

Mr. Wyn Roberts, Conway, C.
 Mr. Robert Adley, Bristol N.E., C.
 Sir Stephen McAdden, Southend East, C.
 Lt. Col. Colin Mitchell, Aberdeenshire West, C.
 Mr. Frank Tommey, Hammersmith North, Lab.
 Sir Geoffrey de Freitas, Kettering, Lab.

APRIL 27, 1971

Sir Donald Kaberry, Leeds, N.E., C.
 Mr. Joseph Hiley, Pudsey, C.
 Mr. Arthur Palmer, Bristol Central, Lab & Co-op.
 Mr. J. C. Jennings, Burton, C.
 Mr. Julian Ridsdale, Harwich, C.
 Mr. S. Clinton Davis, Hackney Central, Lab.
 Dr. Gavin Strang, Edinburgh East, Lab.
 Mr. Mark Woodnutt, Isle of Wight, C.
 Sir J. Langford-Holt, Shrewsbury, C.
 Mr. Peter Hordern, Horsham, C.
 Sir B. Rhys Williams, Kensington South, C.
 Sir Frederick Bennett, Torquay, C.
 Mr. Frederick Mulley, Sheffield Park, Lab.
 Mr. Stanley McMaster, Belfast East, Ulster Unionist.
 Mr. Will Griffiths, Manchester Exchange, Lab.
 Mrs. Peggy Fenner, Rochester & Chatham, C.
 Mr. Edward Bishop, Newark, Lab.
 Mr. Ray Mawby, Totnes, C.
 Mr. Frederick Willey, Sunderland North, Lab.
 Sir David Renton, Huntingdonshire, C.
 Mrs. Jill Knight, Birmingham, Edgbaston, C.

APRIL 28, 1971

Mr. Charles Curran, Uxbridge, C.
 Mr. Jessel, Twickenham, C.
 Mr. John Rankin, Glasgow, Govan, Lab & Co-op.
 Mr. William Wilson, Coventry South, Lab.
 Mr. Marcus Lipton, Brixton, Lab.
 The Rev. Ian Paisley, Antrim North, Prot U.
 Mr. Alfred Morris, Manchester, Wythenshaw, Lab.
 Dr. Glyn, Windsor, C.
 Mr. William Molloy, Ealing North, Lab.
 Mr. Hugh Delargy, Thurrock, Lab.
 Mr. Arthur Probert, Aberdare, Lab.
 Mr. Jack Dunnett, Nottingham Central, Lab.
 Mr. Kenneth Warren, Hastings, C.
 Mr. John Hay, Henley, C.
 Mr. Jack Ashley, Stoke on Trent South, Lab.
 Col. Sir Harwood Harrison, Eye, C.
 Dr. Anthony Trafford, The Wrekin, C.
 Mr. J. R. Kinsey, Birmingham, Perry Bar, C.
 Mr. Emlyn Hooson, Montgomeryshire, L.

APRIL 29, 1971
 Mr. Wilfred Proudfoot, Brighthouse & Spenboro, C.
 Mr. Tugendhat, London and Westminster, C.
 Mr. Eric Cockeram, Bebington, C.
 Mr. Peter Mills, Torrington, C.
 Mr. Arthur Lewis, West Hamm North, Lab.
 Mr. John Gorst, Hendon North, C.
 Sir John Rodgers, Sevenoaks, C.
 R/Adm. Morgan-Giles, Winchester, C.
 Dame Irene Ward, Tynemouth, C.
 Mr. Frank Judd, Portsmouth West, Lab.
 Mr. McCrindle, Billericay, C.
 Mr. John Wells, Maidstone, C.
 Mr. John Peel, Leicester S.E., C.
 Mr. Stephen Hastings, Bedfordshire, Mid C.

MAY 6, 1971

Miss Mervyn Pike, Melton, C.
 Mr. John Hunt, Bromley, C.
 Mr. Michael Havers, Wimbledon, C.

MAY 10, 1971

Mr. Greville Janner, Leicester N.W., Lab
 Mrs. Elaine Kellett, Lancaster, C.

MAY 11, 1971

Mr. John Loveridge, Hornchurch, C.
 Mr. Richard Luce,
 Mr. Nigel Spearing, Acton, Lab.

MAY 18, 1971

Mr. Sydney Bidwell, Southall, Lab.
 Miss Joan Lester, Eton & Slough, Lab.
 Transcribed from Notices and Motions, by
 Louis FitzGibbon.

NEW U.S. POSTAL SERVICE BEGINS TODAY

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1971

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today is an important day for the American people. On this date the new U.S. Postal Service begins functioning, starting out on what I am sure will be a long, hard road toward a better mail system.

I think we were all aware of the obstacles that lay ahead when, last year, we set to work on legislation which would make this day possible. We knew postal

reform would not come easy. We knew it would not come quickly.

Yet something had to be done, and through a bipartisan effort we forged the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970—an act which has made possible today's official birth of the U.S. Postal Service.

Postmaster General Blount is, I am confident, dedicated to transforming the horse-and-buggy operation he inherited into a businesslike, efficient operation, one this country can be proud of.

I wish the Postal Service and postal employees the best of luck as they tackle the complex problems of delivering today's massive mountains of mail.

THE ARTFUL DODGER

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in a surprising 8 to 0 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court recently ruled that Muhammad Ali—alias Cassius Clay—will not be drafted and will not have to suffer the penalties for refusing induction. The unsigned opinion, from which only Justice Thurgood Marshall abstained—because he had served as the Government's chief prosecutor at the time of the case—not only exonerated Clay but administered a slap on the wrist of the Justice Department for prosecuting on the grounds cited. Said the Court:

The Department was simply wrong as a matter of law in advising that the petitioner's beliefs were not religiously based and not sincerely held.

Thus the artful dodger, who has been suspended from the Black Muslim ministry by the sect's own hierarchy, will go scot free. Fifty thousand Americans have died fighting in Vietnam, but Clay, the so-called conscientious objector, will fight only for his own gain in the boxing ring. This decision is the greatest miscarriage of justice yet perpetrated by the Court, and makes a mockery of the entire Selective Service System.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 6, 1971

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

May the God of hope fill you with joy and peace in your faith, that by the power of the Holy Spirit, your whole life and outlook may be radiant with hope.—Romans 15: 13. (Phil.)

Our Father in heaven and on earth, whose wisdom and love are everywhere present and everywhere available to the children of men, we wait upon Thee with receptive hearts praying that Thy spirit will come to new life within us as we face the duties of another week. May we keep ourselves close to Thee and close to one another that together we may work for the highest good of our country.

Help us to honor America not only with our lips but with our lives, not only

with our words but with our works that freedom may ring from shore to shore and from land to land until all men are free.

Bless our prisoners of war and hasten the day when they shall return to freedom and to love. May wars soon cease and peace live among the nations of the world.

