN MEETING THE HIGHWAY CRASH PROBLEM

In response to a request for the writer's views regarding the major problem in efforts to combat the highway crash situation, these will be discussed in three separate pars: 1) Idenification of the major problems in traffic safety at the county and local level; 2) What are the roots of these problems; and 3) What can the Federal Government do to help?

The major problems

Personal observations coupled with interviews with traffic administrators from a number of counties—some successful and a good number not so successful—suggests that most problems encountered in the traffic safety field will fit into four major categories. These are:

1. Public apathy.
2. Low level of official performance.
3. Limited resources.
4. Lack of any system for managing the traffic function, *per se,* including:
   (a) Planning.
   (b) Programming.
   (c) Budgeting.
   (d) Implementation.
   (e) Evaluation.

Though each of the above problems can be separately identified, there is great interdependence of one to another. In an opinion which is generally shared by traffic workers, paramount among these obstacles is that of *public apathy.* The effect of the public lack of concern about our nation's number one domestic problem has an obvious impact upon each of the other categories of problems.

Problem Roots

Public opinion is fickle. Scientifically conducted surveys will show that the traffic accident situation was a major concern of the public five or six years ago. Today, it is deeply submerged beneath concerns—if not anxieties—regarding crime on the streets, ecology, drug abuse, and, of course, the war in Vietnam.

The level of performance of officials who are charged, by law, with the responsibility for traffic safety, is responsive to the constituency served—i.e. public opinion. This is illustrated in the time-worn expression, "Our community will get exactly the amount and kind of traffic law enforcement which it is willing to accept and pay for." The same philosophy applies to virtually all areas of highway crash prevention. Fortunately, there are authorities at all levels of government who have kept the traffic problem in perspective—allocating their attention and resources at a level commensurate with the magnitude of the problem. Many have recognized that, as public officials, their responsibility to educate their constituency with respect to relative importance of community problems and needs is as important as their responding to what the public feel these problems and needs may be.

The lack of a system for comprehensive management of the anti-crash effort has been described by a number of administrators as running a very close second to public apathy as a major obstacle in meeting the traffic problem. Even where public concern, interest, and support has been high; where there is potential for an optimum level of official performance; and where resources have been adequate, the failure to create a system which will provide for planning, programming, budgeting, implementation, and evaluation on a continuing basis has resulted in a complete breakdown in highway crash prevention efforts. This happens at all levels of government and occurs because rarely is a *single agency* charged with the responsibility for highway crash prevention. It is a function which is shared—too frequently in an uncoordinated fashion—by the schools, by the courts, by the highway departments and road commissions, by the police, and a host of other agencies. Though the need for cooperation and coordination of the efforts of the many responsible traffic agencies has long been recognized, only in recent years has emphasis been placed upon the "system management" concept as applied to the traffic safety field.

The need for a creation of improved management systems is particularly acute in an area-wide or county-wide basis where one now generally finds the efforts of the many schools, police departments, courts, road commissions, and street departments completely fragmented—even at times working in opposition one to the other.

What the Federal Government can do

The traffic accident problem is a *local* problem. The remedies which will have the greatest impact will be those which will be designed to meet *local* needs. There has been and continues to be a need for leadership and assistance from the national level. However, such assistance must be *sufficiently flexible to allow communities to meet their own recognized needs and allow them to do what they can and should be doing for themselves.*

Conversation with traffic administrators in various parts of the country suggests that the federal government's practice of earmarking a certain percentage of a given year's allocation to one or two specific program standard areas tends to dictate what the traffic "problems" of a state or community might be.

The federal government can influence the level of performance of traffic officials in a number of ways. One of these will be included in a brief discussion of the need for improved management systems. Financial support for the implementation of needed countermeasures are, obviously, another way in which the government can assist the local official and his program efforts.

In the opinion of a number of traffic administrators, the value of the federal program could be greatly enhanced with little or no additional funding and effort if better utilization was made of the research findings and program evaluation which the federal government has already bought and paid for. For example, one federally funded project resulted in the development of a simple but very workable system of locating accidents for subsequent computer analysis. This project has also developed a computer program which automatically compares essential accident experience to enforcement activity, overcoming the major obstacle to a selective enforcement program by providing the data base necessary for planning such a program. Despite the existence of these two innovative and proven approaches to traffic records use, funds to develop nearly identical programs were subsequently provided other agencies with no information regarding previous finding and progress passed along to the administrators of the newly funded activity. This is but one small example of the situation which has apparently been mirrored many, many times over—and applies to the research community as well as the area of operational programs.

As mentioned previously, there has been a good deal of emphasis in recent years upon the need for greater application of the "management system" approach to traffic accident prevention. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is to be commended for its recognition of the need for more universal application of this common sense approach to long range solutions. Its support of a program which was administered through the National Association of Counties is a case in point. This project has results in a series of excellent management guides for use at the local level. These guides, based upon information obtained from over 50 on-site examinations and interviews with traffic administrators at all levels of government, present an excellent opportunity for advancing the management system concept at the local level. However, the publication and distribution of these manuals alone cannot accomplish this. It is hoped that plans have been or will be made to provide the necessary *follow-up* stimulation, direct at-the-elbow field assistance, and appropriate resources to implement the recommendations and types of activities contained in these guides.

The development of Annual Work Plans which many of the state coordinators have implemented also represents another step forward in directing resources to known needs. The example set in this kind of planning cannot help but filter down to and ultimately influence program planning and evaluation at the local level. But, again, the form of plan which is to be used should be left to the discretion of the local coordinator.

COMMENTS REGARDING MONEYS PROVIDED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR USE IN HIGHWAY CRASH PREVENTION AND LOSS REDUCTION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Comments regarding federal funding of traffic safety programs received from administrators who were interviewed, along with opinions of the writer, are briefly summarized below.

First, as has been previously mentioned, the tendency in the past to earmark a percentage of available funds to certain program standard areas is unrealistic. In doing so, the state coordinator is virtually told what his problems are, and is hamstrung in his efforts to direct the resources to areas of greatest need.

The three-year funding limitation is, in the minds of a number of administrators, unrealistic. No doubt a majority of the federally funded projects can be successfully completed within a three-year period. There are, however, a good number of projects—particularly those which involve major shifts in such things as departmental policies, long established procedures, hardened public views, and the like—frequently require a time beyond the three-year period for the ultimate objective to be reached.

Within the research community—and to a lesser extent among agencies at the operational level—there is some concern with respect to the limited return on the investment of the federal dollar because of a lack of programmatic approach in the preparation of the Requests For Proposals.

LABOR'S PARADOX

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, Vincent J. Manzo, of Fort Washington, wrote the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin that—

It is paradoxical that American society, which has created the most affluent, most knowledgeable labor force in the history of mankind and has disseminated its know-how to all corners of the world, is now reaping the tragic harvest of its own desire to help others.

Mr. Manzo spoke for many American workingmen in asking relief from the detrimental effect brought about by a tremendous influx of foreign consumer goods to the marketplace.

In his letter, Mr. Manzo concludes that—

An answer to this paradox is being sought by many of us in the labor movement.

Those in government and industry must also respond to the challenge. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Manzo's letter in full, entitled "Labor's Paradox":

LABOR'S PARADOX

It is paradoxical that American society, which has created the most affluent, most knowledgeable labor force in the history of mankind and has disseminated its know-how to all corners of the world, is now reaping the tragic harvest of its own desire to help others.

The avalanche of consumer goods reaching our shores from other nations—goods produced because of initial American inventiveness and expertise are driving many American industries to the wall simply because American prices must reflect an American standard of living. Textiles, electronics, steel, the automotive industry—all these and many more are feeling the profound effects of foreign competition.

It is an ironic fact that in order to compete with this influx of foreign goods many American companies are setting up factories and distributing centers abroad. This helps them to survive as corporations, but adds still further to the dilemma of the American worker.

On the one hand, Americans have a natural inclination to take a "One World" view and recognize that all mankind must progress if America is to prosper. On the other hand is the reality of unemployment in the affected industries and the prospect for even greater curtailment of American production.

An answer to this paradox is being sought by many of us in the labor movement.

ADDRESS OF DR. ROBERT S. GARBER, 99TH PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to submit the text of the May 3 address of Dr. Robert Slocum Garber, 99th president of the American Psychiatric Association, delivered at the 124th annual APA meeting held here in the city of Washington.

This remarkable address by the outgoing APA president deserves the widest possible attention and comment. Entitled "The Proper Business of Psychiatry," it expresses the ideals, goals, and initiatives of the APA and relates these to such active matters of current discussion as community mental health centers and the need for national health insurance.

Dr. Garber's speech was brought to my attention by a colleague, Dr. Stanley R. Dean, who is a good friend and neighbor of mine in Miami.

The APA has been fortunate to have Dr. Garber as its president, a man held in high esteem by both his colleagues and those outside the profession for his leadership and contribution to modern psychiatry.

He has, since 1958, been medical director of the Carrier Clinic in Belle Meade, N.J., and is a teacher and member of the professional staffs of Jefferson Medical College and Temple Medical School, both in Philadelphia, as well as Rutgers Medical School in New Brunswick, N.J.

Without further introduction, I turn the attention of the readers of the RECORD to the timely and thoughtful remarks of Dr. Robert S. Garber:

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: THE PROPER BUSINESS OF PSYCHIATRY

(By Robert S. Garber, M.D.)

Members and guests of the Association: It is my great privilege, as your 99th president, to welcome you to our 124th annual meeting and to express to you my deep appreciation for having elected me to your highest office.

We are all aware that my term of office has not been uneventful. The high feeling and turbulence that attended our annual meeting in San Francisco in the wake of the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State tragedy engendered continued debate throughout the year about the proper role of the Association in political affairs—a debate that grew the warmer because of the difficulties the trustees encountered in publishing the results of the June opinion poll. I daresay no president before has had to discharge the responsibilities of the office in a millieu so pervaded by frustration, charges and counter-charges, and divisiveness. One could not at times but feel with William Butler Yeats, that:

Thing fall apart, the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

Still, I would not have foregone the experience for anything. The satisfactions have been many and foremost among them is the warm and understanding support one receives from one's fellow officers, trustees, leaders of the Assembly of District Branches, and countless individual members throughout the country. Also infinitely gratifying is the dedicated service one receives from our wonderful and hard-working staff in Washington. Because he is retiring next month I want to pay a special tribute to our Deputy Medical Director, Dr. B. W. Hogan. "Bart," as we call him so affectionately, came to us in 1961 upon his retirement as one of the most distinguished Surgeon Generals in the annals of U.S. Navy medicine. His devotion to medicine in the service of mankind, his skill as an administrator, his finesse as a diplomat, and his warmth and graciousness as a friend have served our Association in good stead. Most especially has he been the administrative underpinning of the dramatic growth of our Assembly of District Branches. We shall be ever grateful to him.

CENTERS OF OPINION WITHIN THE ASSOCIATION

I have chosen to speak to you today on The Proper Business of Psychiatry since what is our proper business has been the essential question that has occasioned so much debate among us this past year. In spite of the passion that characterized much of the dialogue, I think it is possible and useful to attempt to extract from it some principles which I suggest reflect what we may call persisting "centers of opinion," or "mainstreams of thought" in our psychiatric body politic.

First, I would point out that it is a fact that for at least 30 years your elected leaders in the Association and the most articulate spokesmen among us have, in a myriad of ways, reinforced the prognostication of the late and revered Dr. Alan Gregg at our centennial meeting in 1944. Looking toward the next century he said:

"Psychiatry will find great extensions of its content and its obligations. There will be applications far beyond your offices and your hospitals of the further knowledge you will gain, applications not only to patients with functional and organic disease, but to the human relations of normal people—in politics, national and international, between races, between capital and labor, in government, in family life, in education, in every form of human relationship, whether between individuals or between groups."

If you would review the presidential addresses of the Association since 1944, and even before that,* to some extent you would find a consistent and ever-growing receptivity to Dr. Gregg's postulate: Evidence that we are collectively moving into areas previously foreign to us, as Dr. Gregg predicted, abounds everywhere—in the provocative deliberations of our Assembly of District Branches, in the pages of branch newsletters and our national newspaper, in our seminars with the Brookings Institution on public and foreign affairs, in the establishment of our new Section on Government Relations within our Division of Public Affairs, and in the assignment of numerous councils, commissions, and task forces directed to social issues.

Yet we are subject to an unsettling discomfort as we attempt to conceptualize and adapt our medical model and clinical insights to helping heal what many call a "sick society." I myself would prefer to delineate our mission as helping to build a better society and a more satisfying quality of life. I venture that the center of opinion among us would agree, in broad principle, with Dr. Robert Gibson who, in his recent Strecker Award Lecture, commented:

*See, for example, E. E. Southerd, "Cross Sections of Mental Hygiene, 1844, 1869, 1894, *American Journal of Insanity*, Vol. 84, No. 91, 1919. Also Meyer, Adolf, "Thirty-five Years of Psychiatry in the U.S. and our Present Outlook," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1928.

"Difficult as it may be, I believe the scope and influence of psychiatry must be expanded. Failure to do so would leave the field open to less qualified individuals and groups. The stakes are too high for that. This is not something that can readily be done by the individual psychiatrist on his own. It requires the effort of many, organized and coordinated through district branches and the APA at the national level. It means anticipating and preventing problems—not just reacting to staged demonstrations."

Another proposition around which I think our center of opinion evolves is that we shall maintain our posture and our style as a medical specialty, and as a behavioral science, the corollary being that we do not propose to see our Association converted into an agency for the purveying of propaganda and political preference.

Again in the past two years we have witnessed on the outer fringes of our membership the disturbing activity of a small group who would, indeed, convert us into a radical, politically partisan, agitatory, propagandistic pressure group. They shout, they disrupt, they insult, they shed heat but not light. It has been a strange and alienating phenomenon within our midst, rooted no doubt in the frustration that so many of our young people feel at the seeming incapacity of all establishments to guarantee them a better quality of life or any future at all. They have no monopoly, however, on feelings of frustration. Any of us need only turn to our favorite "futurologist"—Toffler, Platt, Brzezinski, Reich, Seidenberg, and many others—to be convinced that our hold on this Planet Earth is tenuous indeed. But losing our cool will not help. Building our science may. One hopes that our nuclear center of opinion may yet attract and contain these strange particles that threaten to escape from its outer edges.

More auspicious is the far larger group among us who are unhappy with what seems to them a lack of zeal in their Association in coming to grips with social problems. I say "auspicious" because I detect no substantive departure from our central propositions. I see rather a group of dedicated scientists who believe they can do the job faster and better, and who appear determined to work within the viable democratic structure of the Association to bring about change and reform. We welcome this new burst of dynamic energy into our mainstream of progress.

Another proposition that I think is gradually forming within our center of opinion is that we, as an Association, cannot discharge our social responsibilities without becoming involved in politics. Unfortunately, however, there is confusion over the use and meaning of the world "politics." It is anything but a precise term. There are some politics that we must avoid, and some that we cannot. Dr. John Visher, Speaker of the Assembly, in an address to the Trustees Policy Meeting in March, pointed out that politics is not merely a matter of promoting partisanship as among different parties and candidates. It is not merely the process by which legislation and decision making occur, but it also encompasses questions of values and world views. It refers "to attempts to define the good society, to influence and define the moral and public weal, to establish concepts of conduct and responsibility for social interaction, and to chart accurately the realities of power and purpose."

Neither as citizens nor as an organized profession can we avoid "politics" in such contexts. We must help define the "good society," to "influence the moral and public weal." We must bring our professional and scientific judgment to bear on the formulation of public policy in areas that relate to mental health. It is partisan politics that as an Association we must avoid like the plague. Like the universities we must stamp out any temptation to "politicization," mindful that in the long-run it would destroy us as a profession and a science. Partisan politics is for private citizens, and there are any number of partisan groups of various colorations to which we may repair as citizens, including, for example, Common Cause, the American Medical Political Action Committee, the Medical Committee on Human Rights, and many others from left to right.

But let us maintain our integrity as a professional Association. Let us get on with our search for the evidence that will support a major contribution from pyschiatry to the resolution of the disaster-threatening problems of our time. But let us never forsake a critical scientific judgment on the validity of the evidence that we muster lest our pronouncements appear silly and ridiculous. Let us make certain that our public positions emanate from within the realm of our special knowledge and clearly identify the mental health component of the issue to which we address ourselves. When our positions involve us in politically controversial matters—as they surely will—let us make clear that our position is professional in its intent. And let us always sustain a style that is appropriate to our status as a medical specialty and a behavioral science.

So much for the propositions which I believe reflect the centers of opinion within our ranks. As I mentioned before, there were moments this past year when one felt, with Yeats, that "things fall apart; the center cannot hold." But it has held, and it is a pleasure to report to you that there have been only a normal number of resignations from our Association this past year (about 100), and of these there were fewer than half-a-dozen who stated as their reason a loss of confidence in our purposes. May the center continue to hold.

Now I want to turn to three specific issues under the heading of our proper business. All of them critically impinge on the growth and development of our profession. All of them carry with them political and controversial components. All of them demand our undivided attention and vigorous action.