In the spirit of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CLINTON M. HOOSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1824) for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2816) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PAUL ANTHONY KELLY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3475) for the relief of Paul Anthony Kelly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3475

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the time limitations of section 2733(b)(1) of title 10 of the United States Code, or of any other statute of limitations, the claim of Paul Anthony Kelly, a minor, of Troy, North Carolina, for physical injuries he suffered on or about February 1, 1964, as the result of the explosion of a device left after an Army maneuver in the Uwharrie National Forest which was filed on or about July 7, 1966, shall be held and considered to have been timely filed and the claim of said Paul Anthony Kelly shall be considered and, if found meritorious, settled and paid in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF CHARLES ZONARS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2127) for the relief of the estate of Charles Zonars, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2127

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of the war claims fund to the estate of Charles Zonars, deceased, formerly of Athens, Greece, the sum of \$6,400 in full settlement of the decedent's claims against the United States arising in connection with the loss, damage, or destruction by military operations of war during World War II of certain property located in Greece in which he held an interest.

Sec. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FERNANDE M. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5318) for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen. Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT F. FRANKLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5420) for the relief of Robert F. Franklin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5420

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert F. Franklin, a former employee in the Foreign Service of the United States Information Agency, the sum of \$3,849 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal property lost in 1967 while performing his official duties.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 9, add the following: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA LUGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

WILLIAM D. PENDER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5657) for the relief of William D. Pender.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN BORBRIDGE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5900) for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JANIS ZALCMANIS, GERTRUDE JANSONS, LORENA JANSONS MURPHY, AND ASJA JANSONS LIDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6100) for the relief of Janis Zalcmanis, Gertrude Jansons, Lorena Jansons Murphy, and Asja Jansons Lidars.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROGER STANLEY, AND THE SUCCESSOR PARTNERSHIP, ROGER STANLEY AND HAL IRWIN, DOING BUSINESS AS THE ROGER STANLEY ORCHESTRA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4667) for the relief of Roger Stanley, the successor partnership, Roger Stanley and Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4667

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to the State of New York the sum of \$3,729.87 on the condition that it will be used by the State of New York as a credit against the liability for tax under the New York State unemployment tax laws of the Roger Stanley Orchestra of New York, New York, for the taxable years 1959, 1960, and 1961, and will extinguish all liability of the said Roger Stanley Orchestra, under such laws for such taxable years. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of the preceding sentence shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike "any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert "the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Roger Stanley, the successor partnership, Roger Stanley and Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIA G. ORSINI (NEE MARI)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1899) for the relief of Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MISS MARGARET GALE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1995) for the relief of Miss Margaret Gale.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN T. KNIGHT

The Clerk called House Resolution 240, to refer the bill, H.R. 4473, entitled "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims in accordance with sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 240

Resolved, That H.R. 4473 entitled "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight", together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, for further proceedings in accordance with applicable law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "Claims" insert "notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches, and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALMAN M. HILMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6998) for the relief of Salman M. Hilmy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?
There was no objection.

JOHN A. MARTINKOSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4042) for the relief of John A. Martinkosky.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without objection.

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

There was no objection.

EUGENE M. SIMS, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7085) for the relief of Eugene M. Sims, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7085

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the claim of Eugene M. Sims, Senior, based upon the loss of personal property while on active duty in the United States Army in Korea in 1950 is to be held and considered as a claim cognizable under section 241 of title 31 of the United States Code; and the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to consider, settle, and, if found meritorious, pay a claim based upon the said loss, if filed by the said Eugene M. Sims, Senior, within one year of the date of approval of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the other bills on the Private Calendar be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 7960, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7960) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what the request is?

Mr. MILLER of California. The request is to take from the Speaker's table

the bill authorizing moneys for the National Science Foundation, to disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLER of California, DAVIS of Georgia, CABELL, FULTON of Pennsylvania, and MOSHER.

CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to represent my golden State of California—long known for its individuality, personal initiative, and independence.

However, recently that golden image was somewhat tarnished when it was revealed that conditions have become so bad that California's Governor pays no State income tax.

And then, just yesterday, I was shocked when reading the local Washington Post that John Wayne, long an exponent of setting a good example for others, has turned to the Federal Treasury to supplement his income.

Wayne, who takes pride in his rugged individualism and independence, along with his partners, reportedly will receive Government farm subsidy checks totaling approximately \$218,000.

Mr. Speaker, the woman with three or four children on welfare who has been given such a going-over recently for "getting something for nothing" must be shaking her head "quizzically" when she reads about these wealthy "dirt farmers" who receive such high payments from the Federal Treasury.

THE LATE DOROTHY ANDREWS KABIS

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

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, over the holiday weekend the State of Delaware and the United States lost one of its first citizens. Dorothy Andrews Kabis, the 33d treasurer of the United States, passed away on Saturday.

Dottie Kabis entered public life as a fighter for honest election procedures in her hometown of Odessa, Del.

She left public life as the Treasurer of the United States, having served in many offices, public and political, in between.

As an officer of the local Grange and State chairman of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and president of the Delaware Federation of Republican Women, as chairman of the National Federation of Republican Women, Dottie Kabis left her mark. Few citizens of Delaware have done so well or contributed so much to the community and to the State and the Nation.

In Odessa, throughout Delaware, and

in Washington, Dottie Kabis will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, the burial will be at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, July 7, in Sheffield, Mass.

Memorial services will be at 2 p.m. on Thursday, July 8, at St. Paul's Methodist Church, Odessa.

At 2 p.m. on Friday, July 9, in the National Presbyterian Church and Center in Washington, there will be services.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DU PONT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT) in expressing my personal sorrow at the sudden death of Dorothy Andrews Elston Kabis, the Treasurer of the United States for the past 2½ years.

Long before "Women's Lib" became a prominent movement in this country, Mrs. Kabis was a leader in political affairs and was chosen in 1964 by the League of Women Voters as one of the Nation's outstanding women in politics. She was a delegate from Delaware to the Republican National Convention in 1956 and 1960 and served as president of the National Federation of Republican Women from 1963 to 1968, as well as being chosen Republican Woman of the Year in 1967. She also served with distinction on the finance committee of the Republican National Committee and with the Republican congressional and senatorial campaign committees.

While Mrs. Kabis' active work in public affairs was always on behalf of our party, her contributions to the cause of good government and for an equal voice in government by women will be remembered by all Americans. My wife and I join in expressing our condolences to her husband.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order this is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING AN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8699) to provide an administrative assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO SELL VETERANS' DIRECT LOANS UNDER PREVAILING MORTGAGE MARKET CONDITIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3344) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable under prevailing mortgage market conditions direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3344

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1811 (g) of title 38, United States Code, be amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Administrator may sell, and shall offer for sale, to any person or entity approved for such purpose by him, any loan made under this section at a price which he determines to be reasonable under the conditions prevailing in the mortgage market when the agreement to sell the loan is made; and shall guarantee any loan thus sold subject to the same conditions, terms, and limitations which would be applicable were the loan guaranteed under section 1810 of this title."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, lines 3 and 4 strike out "Section 1810 of this title" and insert in place thereof, "Sections 1810 or 1819 of this title, as appropriate."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO ESTABLISH AND CARRY OUT A PROGRAM OF EXCHANGE OF MEDICAL INFORMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4762) to amend section 5055 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and carry out a program of exchange of medical information.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, inasmuch as it does not meet the criteria of the Consent Calendar.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9181) to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9181

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

Sec. 101. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (herein referred to as the "Act") is amended by striking out "and amendments including the 1961 declaration of understanding and the 1963 protocol, as well as the convention signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "and any amendments thereto which have entered or may enter into force for the United States including, but not limited to, the 1956 protocol, the 1961 declaration of

understanding, the 1963 protocol, and the 1965 protocols".