THE PHASING OUT OF PSYCHIATRIC TRAINING SUPPORT

First, our most immediate problem is this: The national Administration budget for fiscal 1972 proposed to reduce psychiatric residency training funds administered by the National Institute of Mental Health by almost seven million dollars. Far more lethal than that, however, is that the Nixon Administration proposes to "phase out" training funds altogether in the years just ahead. I say "lethal" advisedly. In fiscal 1972 alone the $6.7 million cut would eliminate support for upwards of 500 potential residents. But imagine our manpower crisis ten years hence if the Administration's policy were to prevail. Briefly, the Administration has concluded that psychiatry no longer requires public training support. The Administration is ill advised. Its proposal comes at a time when there is overwhelming demand on us to expand our services vastly, notably in the fields of alcoholism, drug abuse and services for children. It would be far wiser, I submit, for the Administration to entertain the wisdom of subsidizing *all* medical specialty training with the understanding that those who choose to avail themselves of this aid would be obligated to a period of public service. If it did so, the outlook for developing the manpower to staff a truly adequate national health delivery system would be far more auspicious than it is today.

Be that as it may, we are doing everything we can to reverse the Administration's lethal course. But we need the help of every member of the Association. I beg of you to exert all possible influence you can—by letter, by telegram, by personal contact with congressmen and people of influence in public policy formulation; and if you need factual information upon which to base your communications, request it from our headquarters in Washington and it shall be sent to you immediately.

THE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

In a few moments I will discuss some aspects of the mental health service delivery system, including the financial implications. Before that, I would like to spend a few minutes in a more specific review of what we have accomplished in the particular clinical facility in which, a few years ago, we invested both our confidence and our aspirations. I am referring, of course, to the community mental health centers which came to be established with federal support in the heady days of the early 1960's, when hope and optimism were more abundant than they seem to be today. The community mental health center concept was created because of the belief that a reasonable range of services, mostly clinical, ought to be readily available to people in the communities where they live. The idea seemed sound and logical then, and it does today. It was urgently necessary because, in the early 60's, mental health services were absurdly fragmented, even more so, if that is possible, than other medical services.

The program must still be considered new. The oldest of the Federally supported centers has been in business less than five years, and the majority of the approximately 300 now operational became so only during the past two years. Nonetheless, at this early stage it is possible to make some observations about both the strengths and the weaknesses of the centers.

We should begin, perhaps, by noting what a very small Federal program this is. From 1964, when the first grants were awarded up to the end of the present fiscal year, Federal funds for this program will have aggregated less than half a billion dollars. This falls *short* of the annual budget of the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene. The Federal grants are awarded on a matching basis and the Federal money averages out to something less than half the cost of operating the centers; even so, the Federal, state, and local monies combined during all these years come to less than the combined annual budgets for all state departments of mental hygiene. The program is even smaller than the legislation backing it would suggest since over the past several years there have been a number of under-appropriations, plus holding back of appropriated funds by the White House. In its current zeal to share revenue with the states, the Administration might take note of the fact that for every Federal dollar that has gone into mental health service programs, the states and localities have been spending about 20.

Compounding the problem of under-funding has been the problem of uncertainty of continued support. There have been times when it appeared that the NIMH would not even be permitted adequate funds to honor the contractual obligations it had entered into with the mental health centers. Fortunately, things never got quite that bad. But for the past two years it has not been possible, because of the money shortage, to fund a large number of good-quality grant applications that local communities have submitted. During the present fiscal year there will be no new staffing grants; indeed, because of the typical lateness of the appropriations bills, even at this time, two months before the end of the fiscal year, NIMH does not know exactly how many of the approved grants *held over from the previous fiscal year* it will be able to fund. Amendments to the Federal legislation passed last year provided for a "premium" level of funding for mental health centers in poverty areas, but it now appears that the funds made available during this year will fall a good deal short of what would be required to provide the full premium funding. There have been concur-

rent shortages of money in some of the states, and particular mental health centers that had developed to the point of being able to expand competently will be unable to do so; indeed, some are in peril of their very survival.

I cannot tell you what existing community mental health centers are like, and I do not think anyone else can, simply because they differ so much from one to another, even in the most basic respects. I think, from those I have seen, heard, and read about, that they also differ greatly in quality. However, there do seem to be some particular respects in which most of the centers come off well.

1. They seem to be treating people at the lowest intensity of care consistent with their circumstances and behavior. This is important because hospitalization is traumatizing and alienating and ought to be avoided whenever it is reasonable to do so. The mental health centers are treating as outpatients a great many people who, a few years ago, would undoubtedly have been sent to state hospitals.

2. As a matter of policy the centers seem to be willing to take many categories of applicants.

3. People are seen, for the most part, without delay. Some provision for emergency service exists in most centers, even if it is only through the regular personnel of a general hospital emergency room. In general, applicants seem to be able to get appointments to be seen promptly—probably a good deal more promptly than they could see a privately practicing ophthalmologist or ENT man.

4. I like to believe that the centers have been a factor in the substantial further reduction of the state hospital population. Those psychiatrists in areas that have no mental health centers will eagerly tell you that their state hospital census has declined, too. But in fact the *rate* of the decline that has been going on since the mid-1950's accelerated in the mid-1960's, and that acceleration has held up. Furthermore, by far the largest decline occurred in the years between 1968 and 1970. We all know that several factors are involved in the reduction of the census, but I do believe that the growth in numbers of, and services from, mental health centers is among them.

At their best, the centers combine the technology, efficiency, and accessibility of good quality general hospital psychiatry and good quality private office practice, together with a battery of back-up services which many patients need, such as help in getting accepted for job training or finding a place to live. But we must give equal time to the other side of the picture, because at their worst, the centers simply magnify institutionalize, and legitimize some of the most deplorable inadequacies of the past. I know personally of only a few such centers, and I make these observations of deficiencies without suggesting that they are widespread.

My greatest concern, I think, is the number of centers at which a great many people called "patients" are never seen at all by a physician at any point in their course of "treatment." I am not asserting here that only psychiatrists can "treat," because I am well aware of the fine work that is being done by many psychologists and social workers. But I do not believe that any applicant who gets beyond the intake interview is being adequately "served" unless a physician is involved in his evaluation and diagnosis. There are various reasons why this is important; the two most compelling are these: first, it is important to rule out somatic origins of the discomfort that led the person to ask for help, simply because most somatic disorders can be treated much more specifically than most emotional disorders and in any event it is fruitless behavior that stems from a thyroid malfunction as if it were a depression; second, symptomatic relief of psychic pain is not to be despised anymore than the symptomatic relief of physical pain, and only the physician can determine whether in this respect a psychoactive medication is called for. I realize that this plea for every patient to be seen by a psychiatrist, if it were put into immediate effect, would require some centers to go out of business. I would not champion that drastic course; I do, however, urge that every center not now able to provide psychiatric participation in each patient's treatment work zealously toward that goal.

I am also concerned by what seems to me an excessive allegiance to what has come to be called "role blurring." This all began a few years ago, I suppose in the laudable interest of overcoming some of the limitations of an authoritarian pecking order. It was designed to enhance the capability of several professionals of varying training, experience, and background, to work together as peers. I think in some areas of mental health services, including some of the community mental health centers, it has now gone too far. Because each of the disciplines came into community practice in some respects unprepared by their training, they have over-responded by persuading themselves that their training gave them little if anything that was useful. Translated into a clinical program, this becomes an attitude that "anybody can do anything," which is nonsense. Even if enthusiasm for psychological testing has greatly eroded, and even if social workers are now spending a great deal more time doing psychotherapy than working with families, there remains a technology for each of the disciplines, and the individual who has conscientiously and successfully negotiated several years of graduate training deceives himself if he denies that this is so. The hazard of the "anybody can do anything" syndrome is double-edged; on the one hand, it leads to the use of expensive specialist time in activities that could well be performed by people with less training and, on the other, it leads to the assignment of people with limited training to procedures that are manifestly beyond their competence.

This leads me neatly to the third of my concerns about particular mental health centers, and this is the manner in which they have brought ancillary personnel into their clinical services. These "paraprofessionals" or "indigenous workers," as they are variously called, can be of great usefulness and benefit to a program that chooses them well, provides an adequate orientation and training program, delineates their responsibilities in a thoughtful, careful way, and builds in appropriate supervision. I have seen centers where this had been done, and it was thrilling to talk with these warm, concerned, and sincere people about their interest in and their effort for the patients. But I know of other instances that are greatly in contrast. At one university-affiliated mental health center, the director, with his lengthy training as a psychoanalyst, uses the term "psychotherapist" to characterize "indigenous workers" who are utterly untrained, without so much as a single orientation lecture, and then set loose on clients with whom, utterly without supervision, they do, in the language of the director, psychotherapy. While this may have a certain fashion, that I subscribe to. If one believes, as I do, that psychotherapy is an informed transaction that has a state-of-the-art and a technology, then he can only view this as a travesty of decent psychiatric service.

I also feel some concern about one of the services required by the Federal regulations, namely mental health consultation. I am not referring to the necessary kind of consultation that involves the needs of and plans for individual patients, but rather the more gossamer and elusive activity generally known as "agency consultation" or "program consultation." Perhaps this diversion of clinical time from clinical activities could be shown to be efficient and effective, but certainly thus far it has not. As Dr. Elaine Cumming has put it, "The literature on consultation makes depressing reading for anyone interested in evidence." Beyond the lack of definitive evidence that such consultation goals as "improving the ambience of the classroom" will prevent mental illness or move the mentally well toward a richer, fuller life, there is the fact that many of the clinicians who are doing this kind of consultation become inarticulate, if not embarrassed, when one tries to get them to articulate what it is they have to offer a myriad of community agencies. Some mental health centers resist the efforts of the agencies they consult with to refer their clients for treatment on the basis that the mental health center should not be a "dumping ground." I had supposed that the very purpose of the center was precisely to be a "dumping ground"—to provide a specialized service to a particular afflicted population, by means of making specialized professional interventions available. I do not want to sell agency and program consultation short, but I think until some evidence of its effectiveness is produced, we have quite a lot on our hands in trying to do a decent job for the manifest casualties.

Finally, as regards the centers, I am concerned that so few seem, as yet, to have mounted the long-term supportive and rehabilitative services so badly needed by the "classic" mental patient—the schizophrenic. As Fountain House in New York, and Horizon House in Philadelphia have shown, it is quite possible to enable many schizophrenics, with a long history of illness, to become either partially or fully functional in a central life role. Fountain House in its brief history has successfully placed many hundreds of schizophrenics in a great variety of firms. I think the lack of interest in rehabilitation resources in the community stems from two sources: one is the funding split, whereby rehabilitation money comes from different state and federal agencies than other mental health funds. The second, I suspect, is that in our enthusiasm for briefer and briefer treatment, for intervening in crises, for reconstituting people who are dramatically disarrayed, we have failed to become aware of the very real possibilities of enabling people with chronic mental illness to live productive lives in the community.

So much for this catalogue of concerns about how some of the new community mental health centers are developing. We do not know how widespread these problems and practices are; but they do exist. And the business of coping with them is particularly ours. It is for psychiatrists individually and through their Association and its district branches to monitor and support the growth and development of the community mental health center, that it may come to deliver a high quality of service to the citizens it serves. We have committed ourselves to the proposition that it is a most promising device for ensuring the delivery of mental health services to all citizens, including those unable to pay for care. We cannot let it fail. The Association has, and must continue to urge adequate federal funding to quicken the pace of their development. Specifically, we urge upon the Administration and the Congress that funding be provided for 100 new centers each year. We could then look forward to somewhere between 1000 and 1500 centers by 1980. This would fall short of the original goal of 2000 centers by that time, but it would be an enormous improvement over the present stalemate.

OUR STAKES IN NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

In the final portion of my remarks today I turn to psychiatry's stance vis-a-vis the necessary and inevitable developments of national health insurance for all Americans. For how we and our patients are to fare in whatever system or systems that may evolve must rank very high indeed on the agenda of our proper business.

President Nixon recently described our health care crisis in some strong language. "This nation," he declared, "is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate concerted action is taken." The specifics of this breakdown are well known: Health services—those available to the rich as well as to the poor—are fragmented and uncoordinated, with emphasis on the treatment of sickness rather than the maintenance of health. Costs are spiraling, with no visible increase in efficiency or effect. The Carnegie Corporation recently observed that neither the resources of new technology nor the insights of the social and behavioral sciences have been brought fully to bear on medical systems and patient care. Hospitals have developed in an isolated, haphazard fashion and have often engaged in expensive duplication of services. And the physician in private practice—once honored for his dedicated service to his patients—is now castigated as a "pushcart vendor in an age of supermarkets."

But rather than dwell on the deficiences—some documented and others alleged—of the current system, I would prefer, in this final part of my address, to concern myself with the challenges the current crisis offers us. I believe the attention now being focused on medical care can lead us more rapidly than I would have thought possible ten years ago to some constructive changes that will be good for us as physicians, and also good for our patients.

We are well aware as psychiatrists of the importance of effective intervention during the crisis period. Established patterns are more open to challenge. New relationships and working alliances can be instituted. Fundamental changes having profound implications can be set in motion, although we recognize that a longer period may be required for their consolidation.

Most of the proposals for improving our health care delivery system involve some form of national health insurance. The proposals vary greatly in their approaches. At one end of the spectrum is the AMA's "Medicredit" proposal, which would grant an income tax credit ranging from 10 percent to 100 percent of the premium cost of a health insurance policy; those without taxable income would receive a certificate good for the full cost of the premium. At the other end of the spectrum is the proposal of the Committee for National Health Insurance, chaired by United Auto Workers President Leonard Woodcock. In addition to providing practically universal coverage and a comprehensive scope of benefits—although there are some special limitations on psychiatric care it would affect the delivery system by offering incentives favoring a more rational organization of services.

I find it disappointing that the drafters of most of the health insurance bills are apparently not aware of the changes in mental illness treatment that have occurred in the recent past or of the fact that this treatment has consequently become more "insurable." The insurance industry—but not the drafters of some of the health bills—no longer view "psychiatric care" as a synonym for "custodial care" but look on mental illness as potentially curable, or at least controllable, in much the same way as high blood pressure or diabetes.

The insurance situation at present, while not ideal from the point of view of the psychiatric patient, is at least encouraging. Private health insurance coverage of mental patients for hospital care and physicians' services in the hospital is in large measure comparable to coverage of other illnesses, with probably three out of every five people under age 65 having some benefits. Out-of-hospital coverage, mainly under major medical plans, brings some benefits to perhaps four out of every ten people. Under Medicare 20 million persons over 65 have good coverage of psychiatric illness in general hospitals (although benefits in a psychiatric hospital are severely restricted) and limited coverage in doctors' offices or outpatient departments of hospitals.

A number of factors have contributed to this growth in coverage. Among these are the psychiatric benefit packages negotiated by labor unions and large groups of employers, such as those in the automobile and steel industries, the inclusion of liberal psychiatric benefits in the plans covering most Federal employees, and the interest the insurers themselves have taken in a more comprehensive scope of benefits, with emphasis on out-of-hospital care. Our own Association can also take pride in its efforts to overcome barriers to broader coverage. For example, in 1965 APA organized a small conference to hammer out definitions, principles, and standards which could serve as guidelines to psychiatrists and other physicians working with insurance carriers to improve coverage. This action was in response to complaints by insurers that there was need for a better definition of mental disorders and of acceptable treatment modalities, as well as machinery or controlling claims abuse. The result was the first edition of *APA Guidelines for Psychiatric Services Covered Under Health Insurance Plans.* A second conference, this time attended not only by psychiatrists but by representatives of insurers and the Federal Government, led to a second edition of the guidelines published in March 1969.

Our Association, in its continuing quest for progress in this vital area, applied to the National Institute of Mental Health for a grant to enable us to look at what has happened in the last 10 years in regard to insurance coverage of mental disorders, especially utilization data from a number of important programs such as the auto workers' and the plans covering Federal employees. This project is now in progress, and when all the data are in—probably before the end of the year—APA will publish a book that I predict will make a solid case for a broad scope of benefits for treatment of mental illness under both private health insurance plans and any national health insurance scheme.

The data now being collected and analyzed are showing some interesting trends. We are finding that admissions to general hospitals for psychiatric disorders comprise only about two or three percent of all admissions, and the costs under most of the plans we have studied are about five to six percent of the total costs for all illnesses. The average length of stay, although almost twice as long as for other illnesses, is still about 16 days and has been decreasing steadily. For outpatient care, among the plans studied only three to four percent of total visits to physicians are for treatment of mental disorders and the percentage of costs ranges generally from four to ten percent of the costs for all illnesses, depending on deductibles and restrictions.

It is also of interest that the expenses of care in private psychiatric hospitals is lower than for that in general hospitals. In 1969 the average daily expense was $42 in a long-term nonprofit psychiatric hospital and $55 in a long-term proprietary hospital, compared to an average expense of $65 a day for treatment of all illnesses in a nonprofit general hospital.

We have also found evidence to support something that many psychiatrists have been aware of for some time—that effective psychiatric treatment decreases utilization of other medical services. For example, a study carried out here in Washington by Group Health Association after the initiation of a psychiatric benefit in 1964 followed 256 patients 12 months before and 12 months after a psychiatric referral. There was a 14 percent reduction in the number of patients seen for nonpsychiatric physician services and 16 percent reduction in the number of patients seen for laboratory or X-Ray procedures. In terms of visits made, the reduction was approximately 30 percent for physician services for and for laboratory or X-Ray procedures.