Sec. 102. (a) Section 2(c) of the Act is amended by striking out "subject to the jurisdiction of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "subject to the jurisdiction of other parties to the convention with respect to international measures of control in force for such parties".

(b) Section 2(e) of the Act is amended by striking out "subject to the jurisdiction of the United States," and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of such section 2(e) the following: "subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or to the jurisdiction of other parties to the convention with respect to international measures of control in force for such parties."

Sec. 103. Section 2 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(1) INTERNATIONAL MEASURES OF CONTROL: The term 'international measures of control' means any proposal of the Commission which had entered into force with respect to the United States with regard to measures of control on the high seas which may be undertaken for the purposes of insuring the application of the convention and the measures in force thereunder by the United States with respect to persons or vessels of some or all other parties to the convention and by other parties to the convention with respect to persons or vessels of the United States.

"(j) NATIONAL MEASURES OF CONTROL. The term 'national measures of control' means any proposal of the Commission which has entered into force for the United States with regard to measures of control on the high seas which may be undertaken for the purposes of insuring the application of the convention and the measures in force thereunder by the United States with respect to persons or vessels subject to its jurisdiction, and any other actions which may be undertaken by the United States for the purposes of insuring the application of the convention and the measures in force thereunder to persons or vessels subject to its jurisdiction pursuant to the provisions of this Act."

Sec. 104. Subsection (b) of section 6 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce, is authorized to take appropriate action on behalf of the United States with regard to proposals received from the Commission pursuant to article VIII of the convention. The Secretary of Commerce shall inform the Secretary of State as to what action he considers appropriate within five months of the date on the notification of the proposal by the depositary government, and again within the first forty days of the additional sixty-day period provided by the convention if a rejection is presented by another party to the convention, or within twenty days after receipt of a rejection received within the additional sixty-day period, whichever date shall be the later. The Secretary of the Department in which the United States Coast Guard is operating shall similarly inform the Secretary of State as to whether he considers that any such proposal relating to international measures of control or national measures of control should be rejected."

Sec. 105. Section 6 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) In the event that a proposal of the Commission does not come into effect because of a number of objections in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 7 of article VIII of the convention, the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, may nevertheless assent to giving effect to it on an agreed date by agreement with one or more of the parties to the convention, as provided for in that paragraph."

Sec. 106. Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Enforcement activities under the provisions of this Act relating to vessels engaged in fishing and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall be primarily the responsibility of the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce, is authorized and directed to adopt such regulations as may be necessary to provide for national measures of control, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State, for international measures of control and to cooperate with the duly authorized enforcement officials of the Government of any party to the convention."

Sec. 107. Section 7 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the duly authorized officials of any party to the convention shall have the same powers as Federal law-enforcement officers to enforce the provisions of the convention, or of this Act, or of the regulations of the Secretaries of Commerce and the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, with respect to persons or vessels of the United States, pursuant to and to the extent authorized by international measures of control, and such officials are authorized to function as Federal law-enforcement officers for the purposes of this Act. Such powers shall include, only if and to the extent authorized in international measures of control, arrest of any person or search of any vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, execution of any warrant or process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Act, and seizure of any property. Unless such enforcement is authorized by international measures of control or by agreement of the United States, such duly authorized officials shall not exercise these powers in that portion of the convention area in which the United States exercises the same exclusive rights in respect to fisheries as it has in the territorial sea except with regard to vessels of their own flag which may be entitled within such zone, by agreement with the United States, to (1) engage in the fisheries, or to (2) engage in activities in support of a foreign fishery fleet, or to (3) engage in the taking of any Continental Shelf fishery resource which appertains to the United States.

"(e) Any duly authorized enforcement officer or employee of the Department of Commerce may be designated by the Secretary of Commerce and any Coast Guard officer may be designated by the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to enforce international measures of control on behalf of the United States with regard to persons or vessels of any other party to the convention to which the measure is applicable, in any portion of the convention area except such portions in which any other government exercises the same exclusive rights in respect to fisheries as it has in its territorial sea unless such enforcement is authorized by the international measures of control or by agreement with the government concerned.

"(f) Any person designated to enforce international measures of control pursuant to subsection (e) of this section may be directed to attend as witness and to produce such available records and files or duly certified copies thereof as may be necessary to the prosecution in any country party to the convention of any violation of the provisions of that country for the enforcement thereof when requested by the appropriate authorities of such country."

Sec. 108. Section 9 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) It shall be unlawful for the master

or owner or any person in charge of any vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to refuse to permit any person authorized to enforce the provisions of this Act and any regulations adopted pursuant thereto, including in the convention area the duly authorized officials of any party to the convention authorized to undertake international measures of control, to board such vessel or inspect its equipment, books, documents, or other articles or question the person on board in accordance with the provisions of the convention, this Act, regulations adopted pursuant thereto, international measures of control, and national measures of control, or to obstruct such officials in the execution of such duties."

Sec. 109. (a) Section 10 of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 10";

(2) by striking out "any provision" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (b) of section 9";

(3) by inserting "by the Secretary of Commerce" immediately after "adopted"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Any person violating subsection (c) of section 9 of this Act or any regulation adopted pursuant to this Act, upon conviction, shall be fined for a first offense not more than \$1,000 and be imprisoned for not more than six months, or both, and for a subsequent offense within five years not more than \$10,000 and be imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

Sec. 110. (a) In subsection (a) of section 7 of the Act strike out "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to administer and enforce, through the Fish and Wildlife Service," and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to administer and enforce".

(b) In subsection (c) of section 7 of the Act strike out "Secretary of the Interior" each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof at each such place "Secretary of Commerce".

(c) In the first sentence in subsection (a) of section 11 of the Act strike out "Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of Commerce".

(d) In the last sentence in subsection (a) of section 11 of the Act strike out "Secretary of the Interior" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Commerce".

Sec. 111. (a) Section 3(a) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, may designate from time to time Alternate United States Commissioners to the Commission. An Alternate United States Commissioner may exercise, at any meeting of the Commission or of the United States Commissioners or of the advisory committee established pursuant to section 4, all powers and duties of a United States Commissioner in the absence of a duly designated Commissioner for whatever reason. The number of such Alternate United States Commissioners that may be designated for any such meeting shall be limited to the number of authorized United States Commissioners that will not be present."

(b) Section 3(b) of the Act is amended by inserting immediately after "Commissioners" in both places it occurs, the following: "or Alternate Commissioners".

(c) Section 5 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. Service of an individual as a United States Commissioner or Alternate United States Commissioner appointed pursuant to section 3(a), or as a member of the advisory committee appointed pursuant to section 4(a), shall be deemed service as a special Government employee of the United States, as defined in section 202 of title 18, United States Code."

(d) Section 12 of the Act is amended by inserting immediately after "Commissioners" the following: ", Alternate United States Commissioners."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present for the consideration of the House, H.R. 9181, to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950, as amended.