With these kinds of data being uncovered, I find it dismaying that most of the national health insurance proposals that have been drafted thus far impose unwarranted restrictions on psychiatric care. I will not take the time to go into the various measures in detail, and of course all the proposals, including the Administration's, have not yet been introduced in Congress. You may be sure that your Association, at the appropriate time, will present a strong case for equitable coverage. The APA Committee on Financing of Mental Health Care, in a statement approved by the Executive Committee in February, observed: "Any limitations of coverage for psychiatric services beyond that placed on other medical services perpetuates the existing double standard, discriminates against the psychiatric patient, and—more importantly—would discourage improvement of health care facilities and services."

I would therefore make a plea both for adequate coverage of the mentally ill under any national health insurance plan and for a well balanced system of health delivery that offers freedom of choice to both patient and physician. Representatives of the AMA who appeared before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Health recently made some points that I think are well worth noting here. The health care system in this country, they said, "is a pluralistic one—a composite of private and public programs which grew to meet needs as they arose . . . (It) offers opportunities for innovation and competition, incentives for organizational change and improvement of quality. Medical services, under such a pluralistic system, are better able to grow and change with the times than they might be under a monolithic system, locked into bureaucratic management, subject to nonmedical ukase, or political whim."

The well-balanced system of care that we would all like to see come about must of course rely heavily on the private sector. As a private hospital psychiatrist, I have particularly strong feelings about this. I feel that we in the private sector can be proud of a number of accomplishments, and I also feel that the private psychiatric hospital has worthwhile contributions to make from its long-range experience as we start considering a national system of financing health care. Psychiatry, of course, has had more experience with state medicine than any other medical specialty. There are many reasons why the state hospitals sometimes turned into human warehouses rather than therapeutic institutions; time does not permit me to go into them now. It should be noted, however, that even when the state hospitals were having their worst times, the private hospitals were showing that something could be done for the patient. Even though some insurers and legislators tried to rationalize their lack of interest and commitment as being based on the hopelessness of mental illness, constantly confronting them were examples provided by private hospitals and psychiatrists in private practice to show that the situation was not hopeless.

And it is equally imperative today that the private sector make it known that it has an important contribution to make to health care delivery. The mental health center concept permits a mix of public and private facilities serving a given population area. Several states are already contracting with private psychiatric hospitals and psychiatrists in private practice to deliver various elements of service. In so doing, they make good use of the strengths of private practitioners and institutions and at the same time ensure a degree of government control that permits coordination, comprehensive planning, and the development of a more unified and rational system of funding.

The role of private enterprise models in mental health service delivery systems has

been given thoughtful consideration by a task force under the aegis of the APA's Council on Mental Health Services. After two years of deliberations, it adopted as its basic principle that "the resources, capabilities, potential, and efficiency of the private models should be fully utilized and integrated into any public systems that may evolve, with heavy reliance on the device of contracting for service as between public agencies and the private sector."

The task force noted that the use of contract services from the private sector will do much to further the rapid development of the community mental health center movement. It could help overcome many problems inherent in the centers' structure and financing, such as the burdening of full-time salaried physicians with administrative tasks, which reduce their direct contacts with patients; the unpredictability of financing from year to year; the difficulty of instituting cost analysis and quality control; the often vague and fragmented responsibility and authority of the director; and resulting difficulties in obtaining properly qualified staff.

With regard to quality control, the March Trustees Policy Meeting reflected unanimity in recommending the formation of peer group programs to exercise quality control over treatment, the appropriateness of treatment and the fees charged. Further, they favored establishing a task force to study the problem and to draft guidelines for peer review programs to be published by APA.

Another effort of our Association which is concerned with delivery of services is a two-year project just approved by the Health Services and Mental Health Administration titled "Planning Study for Mental Health Service Systems." There has been relatively little emphasis in psychiatry on studies that might improve delivery of mental health services. It is virtually impossible to get meaningful statistics on such basic questions as the incidence of mental illness, on various treatment modalities, and on outcome. Program evaluation, he noted, is a rarity, and an infinitesimal portion of the mental health dollar is spent on research and development of delivery systems. Moreover, evaluation of services in terms of cost effectiveness is met with suspicion and outright resistance. I should note here that evaluation efforts are costly. In view of the crises that constantly confront budgets at the local level, we must look to the Federal Government—most particularly to NIMH and the Health Services and Mental Health Administration—to support this much needed work so that we can begin to fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge.

I would like to end this section on the delivery of mental health services with a warning. We have many lofty goals in view, and we have several important projects under way. At the same time that we develop recommendations for the inclusion of mental health benefits in national health insurance, I hope that all APA members will do whatever they can at the district branch level to improve coverage of mental illness in existing health insurance plans. We need to continue to press upon Blue Cross the need for better coverage of care in psychiatric hospitals. But perhaps the greatest emphasis should be on better outpatient and partial hospitalization coverage. If we really mean what we say when we talk about the desirability of treating the patient where he lives and avoiding hospitalization whenever possible, it behooves us to work at the local level to improve outpatient coverage. And this means that we must work cooperatively with other groups in our areas—with mental health associations, other professionals, with management, labor unions, and the insurance carriers. Those of us already involved in community psychiatry will find that this kind of cooperation comes easy. Those of us without this kind of experience may find it a little more difficult. But such an effort is well worthwhile, and I urge it upon all of you.

I have posed three major challenges among many that confront psychiatry today—the drastic threat to the further growth of our profession inherent in the threatened elimination of Federal training funds, the need to make good on our commitment to the community mental health center movement, the need to ensure that the mentally ill are given equal treatment under any national health insurance system or systems that may evolve. If we do not overcome these challenges, they will overcome us. I trust we will not fail.

THE PARADOX OF THE KANSAS MENNONITES

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the travel section of the Washington Post on Sunday, May 16, 1971, contained an enlightening and interesting article by Kent Ruth on the contributions of Kansas Mennonites who live in south-central Kansas.

The article highlights the important contributions of Dr. Arthur E. Hertzler, the "Horse and Buggy Doctor," who founded an outstanding medical clinic in Halstead; the bringing of "Turkey red" winter wheat which established Kansas as the breadbasket of our Nation and the Nation's leading milling center; and the educational accomplishments of three Mennonite-supported colleges.

I bring this article to the attention of my colleagues, because these areas discussed are in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas which I represent. We, in Kansas, are proud of the many contributions which the Mennonites have made to our State and Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Washington Post article:

THE PARADOX OF THE KANSAS MENNONITES

(By Kent Ruth)

HALSTEAD, KAN.—The houses are big, the barns are carefully worked, the fence rows clean. The animals are sleek and well cared for. The people themselves are sturdy of build, their dress neat and on the clean-plain side. Their manner is open and friendly, if somewhat reserved.

But easy comparisons end here between Pennsylvania's productive Lancaster County and agriculturally rich Harvey County in south-central Kansas.

Both areas have an unmistakeable Mennonite stamp . . . in history, development and culture. But the familiar horse-and-buggy image of Mennonitism undergoes a sharp metamorphosis as it moves from the land settled in the late 18th century at the invitation of William Penn to the one-time "Great American Desert" occupied in the late 18th century at the behest (and with the cooperation) of the Santa Fe Railroad.

Lancaster County Mennonites—the Amish Pennsylvania Dutch, or "queer people," as you will—have long been discovered by the travel world. In fact, some observers (and some Mennonites) are beginning to worry about the effects of tourism-spurred commercialism and development on their heretofore quiet, secluded way of life in Pennsylvania.

Mennonites in Harvey and several adjoining counties, meanwhile—representing three distinct groups within the tiny sect—go about their soil-oriented businesses with a minimum of fanfare and, to judge by appearances, a good bit of material success.

Tiny Hesston (Pop. 1,103), for example, boasts the sprawling buildings of Hesston Corp. on its north side. In the past decade or so the Mennonite-founded firm has grown from a farm-shop operation to a multi-million-dollar manufacturer of farm machinery distributed around the world.

Yet a few blocks away, on the south edge of the village, new buildings of Hesston College show that Kansas Mennonites are not wedded solely to agriculture. And Hesston College is but one of three the area supports, one for each of the three sects. (To their credit, the three schools have recently begun to share facilities and resources.)

All of which is by way of pointing out that travelers—particularly those who may have enjoyed Pennsylvania's Amishland—may well find something new, even reassuring, amid Kansas Mennonites. For though they are conservative in many ways, they are progressive in others. And the resulting contrasts will not be lost upon the observant visitor.