The purpose of this bill is twofold. H.R. 9181 brings the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act into accord with two new protocols to International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and provides for the appointment of alternate U.S. Commissioners to the International Commission for this important fishery.

The new protocols, which were approved by the Senate on July 19, 1966, entered into force on December 19, 1969. Both protocols are designed to strengthen conservation efforts in the northwest Atlantic region.

One protocol expedites the entry into force of new regulations proposed by the International Commission. Previously, each signatory government participating in the panel for the subarea to which a proposed regulation applied had to approve such a proposal before it could enter into force. This situation often resulted in troublesome delays in bringing about conservation measures. By the terms of the new protocol, a signatory nation is deemed to have approved a proposed regulation unless it objects within a specified period. H.R. 9181 conforms the existing law to this protocol by requiring the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce, to take appropriate action on such proposals within a specified period.

The other protocol empowered the Commission to design a plan for international enforcement of the convention's regulations. Under the old procedures of enforcement, each signatory nation could enforce regulations only with regard to its own nationals and vessels. Under the new enforcement scheme proposed by the Commission authorized inspectors from any signatory nation can enforce the convention regulations with regard to the nationals and vessels of all signatory nations. The Commission's scheme entered into force 5 days ago, on July 1, 1971. H.R. 9181 empowers the Secretary of the Department controlling the Coast Guard and the Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to issue the regulations required to implement U.S. participation in the new enforcement scheme.

In order to assure that the United States is represented by the full number of Commissioners, three, to which it is entitled at any meeting of the Commission, H.R. 9181 empowers the President to appoint alternate Commissioners. In the event that a regularly appointed Commissioner should be absent from a meeting or in the event of a vacancy, the alternate would be entitled to sit at that

meeting only. Such alternates, as in the case of the regular Commissioners, are unsalaried and are reimbursed for expenses only.

This bill does not authorize the appropriation of any new funds. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration estimates that the cost of our participation in the new enforcement scheme will amount to \$70,000 for fiscal year 1972. These funds would be drawn from the budget for the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. Speaker, the Northwest Atlantic Fishery is important to the economy of the New England fishing industry, the United States as a whole, and to the other nations who belong to the convention. If a maximum sustained catch is to be maintained, more effective conservation and enforcement measures must be taken.

The two protocols which are implemented by this bill were initiated by the United States and supported by our fishing industry. The estimated cost of our participation in the new enforcement procedure is nominal. Moreover, such participation would involve no new policy as the United States is already a participant in four other fishing conventions which provide for international inspection.

Due to the fact that the new enforcement procedure has already taken effect, it is essential that H.R. 9181 become law so that our Nation can fully participate in and benefit from the scheme's provisions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has adequately explained this bill. There is no reason for repetition. I support this legislation and trust it will be approved by the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which for the first time may put some teeth in the conservation and regulatory efforts of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. These amendments are long overdue.

To the extent that the Commission adopts strong conservation measures, the protocols and this implementing legislation will insure their prompt entry into force, and will enable the United States to conduct some meaningful inspections on the high seas. The effectiveness of the inspection system, of course, will depend upon the latitude granted our inspectors when onboard foreign-flag fishing vessels, and the draft regulations which I have seen do not go far enough. This is a vital first step, however. Once the parties gain some experience with the system and realize that it is not causing harassment of their fishermen, the powers of international inspectors may be substantially strengthened.

While I support this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I must again emphasize the fact that the Convention and implementing legislation have meaning and substance only if strong conservation measures are adopted to protect the

various species of fish which inhabit the Northwest Atlantic.

The record of this Commission is not good. A number of fish stocks of great importance have declined drastically during the past decade. The Atlantic salmon is a case in point. Several years ago, Danish fishermen began catching the Atlantic salmon off Greenland. From a total catch of 35 tons in 1965, the Danish catch rose to almost 1,000 tons in 1969. The salmon caught off Greenland do not spawn in those waters. They come from the streams of the United States, Canada, Ireland, and Great Britain. While the United States and a number of other countries favor a total ban on high seas fishing of this valuable sports fish, the Danes refuse and have only agreed to maintain their catch at the 1969 level, a level which will insure the virtual extinction of the Atlantic salmon in a few more years.

The case of the Atlantic salmon clearly demonstrates that if a country wishes to put short range commercial gain ahead of intelligent conservation for the benefit of all nations, it can do so with impunity under present international arrangements. The United States must not allow such actions to go unchallenged. These multilateral conventions and our bilateral fishery agreements, particularly those with Russia and Japan, tend to create an illusion of conservation while, in fact, they provide a screen behind which our coastal fisheries are systematically plundered by our friendly NATO and other allies.

Mr. Speaker, the fish which live over our Continental Shelf and those which spawn in our waters such as the Atlantic salmon must be protected by the United States, unilaterally if necessary. The proposed 1973 Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea may come too late for the Atlantic salmon and many other valuable species.

I again support this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and urge its enactment. It is a positive step to shore up an inherently weak system of international conservation. But much more is needed, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support the strongest possible measures to protect our fishery resources in the months to come.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to subscribe to the statements just made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) who is quite familiar with this subject. We served on the Committee on Merchant Marine together and on the Committee on Fisheries and, as a former executive of the State of California's Division of Fish and Game, I cannot stress too strongly the necessity for action long delayed in not only protecting this but other species of anadromous fish. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the

motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9181, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARMING AT HOLLYWOOD AND VINE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we all learned that the present Governor of California, a former Hollywood cowboy, is now a Hollywood farmer.

Governor Reagan has done so, he says, because he is interested in cattle, and horses, and ranching. But I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that another part of the Governor's statement gets a little closer to the real point, for he speaks of farming as "part of my business" and as an "investment."

Unfortunately, what we learned, in fact, is that Governor Reagan is just one more of the many wealthy Hollywood personalities who use farming as a convenient, but legal means of tax dodging.

The Governor evidently responded to one of the advertisements which appear regularly in the Wall Street Journal and other such publications telling how farm investments for wealthy people result in tax shelters that enable them to avoid millions of dollars in taxes.

We were aware of this problem when we acted on tax reform legislation during the last Congress. In fact the Senate and House both took note of such tax-dodging schemes. The reports of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees both said that these schemes—in which tax losses are written off against nonfarm profits—"produce a significant tax advantage and tax saving for the taxpayer whose ordinary income is taxed in a high bracket."

Furthermore, they said, the utilization of these tax advantages by high income taxpayers is not merely a "theoretical possibility," a fact confirmed by the disclosure about Governor Reagan and other Hollywood farmers like Jack Benny, Alfred Hitchcock, and Richard Widmark, among others.

The House and Senate agreed that this was a tax abuse which should not be allowed to continue, but it is obvious that during the last session we did not adopt measures strong enough to stop this abuse, much to the relief, no doubt, of Governor Reagan and his management advisors.

There are many people who are able to exploit this potential tax evasion.

Prentice-Hall, for example, has published a report on the changes made in the Tax Reform Act of 1969 entitled "Tax Saving Ideas Under the New Tax Reform Act." Look at what it has to say about the tax advantages of being a gentleman farmer:

The good news: The Tax Reform Law "goes easy" on all gentlemen farmers, particularly

when you look at what it does to some other well-known tax shelters.

If you are careful and watch your step, you can live with the new restrictions and salvage many of the tax breaks.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we in the Congress halted such tax breaks. Certainly the vast majority of our taxpayers cannot even afford to become involved in such schemes. But the wealthy Hollywood farmers who can, milk the Treasury up to \$600 million a year.

Farmers and farm organizations have been trying for some time to change this loophole in our laws. Senator METCALF and Congressman CULVER has introduced legislation to end tax-loss farming. Senator NELSON has joined me in sponsoring legislation to prohibit tax-dodge and hobby farmers—in farming to avoid taxes and not to make a profit—from getting the same farm program benefits as the legitimate farmer.

I am happy to say we have now been joined by some city brethren; namely, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles.

Taking note of the fact that such tax loss farming schemes are possible, that Board, by a unanimous vote, has asked the Congress, "in order to establish a sound and fair tax policy," to "rewrite income tax laws of the Nation to eliminate these glaring and blatantly discriminatory tax advantages for the rich and influential."

Mr. Speaker, on that there is total agreement between rural and urban America.

How can we, in all fairness, leave avenues open for the rich to use agriculture for tax-dodging purposes when, for example, we took away the 7-percent investment credit for small businessmen and farmers, a tax provision which helped our farmers to at least keep up with the tremendous operational costs of modern agriculture.

The elimination of this provision has been significant. Since the beginning of the year, for example, purchases of tractors by genuine farmers declined by 30 percent or more in Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa, by 28 percent in Michigan, and by 22 percent in Wisconsin. It is not that new machinery is not needed, but only that the farm economy is as bad or worse off than the economy in general.

The farm economy is in need of rejuvenation and it could be helped greatly with the return of the 7-percent investment credit.

Mr. Speaker, if our tax laws are going to help farmers, I would hope and prefer that they help those who milk cows rather than those who milk the Federal Treasury by using farming as a tax shelter.

While I am distressed with the fact that wealthy persons use farming to save tax dollars, what they are doing is nonetheless legal. I do not believe it should be. And that is why I believe this is a matter which ought to get the immediate attention of the Congress.

I include several articles on this matter in the RECORD, as well as a copy of the resolution passed by the Los Angeles County Board:

[From the Sacramento Bee, June 13, 1971]

REAGAN TAX ANGLE: CATTLE FIRM OFFERS BENEFITS

(By James Wrightson)

Gov. Ronald Reagan, who avoided paying any state income taxes in 1970 and perhaps one other year while governor, is using the services of a nationally known firm offering tax benefits for wealthy people by managing cattle herds in 18 states.

Records in Nevada, Montana and Wyoming show that Oppenheimer Industries, Inc., of Kansas City, Mo., manages cattle for the Reagan Cattle Co.

Reagan's connection with the Oppenheimer company was discovered from public sources during a joint investigation by the Sacramento Bee and the New York Times.

It is not known how many cattle are owned by the governor and managed for him by the Oppenheimer company, nor how much his taxes have been affected. The governor has steadfastly refused to answer questions about his financial holdings. He could not be reached for comment on his cattle investments.

The Oppenheimer firm, with offices in Kansas City, Beverly Hills, New York City, Washington, D.C., Denver, St. Louis, Sun Valley and Calgary, Canada, manages 120,000 head of breeding cattle in 18 states, 5,200 registered bulls and 40,200 feeder cattle.

Other Oppenheimer clients, in addition to Gov. Reagan, include Jack Benny, Alfred Hitchcock, Richard Widmark and golfers Gary Player, Jack Nicklaus, Doug Sanders and Arnold Palmer.

NET WORTH

In its application to operate in California, on file in the State Department of Corporations, the Oppenheimer company says that, to become a client, a person must have a net worth of at least \$500,000—not counting home and household effects—or be worth at least \$100,000 and be in a combined federal-state income-tax bracket of more than 50 percent.

The company's annual report says that the greatest percentage of Oppenheimer clients are the men who know most about money—bankers and stock-brokers—and that another "significant segment" of customers are those connected with the entertainment industry.

The company advertises that its services managing herds of cattle will be "attractive principally to those who are in a position to benefit from the tax incentives available under the existing federal tax law."

In Montana, the Reagan cattle are branded with the Oppenheimer "gunsight" insignia, with an "R" beside it.

There in the "Big Sky" country on a ranch on the Montana plains 51 miles from the North Dakota border, Hereford bulls bearing the "gunsight R" brand roam among the buffalo berry bushes and eat the lush native grass.

MAN IN CHARGE

The rancher in charge of the Reagan bulls is 28-year-old Gary Murphy. He has, in all, 29 bulls in his herd. He says 13 are owned by the Reagan Cattle Co. He bought them three years ago—about the time the Reagan brand was registered in Montana by Oppenheimer Industries.

On Oppenheimer's instructions, Murphy said, he bought 20 bulls at \$450 each and branded them with the "gunsight R" brand of the Reagan Cattle Co. Since then he has sold seven bulls because they were injured.

The Reagan bulls were found in a pasture several miles from Murphy's neat ranch house in a valley sheltered from the biting cold, snow-laden winds that sweep the Montana plains.

Murphy leases a 22,000-acre ranch near the headwaters of Deer and Pasture Creeks.

One recent cloudy day, the bulls were seen

grazing near a pond in what Montanans call a "coulee"—a small ravine where water collects. When a vehicle approached, the brown and white animals rose indolently and walked away.

"GUNSIGHT R"

One of them ambled into the buffalo berry bushes. The brand on his left rear flank was the "Gunsight R." He was one of the five bulls in that remote pasture that belong to Gov. Ronald Reagan.

At the Nevada State Department of Agriculture in Reno, there is the Oppenheimer Industries application for the "Rocking R" brand for the Reagan Cattle Co.—an "R" with a crescent beneath.

Filed with it is a cattle management contract signed by the chairman of the Oppenheimer board, H. L. Oppenheimer, and signed for Reagan by his personal attorney, William French Smith, who led the Reagan "favorite son" delegation to the Republican national convention in 1968.

Smith is also chairman of the University of California Board of Regents—appointed by Reagan, and the governor's personal friend.

In Wyoming, the "Trident R" brand of Oppenheimer Industries and Reagan Cattle Co. was recorded in 1969 for cattle to run in three Wyoming counties. The Montana and Nevada brands were recorded in 1968, after Reagan had been governor of California for 20 months. The Nevada brand was not renewed in 1971, and there is no record of any movement of Reagan Cattle in Nevada recently.

A card on file lists Ronald Reagan as doing business as the Reagan Cattle Co.

There are more than 300 brands for cattle managed for clients by Oppenheimer Industries on file in Helena, the capital of Montana. In Wyoming, there are over 100 Oppenheimer brands for clients. There are over 50 in Nevada.

The Oppenheimer literature, inviting clients to join the company in a perfectly legal tax saving venture, evokes the Bible.

"Fattening, slaughtering and consuming beef is nothing new," it says. "It has been going on since the days of the Old Testament."