Along U.S. 50 just west of Newton (Pop. 14,877), the Harvey County seat, a neat roadside shield alerts the motorist to a left turn onto the Hertzler Memorial Highway. Around the top of the emblem are the words "Horse and Buggy Doctor." Across the center is the silhouette of the horse and buggy. The shield tells much about the area.

The "highway" itself runs something less than two miles south to the Mayo-like clinic and hospital that makes the pleasantly little tree-shaded village of Halstead (Pop. 1,596) one of Kansas' best-known towns. So respected has the institution become over the years, for example, that in many parts of Kansas and Oklahoma to "go to Halstead" is synonymous with having a thorough medical check-up.

Dr. Arthur E. Hertzler was born, a Mennonite, in 1870. He came to Halstead to practice medicine before the turn of the century. He lived long enough to see his one-room practice grow into a sprawling, highly regarded clinic-hospital facility . . . and to record, with acerbic wit, his thoughts and experiences in the best-selling "Horse and Buggy Doctor."

He did indeed make his first sick calls in a buggy. But his medical facility was thoroughly modern, as was his thinking. And in this he parallels the development of the Mennonites in Kansas, many of whom are already planning to celebrate the centennial of their arrival from the steppes of Southern Russia.

These Mennonite immigrants, as is widely "known, brought with them some of the hardy "Turkey red" winter wheat that had served them well in the Ukraine. They were not mistaken in believing it would serve them equally well on the Great Plains. To use their wheat, of course, they built mills. And so they helped to establish Kansas as one of the nation's leading milling centers.

Never "locked in" by the religious scruples against most modern inventions, as are their Amish brothers, they have always shifted easily to the new and improved, whether in soil and moisture conservation techniques or, as in the case of Hesston Corp., with innovative farm equipment. The result, so far as the urban traveler is concerned, is a predominantly agriculture oriented region that still manages to offer some interesting and unusual sights—and a few satisfying different things to do.

Into the latter category must fall a visit to the annual smorgasbord of the Halstead church. A November event that success in

past years has limited (or the convenience of everyone concerned) to three successive hour-long servings of 250 ticket-bearers each, it regularly draws happy diners from across the state.

German-Mennonite influences frequently appear in other area activities, particularly those centered around the colleges. From time to time Bethel, at North Newton, sponsors a Mennonite Folk Festival, which plays the entire cultural spectrum from foods to the arts, from old-style hog butchering to one-act "dramas" in low German that one can enjoy (as the writer discovered, to his great surprise) without knowing more than a word or two.

Bethel College, incidentally, also maintains an excellent historical library for the visitor who might care to pursue his study of Menno Simons' followers beyond the dinner table. And a museum that contains, with a notable stuffed-animal collection and considerable historical material, much that is both interesting and enlightening on Mennonite culture.

One of the more dramatic creations the eastern visitor is likely to remember is the one-room hut of the pioneer sod-buster. Spartan-like in appearance, as were most dwellings on the virgin prairies, it is nevertheless warmed by decorative touches here and there that served to remind the weary immigrants of their homeland.

But one can capture the feel of the Mennonite culture without eating *verenika pluma mos*, or *borscht*.

And without visiting a museum. (The state, by the way, maintains the Kansas Health Museum at Halstead, also a tribute to Dr. Hertzler.)

One need only drive about, almost aimlessly, to see striking indications of this culture. Just to the east of the one-time Bernard Warkentin flour mill in Halstead, for example, still stands the old Warkentin home—its large white house and sprawling, cupola-adorned barns faithful reproductions of the "old country" structures their builders left behind them.

There's a similar vintage stamp on the "new" mill he built when he moved his flouring operation to nearby Newton. No longer used, the structure manages to maintain a certain dignity, even in abandonment—buoyed perhaps by the knowledge it has been declared a national historical landmark.

Ironically, Warkentin was accidentally shot and killed in his railroad compartment while on a return visit to his Russian homeland—but not before he had built a gingerbreaded Victorian monument to his success in his new homeland. (The home, preserved in its original condition with much of the furniture and furnishings, is now open to visitors on a limited basis.)

To the north lies Hillsboro, with Tabor College and yet another historical-cultural museum. It, too, contains large churches, comfortable homes . . . and, stretching away in all directions as far as the eye can reach, the flat, fertile farmlands of central Kansas that make it all possible.

The Mennonites way of life, is slowly disappearing here. But the "quiet people" just don't change rapidly. Even the relatively modern-minded ones that live in South-Central Kansas.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADVERTISING, MARKETING, AND SOCIETY

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish a "National Institute of Advertising, Marketing, and Society." This bill was originally introduced on May 3, 1971, by Senator Moss—S. 1753.

The bill recognizes and meets a need for a focused, scientifically sound program of behavioral research on the psychological and social impact of marketing and advertising to be conducted by an appropriate independent institution.

My concern with advertising is most directly related to that seen on television, and particularly child viewers. This is so for several reasons.

First, as the Federal Trade Commission recently noted, new methods of television advertising may be causing effects in viewers different from those customarily generated by advertising. Television advertising is not analogous to traditional advertising in the printed media—its effects are far more subtle, persuasive, and render the viewer far more vulnerable.

Second, children constitute a special group of consumers and television viewers. If we need to be concerned about the effects of television advertising on adult viewers, we need to be doubly concerned with its effects on child viewers. An average child watches television 1,340 hours a year and goes to school 980 hours. By the time he is 18, he will have seen 350,000 commercials. Says Mr. Robert Pitofsky, Director of the FTC's Office of Consumer Protection:

> Advertising is a major influence on what our children think, what they want, what they aspire to be, the level of innocence or cynicism with which they view their world.

It is absolutely imperative that we insure that the effect of advertising to children not be personally and socially destructive. But this is exactly the charge that has been persuasively leveled against television advertising directed to children. The list of complainants is long and distinguished, ranging from the Honorable TORBERT MACDONALD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, of which I am a member, to FCC Commissioners Burch and Johnson, to nutrition expert Robert Choate. Even the President of the United States has felt compelled to comment. Surely this is an issue which can and should command truly bipartisan support.

We need feel no concern about infringing on the rights of broadcasters and in opening ourselves to charges of Government censorship by involving ourselves in the field of children's television. As a class, children have always enjoyed special protection under the laws in recognition of their vulnerability and the immaturity of their judgment. Surely this includes protection of children as consumers and as television viewers. Says the FTC:

> The unique aspects of television and its place in the lives of most children provide compelling reasons for argument that special standards should be developed in the regulation of advertising addressed to children.

Children's television has been characterized as a "vast wasteland" and an "entrenched monstrosity," characterizations directed not only at the advertisements, but also at programs for children. Children's television need not be this way. It could serve to educate our children as intelligent and informed consumers and enlightened citizens. It not only can, but must. We simply will not tolerate such a vast segment of a child's time being put to any other use.

This bill does not meet all of the problems of children's television. It does provide, however, for studies on the relationship between marketing techniques and drug abuse, the alienation of young persons from society, and the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of children.

The institute conducting these studies would be located in the FTC and would provide a desirable institutional framework for the studies which the FTC intends to conduct on the subject in the fall. Let us make sure that the next time Congress considers a bill on the subject of children's television, the broadcasters will not be able to shirk their responsibility by claiming that none of the charges can be substantiated.

TESTIMONIAL FOR "POP" GUMMERE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and dedicated citizens and public servants in the city of Seal Beach, Calif., which I have the privilege to represent, is being honored tonight by his many friends at a testimonial dinner.

The man is Lloyd E. Gummere—called "Pop" by his friends—who has voluntarily stepped down after almost 7 years of service as both mayor and councilman of Seal Beach.

I have known Pop Gummere for many of those years and can personally attest to the many significant contributions he has made to the welfare of his city. By these remarks, I want to join the testimonial.

Many of the councilmen and city employees who worked with Pop over the years have drafted and signed a resolution which recalls his specific contributions to Seal Beach and his unselfish service and devotion to the principles of democracy and honest, effective, and responsive local government.

The resolution follows:

A RESOLUTION OF TRIBUTE TO LLOYD E. "POP" GUMMERE UPON HIS VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT FROM THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

Whereas, Lloyd "Pop" Gummere was elected to the City Council of the City of Seal Beach in 1964 and re-elected unopposed in 1968 and was selected by the members of the City Council to serve as Mayor of the City of Seal Beach in 1966–67 and 1968–69, and

Whereas, Mr. Gummere, did voluntarily, resign from his office as Councilman representing District No. 4, in order that the citizens of another Councilmanic District would have the opportunity to express their wishes as voters at a special city election held on March 30, 1971, and thereby further promoted the concepts of democracy and honest, responsible local government.