A brochure put out by Oppenheimer Industries, titled "An Introduction to Cattle Ownership and Its Benefits," reads:

"Federal tax laws favor cattle if you pick the right kind and stick to the rules. Herds of beef cows top the list. When you buy them you become a farmer and can keep your books on a cash basis.

"You put in dollars that depreciate or are deductible. You take out capital gains."

The tax on capital gains is much less than on earned income.

The cattle-owning plan works this way: A client invests some of his income, before government taxes are due, in a herd of cattle. He borrows some of the money for the purchase of the herd, and can deduct the interest for one year in advance.

Once he owns the herd, the wealthy client is—in the eyes of the Internal Revenue Service—a full-fledged rancher or stockman, whether or not he knows the difference between a cow and a bull.

The first year, he can deduct the interest for that year, the prepaid cost of the feed, veterinary care, Oppenheimer's commission, and a whopping first year "additional depreciation" on the cattle.

This could amount to enough to avoid or postpone payment of any income taxes, state or federal.

The second year, the "instant stockman" can deduct the cost of feed, care of the herd, Oppenheimer's commission and, again, depreciation.

Tax attorneys say the tax laws allow a "writeoff" of more than half the value of the cattle herd in the first two years of

operation. This would allow the client to avoid—or at least postpone—paying income taxes until the next year.

Then, the client sells his herd for what he paid for it, or maybe a little less, and begins all over again. If he makes money, it is taxed at the capital-gains rate—not as earned income.

The governor's nonpayment of state income taxes for 1970 was reported first by Rosemarie King, a student working on Sacramento State College's radio station.

The governor conceded it, blaming "investment losses" for his tax exemption.

When Miss King later charged that there were two years when the governor paid no state income tax, Reagan didn't challenge her. He told a Los Angeles press conference that there were only "two years in my adult life when I did not have a tax obligation."

Tax attorneys look critically at the governor's statement giving "investment losses" as the reason he paid no state income taxes and got money back on his federal taxes in 1970. They say the Oppenheimer setup is designed as a "tax shelter" to avoid postpone or drastically cut payment of taxes—state and federal—without any real financial loss to the wealthy client who invests.

SOME LINKS

The board chairman at Oppenheimer, H. L. Oppenheimer, is a stepson of Jules Stein, chairman of the board of the Music Corporation of America, where some of Reagan's close friends and advisors are executives.

Reagan's 771-acre ranch in Riverside County is held in the name of Jules Stein.

Tax experts speculate that Reagan became an Oppenheimer client to reduce taxes on his income from the \$1.3 million profit from selling his 'Yearling Row' Ranch in the Malibu Mountains in 1966.

In an angry statement after it was revealed that he had paid no state income taxes in 1970, the governor said he paid a total of \$91,128.22 in state income taxes during his five years as governor.

But tax lawyers and former Internal Revenue Service agents believe the tax on the sale of the 236-acre ranch in the Malibu hills accounts for nearly all of the \$91,000-Reagan says he paid over five years.

The governor's salary during the tax years in question was \$44,100.

With the interest on the \$1.3 million he made on the ranch coming in each year and his governor's salary, his income came to about \$100,000 a year, tax experts estimate.

They speculate that a \$75,000 investment with Oppenheimer taken from the \$1.3 million he made on the ranch, might "shelter" his income so he would have no state tax obligation.

REAGAN COMMENTS

Gov. Ronald Reagan, asked about The Sacramento Bee-New York Times report on his cattle holdings, issued the following statement:

"I have been interested in cattle, horses, in ranching all my life. It is an ordinary part of my business and I intend to continue with it even though it is a relatively small investment."

The statement was issued through his press secretary. Reagan has consistently maintained that his personal finances are not part of his public life.

[From the Washington Post, June 13, 1971]

REAGAN IS CLIENT OF FIRM PROVIDING TAX BENEFITS

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., June 12.—Gov. Ronald Reagan, who avoided paying state income taxes in 1970, is a client of an exclusive Midwest cattle-managing firm that provides tax benefits for the rich, the Sacramento Bee reported today.

The newspaper said in a copyrighted story

that records in Nevada, Montana and Wyoming show Oppenheimer Industries, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., has managed cattle for the Reagan Cattle Co.

Reagan, in a prepared statement distributed by his press aides, said, "I have been interested in cattle, horses and ranching all my life. It is an ordinary part of my business, and I intend to continue with it even though it is a relatively small investment."

The statement did not give specifics on his cattle or ranch holdings, nor did it mention Oppenheimer Industries.

Oppenheimer Industries advertises that its cattle management services are "attractive principally to those who are in a position to benefit from the tax incentives available under the existing federal law," the newspaper said.

It said in a story for its Sunday edition that it was not known how many cattle are owned by Reagan and managed for him by the company or how much it has affected his tax status.

Since the disclosure that the governor did not pay state taxes last year, he has repeatedly refused to answer questions about his financial holdings other than that he incurred "business reverses" on his investments.

Reagan did pay a federal income tax for 1970.

Oppenheimer Industries, with offices in Kansas City, New York City, Washington, D.C.; Denver, Colo.; St. Louis; Sun Valley, Idaho; and Calgary, Canada, manages 120,000 head of breeding cattle in 18 states along with 5,200 registered bulls and 40,200 feeder cattle.

Among its clients are Jack Benny, Alfred Hitchcock, Richard Widmark and golfers Jack Nicklaus and Arnold Palmer.

In its application to operate in California, Oppenheimer Industries said that to qualify as a client, a person must have a net worth of at least \$500,000—excluding home and household effects—or be worth at least \$100,000 and be in a combined federal-state income tax bracket of more than 50 per cent.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, June 13, 1971]

REAGAN REPORTEDLY INVOLVED WITH TAX SHELTER CATTLE FIRM

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—Gov. Ronald Reagan, who paid no state income taxes in 1970 because of what he called "business reverses," is a client of an exclusive Midwest cattle-management firm which provides tax benefits for the rich, the Sacramento Bee reported yesterday.

The newspaper said in a copyrighted story that records in Nevada, Montana and Wyoming show Oppenheimer Industries, Inc., of Kansas City, Mo., manages cattle for the Reagan Cattle Co.

Oppenheimer Industries advertises that its cattle management services are "attractive principally to those who are in a position of benefit from the tax incentives available under the existing federal law," the paper said.

QUANTITIES UNKNOWN

The Bee said in a story for its Sunday edition that it was not known how many cattle are owned by Reagan and managed for him by the company or how much it has affected his tax status.

Since the disclosure that the governor did not pay state taxes last year, he has repeatedly refused to answer questions about his financial holdings other than to say he incurred reverses on his investments. Reagan did pay a federal income tax for 1970.

Oppenheimer Industries, with offices in Kansas City, New York City, Washington, D.C., Denver, Colo., St. Louis, Sun Valley, Idaho, and Calgary, Canada, manages 120,000 head of breeding cattle in 18 states along with 5,200 registered bulls and 40,200 feeder cattle.

Among its clients are Jack Benny, Alfred Hitchcock, Richard Widmark and golfers Jack Nicklaus and Arnold Palmer, the Bee reported.

In its application to operate in California, Oppenheimer Industries said that to qualify as a client, persons must have a net worth of at least \$500,000—excluding home and household effects—or be worth at least \$100,000 and be in a combined federal-state income tax bracket of more than 50 percent. The application is on file with the State Department of Corporations.

The Bee said the firm's brochure reads: "Federal tax laws favor cattle if you pick the right kind and stick to the rules. Herds of beef cows top the list. When you buy them, you become a farmer and can keep your books on a cash basis. You put in dollars that depreciate or are deductible. You take out capital gains."

LOWER TAX LEVEL

The tax on capital gains is less than on earned income.

State tax law limits business reverses deductions to \$1,000 of normal investments such as stocks. Deductions for items such as depreciation are more liberal for livestock investments, however the Associated Press reported.

The newspaper said the cattle-owning plan works this way: "A client invests some of his income, before government taxes are due, in a herd of cattle. He borrows some of the money for the purchase of the herd, and can deduct the interest for one year in advance. "Once he owns the herd, the wealthy client is—in the eyes of the Internal Revenue Service—a full-fledged rancher or stockman, whether or not he knows the difference between a cow and a bull.

"The first year, he can deduct the interest for that year, the prepaid cost of the feed, veterinary care, Oppenheimer's commission, and a whopping first year additional depreciation on the cattle.

"This could amount to enough to avoid or postpone payment on any income tax, state or federal.

"The second year, the instant stockman can deduct the cost of feed, care of the herd, Oppenheimer's commission and, again depreciation.

SMALLER BITE

"Tax attorneys say the tax laws allow a write-off of more than half the value of the cattle herd in the first two years of operation. This would allow the client to avoid—or at least postpone—paying income taxes until the next year.

"Then, the client sells his herd for what he paid for it, or maybe a little less, and begins all over again. If he makes money, it is taxed at the capital gains rate—not as earned income."

Reagan said in a statement yesterday: "I have been interested in cattle, horses, in ranching all my life. It is an ordinary part of my business and I intend to continue with it even though it is a relatively small investment."

The Bee reported that the chairman of the board of Oppenheimer, N. H. L. Oppenheimer, is a stepson of Jules Stein, chairman of the board of the Music Corporation of America. Several executives of MCA are close friends and advisers of Reagan.

Stein also is listed as a trustee of Reagan's 771-acre ranch in Riverside County, the Bee report said.

RESOLUTION

On motion of Supervisor Hahn, unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, there is a pattern in the United States and in California of loopholes in tax laws which allow certain millionaires to pay no income tax and other individuals to call themselves gentlemen farmers and to invest

in agriculture and cattle with resulting tax shelters; and

Whereas, homeowners, small businessmen and ordinary citizens are unable to escape from the responsibility of paying fair and just costs of government at every level—local, state and national; and

Whereas, these income tax loopholes exist at a time when property taxes are at an all-time high and taxpayers are facing continuing tax increases:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles urges the following in order to establish a sound and fair tax policy:

Congress of the United States rewrite income tax laws of the nation to eliminate these glaring and blatantly discriminatory tax advantages for the rich and influential.

Legislature of California overhaul its total tax structure, including enacting major property tax reform for homeowners during this 1971 session and eliminating loopholes and inequities in state income tax laws.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the President, members of Congress, the Governor of California, and members of the State Legislature.

A MORE PERFECT UNION

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

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion marking the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, it is highly appropriate to pause and take stock of the health of the ongoing American experiment in democracy. This is particularly timely now, during an eventful and uncertain period, when some would say that the patient's condition is indeed critical. Although the country may have a few aches and pains after 195 years, I believe that Old Glory is still alive and well and the prognosis is good.

Some of the prophets of doom argue that "the system" is unresponsive to changing needs in modern times. They say that it does not "relate" in a society that has outrun its government's capability to deal with today's problems. In my view, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, two examples of "the system's" responsiveness and workability have received great national attention this past week.

There has been a growing awareness that the Nation's young people are ready to participate in the electoral process. Whether we agree or disagree with this principle, it is certainly fair to say that most young people themselves have supported the 18-year-old vote concept for some time. Last year, however, most efforts to lower the voting age in individual States were defeated, perhaps as a reaction to protests common at that time or perhaps simply because the time was not quite right.

But this past week marked the conclusion of the shortest constitutional amendment process in our history with two-thirds of the Congress and three-fourths of the States, including Alabama as the 37th, ratifying the 26th amendment which extends the vote in State and local elections to citizens 18 years of age and older. In contrast to the years of unsuccessful effort, it took only 3 months to realize this basic change in

our Constitution, providing once again the truth of the old saying that "nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come."

In the same way, the Supreme Court this past week met the challenge of the Constitution in the case of the "Pentagon Papers." Two opposing forces—the desire of the executive branch to keep its classified secrets and the right of the American people to know, collided in an important and historical battle. In most nations, the battle would have been over at the beginning, because the government would have swooped down upon the newspapers and confiscated everything. But here, in America, the battle was in court, out in the open, and whether the decision strikes us as good or bad, it certainly points up once again the capability of our governmental process to deal with the gravest of issues.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, these two examples clearly nullify the conclusions of those who would find nothing right with America. Those who would refuse to accept the opportunity offered by working within the system—who want overnight to right all wrongs, cure all ills, and solve all problems as they alone may see them—deny the attempts which have been made to improve mankind throughout the history of our great Nation. And at the same time deny the ongoing challenge to continue those efforts which are supported by the vast majority of their fellow citizens. Demanding the good things of American life only on their own terms, they deny the slower and deliberate, but far more telling progress which continues to benefit all.

After the Declaration of Independence, the next great document of American history is, of course, the Constitution, and in its preamble is contained the stated intent of the people to form a "more perfect" union. Not perfect, but "more perfect," and I believe the choice of words is significant. The Republic has come a long way since those early days, but what seems most needed now is a reawakening of the old virtues of America—and the belief in ourselves and in each other.

Mr. Speaker, those who would cripple this free system must be met by an America determined, in the words of Tennyson, "to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

WHAT PRICE "PATRIOTISM"? A TALE OF TWO CITIZENS

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following headline appeared in the Washington, D.C., Post of June 29, 1971: "Patriotic Motives Cited by Ellsberg" and the opening paragraph of the story read as follows.

BOSTON, June 28.—Daniel Ellsberg, charged with criminal misuse of government secrets, surrendered to federal authorities today with a sidewalk concession that he did distribute the classified Pentagon papers on Vietnam, as an act of patriotism.

In line with this questionable value judgment of Mr. Ellsberg's, and in con-

nection with the major controversy over Government secrecy, I think this is an appropriate time to remind ourselves of another U.S. citizen who was once faced with the same decision concerning secret Government material.

What has been called the most serious potential threat to American national security, and to American cryptanalysis in all of World War II, took place during the 1944 presidential campaign, when Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, ran for the first time, against President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the major issues of the campaign—and one that has survived to this day—was the charge that F.D.R. had deliberately led the United States into the war, and laxity on the part of his administration was responsible for the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. It was known among many high officials that the Government had broken top secret Japanese codes prior to Pearl Harbor. From this, the conclusion was drawn that Roosevelt had known well in advance of the attack but had done nothing to warn Pearl Harbor. I will not comment on this; it is still being debated; there are numerous books and articles both pro and con. It probably will never be decided to everyone's satisfaction.