Whereas, Mr. Gummere was instrumental

in the promotion of recreation programs for the City's youth, including the organization of the City's Recreation Department, and in the acquisition of recreational facilities and open space including Marina Park, Edison Park, Schooner Park, and Bullet Hill (Gum Grove) Park, Lifeguard Headquarters, and

Whereas, Mr. Gummere, in recognition of actual and potential environmental and ecological problems, actively participated in planning for adequate sewage disposal facilities to avoid pollution to the City's water and tidal areas, and was an early active campaigner for cleaner air by reduction of smog and fallout from nearby industrial type facilities, and

Whereas, Mr. Gummere recognized the noise pollution problems resulting from nearby airport facilities and worked diligently to eliminate this problem, and

Whereas, Lloyd E. Gummere recognized the need and actively supported the construction of additional water supply, storage, transmission and distribution facilities including wells, reservoir and distribution and transmission lines, and

Whereas, Lloyd E. Gummere in realization of potential growth problems effecting the community's environment was an active supporter of long range planning including the adoption of the General Plan in 1966 and the Riverfront Redevelopment Plan in 1969 to guide the orderly growth of residential, commercial and industrial areas in the City consistent with the citizen's goals, and

Whereas, Lloyd E. Gummere recognized the need for public transportation for a substantial portion of the City's citizens and assisted with the organization and actively supported the first no-fare city bus service in Orange County, and

Whereas, "Pop" Gummere supported and promoted programs for the protection of life and property including the organization of the City's first professionally staffed Fire Department, construction of fire stations and acquisition of fire fighting apparatus, and the proper and adequate staffing and organization of the Police Department provided with larger and more adequate physical facilities and modern equipment, and

Whereas, Mr. Gummere in recognition of the need to provide adequate service to the community's citizens supported the construction of the Seal Beach Administration Building in 1969, and

Whereas, Lloyd Gummere in recognition of the need to improve the library service to the community, actively supported the concept of city cooperation and participation with the Orange County Library District for a new larger library to serve the Leisure World area of the city and supported studies to initiate improved service and facilities for library service to other areas of the city, and

Whereas, Mr. Gummere was a supporter and active participant in the orderly growth of the city through the annexations of the College Park, North American Rockwell Space Center, Rossmoor Shopping and Business Center and Surfside areas, and

Whereas, Lloyd Gummere, served as Mayor and Councilman during the period of growth from a population of 16,100 to over 25,000 citizens and from 8 square miles to 10 square miles with many private developments including Beverly Manor Convalescent Hospital, Old Ranch Country Club, North American Rockwell Space Division and National Aeronautical and Space Administration facilities, Old Ranch Tennis Club, College Park, Bridgeport, R. & B. and Rossmoor Center residential developments, and

Whereas, Mr. Gummere also served his city and its residents by service as the city's representative to Orange County Sanitation District No. 3, on the Board of Directors of Orange County Sanitation District No. 4, and as the first Chairman of the Seal Beach Redevelopment Agency, and

Whereas, "Pop" Gummere also served his community and fellow citizens as a member of the Board of Directors of the Golden Rain Foundation, Leisure World-Seal Beach, and as Chairman of the Fact Finding Committee (Leisure World), Vice President of the Orange County Division of the League of Cities, and previously served as a Councilman in Pismo Beach, California, and

Now, therefore, the undersigned members of the City Council of the City of Seal Beach elected officers and council appointed staff members who served with Lloyd "Pop" Gummere do hereby honor and pay tribute to Mr. Gummere and his unselfish service to the citizenry of Seal Beach and to his devotion to the principles of democracy and honest, effective and responsive local government.

MORE THOUGHTS ON CBS "PENTAGON" PROGRAM

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to read an article by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, a former special counsel to the President. The article originally appeared in the Sunday, May 16, 1971, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times. The comments will be of value to those interested in the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon." I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

MORE THOUGHTS ON CBS "PENTAGON" PROGRAM

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—In speaking of the impact of national television through appeal to "the emotions rather than the intellect," a network anchorman said: "The result has caused me to wonder whether in the future a democracy which has uncensored TV in every home will ever be able to fight a war, however moral or just."

He continued, "When people are horrified by the same-day sights of blood and mutilation, the hallmarks of all wars, they are not easily convinced that the cause also may be at stake." The anchorman warned, "The consequences may well be that television will breathe pacifism in a democracy when the evidence of its own military action can be tuned in every night."

That was Roger Mudd of CBS News speaking on Dec. 7, 1970, before the annual Tap Day convocation of Omicron Delta Kappa, an honorary leadership fraternity, at Washington and Lee University.

Mudd, who a few months later was commentator for the controversial TV documentary, Selling of the Pentagon, declared that it was his belief "after about 17 years in the newspaper and television business" that broadcasting, whether on radio or television, "will not prove to have contributed to the advancement of ideas or education of man as much as the printed word."

CALLS TV NATIONAL OPIATE

Mudd then declared that "the inherent limitations of our media make it a powerful means of communication, but also a crude one which tends to strike at the emotions rather than at the intellect." He stressed that for the television journalist "this means a dangerous and increasing concentration on action which is usually violent and bloody rather than on thought, on happenings rather than issues; on shock rather than explanation; on personalizing rather than ideas."

"Our broadcasts have not improved," Mudd said. "If anything their quality has declined The tube has become a trip, a national opiate, a baby-sitter who changes nothing, something to iron by and to shave to and to doze over."

Mudd, then out-Agnewed the vice president, declaring, "I am convinced that President Nixon would never have made folk heroes out of the hard-hat demonstrators had the networks not first elevated the ROTC-building burners, the research-file destroyers, and the non-negotiable demanders."

As a speaker at Washington and Lee, Mudd made a lot of sense to men like Rep. F. Edward Hébert (D-La.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Hébert had been opposed to the "managing of the news" at the Pentagon for more than 25 years, and had been conducting investigations of waste and mismanagement in defense contracts in Democratic and Republican administrations from the days of President Harry Truman.

HÈBERT A NEWSPAPER CRUSADER

A former newspaper city editor in New Orleans, Rep. Hébert was a crusader against corruption in city and state governments. Also he was a crusader against corruption and mismanagement in the defense establishment, including revelations of what he called the "chamber of horrors" in defense buying practices back in 1952 and 1953.

Mudd states in the TV documentary that $30 million a year is too much for Pentagon press agentry. Hébert believes the television networks, including CBS, are not helping the situation on taking direct payments of millions of dollars for "Army recruiting propaganda" even as many stations around the country refuse to take the money and charge it up to "public service." The Army has launched an expensive advertising campaign, primarily on TV, which is built around the slogan, "the Army wants to join you."

Hebert questions whether the Selling of the Pentagon documentary didn't focus too much on superficial examples rather than pinpointing more substantial examples of excessive spending. The Louisiana congressman said a more fertile field for journalistic enterprise might be coverage of excessive spending for ineffective weapons. Hebert, along with Sen. John McClellan (D-Ark.), was strong in his criticism of Pentagon spending for the F–111 plane, formerly the TFX. The entire F–111 fleet again has been grounded until an investigation can be completed into the most recent crash of one of the planes.

SUGGESTS MUDD RE-READ SPEECH

Hebert feels the superficial TV documentary by Mudd ". . . breathes pacificism in a democracy" in a manner that is not helpful to balanced judgments by the American people on defense spending. The awards that have been heaped upon Selling of the Pentagon and Mudd are "an indication of the sorry state of affairs in the television industry," Hebert said.

"I believe that it would be most helpful if Roger Mudd would go back and read the speech he gave at Washington and Lee," Hebert said. "He might also suggest that some of his bosses read it, particularly that part that 'our broadcasts have not improved, if anything their quality has declined.' I share Roger Mudd's concern over whether a democracy will be able to fight a war where television dominates every home." Hebert said.

"I don't know whether Roger writes his own shows, or whether this was just a case of being required to say the words and then defend them. His speech at Washington and Lee indicates to me that he once understood the problem better than his Selling of the Pentagon indicated he did."

It is possible that Roger Mudd's university speech will be remembered and quoted at least as long as the Selling of the Pentagon is remembered.

BLUE RIBBON DEFENSE PANEL REPORTS—UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE (III)

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, S. Possony, in "Origin and Consequences of World War II," said:

> We can define the condition wherein the probability of war is the lowest: war is most improbable when the would-be aggressor is absolutely certain that, in case of armed conflict, he would be beaten and defeated.

Our abandonment of the military posture which guarantees as far as possible that even the most reckless aggressor will refrain from attacking the United States—clear superiority—proceeds first in theory and then in fact.

Former Secretary of Defense McNamara concluded that if we were to let the Soviets achieve nuclear parity with the United States they would stop building strategic offensive weapons. Even though the Air Force had recommended as far back as 1962 that the United States needed a Minuteman force numbering at least 2,000 to assure that enough of them would be able to survive a Soviet first strike in the mid-70's to effectively retaliate, McNamara froze our ICBM force level at 1,054. The Soviets—see newsletter 71–18—continued to build ICBM's far past the point of parity, now possess practically 50 percent more of these intercontinental nuclear rocket weapons than we do, and are still building on a crash basis.

Instead of attempting to reverse these ominous developments the current administration has decided to introduce a new theory which holds that defense and survival can be had on the cheap. This new theory is known as "realistic deterrence," see Newsletters 71–3, 4, 5. Unlike Mr. McNamara's theory which could be proved wrong in the real world simply through continued Soviet deployment of strategic weapons, this new theory can be proved wrong in the real world only through successful Soviet attack on the United States.

The supplemental report of the blue ribbon Defense Panel identified this inadequate allocation of resources toward defense, the first purpose of government, as one of the major strategic indicators which compelled them to make the projection that:

> It is not too much to say that in the 70's neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure.

How much should be spent on defense? Some defense critics say we are overspending on defense and point to some real or imagined deficiency within our society. They may point to what they consider inadequate school systems as proof that we are spending too much on securing ourselves from foreign attack. They are hopelessly confused as to the criteria used to establish what must be spent on defensive measures. Defense preparedness measures must accord with the threat which exists in the present and is expected to exist in the future. It must be remembered that if we are not able to assure our survival we can protect none of our other values. Every cut in defense funds at this point brings nuclear war, with untold millions of fatalities, that much closer.

Our national priorities have now been "reordered" to the point where next year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Department which, 20 years ago, did not even exist at the Cabinet level, will receive more funds than the Department of Defense. The current Department of Defense budget request is at the lowest point in two decades in terms of percentage of total Federal spending. Less than one-third of the funds extracted from the American taxpayer will be applied toward defense this year. Within the shrunken Department of Defense budget, 53 percent of all funds are now going toward personnel and related costs. Even though the number of people on the DOD payroll has dropped by 1¼ million since 1968, personnel costs have risen by $7.2 billion. In 1974, over 60 percent of the Defense budget will be devoted to personnel costs.

Less than 10 percent of the 1972 defense funds will go toward our strategic forces. In terms of constant 1972 dollars we will be spending one-half as much on our strategic forces as we did a decade ago. In fact, this year we will spend considerably more on Federal aid to education than we will on the strategic forces which assure our survival.

On the other hand, the Soviets, with only 25 percent of their military spending going toward personnel costs, will spend twice as much this year on nuclear weaponry as the United States. Although dollars to rubles cost comparisons are quite complex, it is easy enough to ask the question, "How much would it cost us to buy what the Soviets now have deployed or under construction?" Obviously plenty more than we are now spending.

We all owe the members of the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel who had the insight and courage to draw up a realistic, straight from the shoulder assessment of disastrous current trends in defense preparedness, a great deal. Being forewarned, there can be no excuse for continuing to disarm. As the panel members said in closing their report—

> The most ominous danger of being second rate in the nuclear age is that it multiplies the chances—not of peace—but of nuclear war . . . The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely to the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive.

U.S. TROOPS RECALL: A MATTER OF TIMING

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, change for the sake of change, concludes former Under Secretary of State George Ball, is no sound policy for a great Nation. Mr. Ball explains why in the following lucid column in the Washington Post of May 19:

U.S. TROOPS RECALL: A MATTER OF TIMING

(By George W. Ball)

I do not quarrel with Messrs. Mankiewicz' and Braden's requiem for "the last of the imperialists" in yesterday's Washington Post, nor do I even object to their including me among those thus celebrated. I strongly suspect that their description of the cleavage in thought between my generation and those under 30 is all too accurate—though I take no comfort from that conclusion.

My quarrel with Senator Mansfield's proposed amendment, which would abruptly direct the President to bring home half of our troops now deployed in Europe, relates primarily to method and to timing.

NATO is an alliance of nations that perceived a common danger and organized to meet it. It can survive and function only on the basis of mutual confidence, which means that the member nations should not act preemptorily and without full consultation. NATO survived General de Gaulle's rude and arbitrary withdrawal, but only because France did not play anything like the leadership role now played by the United States, nor did Germany depend for her security on France's staying power, as she does on America's.

For our country to act so capriciously would be reckless and destructive, particularly if, as I believe to be the case, Western Europe is at a kind of climacteric—a period of change in life where its future cannot be taken for granted. It is here that the matter of timing becomes important, for, though I do not believe for a moment that American troops could or should be a permanent aspect of the European landscape, the present moment would seem the worst possible time for a substantial and abrupt withdrawal.

Between Chancellor Brandt's *Ostopolitik* and the negotiations over Britain's entry into the common market, Europe is going through an uneasy summer. The recent apparent reversal of French policy betrays this. Free of the Gaullist enchantment, France can no longer blink at the fact that West Germany is the strongest power in continental Western Europe. Thus Frenchmen are beginning to fear that, unless Britain casts her lot with Europe as a counter-weight to emerging German power, the specter of German dominance will become increasingly more disturbing, particularly as the Germans begin to probe, no matter how tentatively, the potential for new arrangements with the East.

Europe at the moment is at a crossroads. If Britain joins the European Community, there is a good chance that, over the next few years, Europe can build solid foundations for a modern political structure that should assure not only cohesion and stability, but tighten Germany's Western links. But, if the effort should fail, then latent forces of fragmentation could well begin to operate and Russia would make the most of the political malaise that would ensue.

France would tend to turn in on itself as it did between the wars. A new generation of Germans would feel strong pressures to seek illusory ties with the East—a phenomenon that has occurred again and again in German history. Italy, with its political center already badly eroded and suffering the new disquiet of a Mediterranean nation no longer washed by an exclusively Western sea, might pursue a quite uncertain course—particularly if, as seems possible on the demise of its 79-year-old leader, Yugoslavia should begin to fall apart.

Thus, for these reasons alone, it seems too nervous a moment to disturb the confidence of Europe—and particularly Germany—in

America's intentions and staying power. But I recognize that these arguments rest on the assumption that it is important to maintain a power balance with the Soviet Union—which many of my young friends do not share—and the further assumption that the Soviet Union would almost certainly take advantage of opportunities for expanding its influence in Western Europe if it saw the chance to do so.

To conclude that the Soviet Union is in an expansionist phase one need look no further than the recent vast extension of Soviet power in the Mediterranean and Egypt. And to the young, who would insist that the Soviet Union is no worse in its motive or actions than the United States, I would pose only one question: Why, in that case, need Russia maintain a wall in Berlin, or forcibly prevent its own citizens and those of Eastern Europe from moving to the West? Evil as it may appear to our self-flagellating youth, the "American empire," even at the height of its pre-eminence, never sought to encage the millions in its orbit. And would the young moralists of today feel no qualms if more and more of the world's population were forced within an expanding prison?

In any event, why hurry as Senator Mansfield would have us do?

Once there was a village that was saved from the constant devastation of destructive floods by the building of a dam. For a quarter of a century the village prospered; then a restless new generation asked the penetrating question: "Why do we need the dam? After all, there has not been a flood for 25 years." So they tore it down.

It is a partially inept parable, since it implies a sense of permanence with regard to our NATO deployments that I do not endorse. Yet it does underline one simple point: Change for the sake of change is no sound policy for a great nation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SENATE—*Friday, May 21, 1971*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

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

Eternal Father, without whom we can do little that is great and good, but with whom all things are possible, help us to begin, continue, and end this day with Thee. Shed Thy light upon our pathway that we may see Thy way clearly and walk in it. Help us so to live that we may be part of the solution and not part of the problem confronting us. May we be cheerful when things go wrong, serene when things are irritating, and persevering when things are difficult. Spare us from bitterness or resentment or inflamed temper. Give us grace so to live with joy and peace in our lives that we may reflect the spirit of the Master Workman, who went about doing good, and in whose name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DAVID H. GAMBRELL, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 20, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate on May 21, 1971, received a message from the House of Representatives that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8190) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes"; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 26, 29, 37, 39, 41, 46, 62, 64, 69, and 84 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 18, 38, 49, 57, and 59 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 20, 1971, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with no reference whatsoever to the Pastore rule of germaneness, which will not begin until the unfinished business is laid before the Senate, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to items on the calendar, beginning with Order No. 111, Senate bill 441.

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

BLANDINA SALVADOR

The bill (S. 441) for the relief of Blandina Salvador, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 441

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Blandina Salvador shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92–112), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Blandina Salvador. The bill provides for the payment of the required visa fee and for an appropriate visa number deduction.

ALBINA LUCIO Z. MANLUCU

The bill (S. 559) for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully ad-