On September 11, 1944, Representative Forest Harness, of Indiana, told the House of Representatives that—

The Government had learned very confidentially that instructions were sent out from the Japanese Government to all Japanese emissaries in this hemisphere to destroy the codes.

This speech was reported at once to Gen. George Marshall, Army Chief of Staff. Marshall saw the danger: If the Japanese heard of this speech, they would instantly and correctly deduce that their codes had been broken. They would change them at once, and in one stroke would deprive the United States of one of our most valuable weapons in the entire war.

Marshall did not go to Roosevelt. Instead, with only Adm. Ernest King, Chief of Naval Operations, let in on the matter, he sent a letter to Governor Dewey by personal messenger, marking the letter "Top Secret" and "For Mr. Dewey's Eyes Only."

Dewey had read only a few lines when he saw the word "cryptograph" and stopped at once. He guessed what the letter referred to, as he had already heard the codebreaking secret from several persons. He felt that as a presidential candidate he could go no further.

Marshall tried again. This time Dewey refused to read or discuss the letter except in the presence of one of his closest friends and advisers, in case anything should happen to General Marshall. He also wanted to keep the letter, promising to put it in his most secret file. Marshall agreed. Dewey then turned to what one authority calls "the most revealing single document in the annals of cryptology."

The letter to Dewey admitted the Japanese code had been broken. Not only were Japanese moves in the Pacific known in advance, but also a good deal of Nazi Germany's situation, since the

U.S. Government was deciphering messages from the Japanese Ambassador in Berlin to Tokyo.

The Battle of the Coral Sea had been anticipated; Midway, called "the Battle That Doomed Japan," and "the Turning Point in the Pacific"—the Japanese lost heavily and many senior Japanese officers knew then the war was lost—had been won because disposition of the Japanese battle fleet was known; Japanese convoys had been ambushed and sunk; hit-and-run raids were possible on Japanese naval installations.

Marshall did not tell Dewey what to do in so many words: "I am presenting this matter to you in the hope that you will see your way clear to avoid the tragic results with which we are now threatened in the present political campaign."

What followed is best summed up in the following paragraph from the most comprehensive book ever written on cryptoanalysis and secret codes: "The Codebreakers," by David Kahn, MacMillan, 1967. The paragraph appears on pages 607-608:

This extraordinary missive put Dewey in a grave predicament. He felt that the Japanese simply could not be using the same code in September 1944 as they had been in November 1941. Profoundly convinced of the righteousness of his cause and of "the dreadful incompetence" of the Democrats, both in the country and the world as a whole, and at Pearl Harbor in particular, he—and many Republicans—might well have thought that true patriotism actually called for exposing some 3-year-old secret about pre-war codes to prove his point and elect the right man and the right party to control the destinies of a whole nation. For with that exposure furnishing apparently solid evidence, the Pearl Harbor charge might have propelled him into the White House. Dewey talked the matter over in detail with Bell and with Herbert Brownell, his two closest advisers. He weighed these arguments and the prize at stake—leadership of the most powerful country in history—against the possibility of prolonging a war in which hundreds of Americans were dying daily and against his regard for Marshall as an utterly truthful and honorable man. After 2 days of intense deliberation, he decided not to mention the code-breaking.

Dewey never did tell Marshall in so many words what he had decided. But he never mentioned the code matter during the campaign. He lost, heavily.

Marshall in appreciation did later send a messenger to Dewey with recent broken messages, showing just how knowledge of the code was helping in the course of the war. Dewey, in return, offered to aid Marshall by intervening to stop a debate on Pearl Harbor—and the code issue—which was threatening to start in the Congress. Marshall said he had already made enough requests of Dewey would not personally embarrass him further. Dewey answered in effect that as far as he was concerned, personal embarrassment had nothing to do with it, if it meant successful progress in and prosecution of the war. No debate ever started but I have no doubt Dewey would have done all he could to stop it.

The last episode came at Roosevelt's funeral in Washington. Marshall took Dewey to the War Department, and showed him the latest, most secret messages, broken by knowing the codes, and

was given a full, on the spot story of just how important the matter had really been.

Probably less than half a dozen men ever really knew all about this. Most of them are dead now. One was offered a fantastically large sum of money to write the details of the matter, but he refused.

What price "patriotism"? Some men can be bought for momentary adulation, and can be bought cheaply indeed. Others cannot be brought at any price—not even for the office of President of the United States.

MINORITY ACTIVITY IN THE PEACE CORPS

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

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents received a most remarkable letter from the Peace Corps, which has all the earmarkings of a blatant effort to incite racial bias and politically motivated divisions among American young people. The letter was apparently mailed to a number of minority-group potential applicants by Miss Carolyn Gullatt, a returned Peace Corps volunteer, as part of a recruiting campaign to enlist young people to carry out the agency's program overseas. This letter was written on Peace Corps' stationery and mailed under the Government frank, but it is nothing more than a politically motivated insult to the average American.

I immediately protested this to the Peace Corps and was told that the writer is employed by the agency and was allowed to write the letter "in her own words to encourage minority applicants to take a real look at the Peace Corps." In his letter back to me the director of the agency's congressional liaison office said, "We now realize that portions of the text could have a negative interpretation," and added, "We are not planning any further mailings."

The Richmond News Leader had a splendid editorial in its June 25 edition, in which the text of the letter from Miss Gullatt was included, and I wish to include this herein with my remarks:

[From the Richmond News Leader, June 25, 1971]

RAPPING WITH CAROLYN GULLATT

A series of ads currently running on local radio stations, begins: "What is the Peace Corps today?" A Peace Corps volunteer then talks glowingly about his experiences, and the ad concludes: "The Peace Corps: You can be proud of it."

No you can't—not of one facet of it, anyway. And that facet is an apparent willingness on the part of the Peace Corps to peddle racism and anti-Americanism. In support of that proposition, we give you the letter below. It was written to a resident of Petersburg on Peace Corps stationery, and mailed in a franked Peace Corps envelope. Now we ask you: Is this the kind of letter that ought to be emanating from the offices of the Peace Corps? Is it the kind of thing that taxpayer money ought to underwrite? The letter is a stunning example of neo-Black Pantherism. It has no appeal except an appeal to race, and an appeal to those who detest the United States.

Virginia's Fourth District Congressman,

Watkins Abbitt, took one look at the letter and was predictably aghast. On June 1 he got in touch with Ralph Vandervort, director of Congressional relations for the Peace Corps. Congressman Abbitt asked Vandervort two questions: Is the jivy author of the letter still on the Peace Corps payroll? Did the Peace Corps sanction her letter—a letter that evidently went out to a considerable number of persons? Two days ago the answers came back: Yes, the author remains on the payroll. And, yes, she wrote an "official" letter. Vandervort added that the Peace Corps is "re-examining" its policy of permitting such letters to be written.

So there you have it: The Peace Corps is in the business of sanctioning black racism; it is in the business of encouraging hatred of the United States. Instead of firing the author and disowning her letter, the Peace Corps keeps her on the payroll and stands by her letter. It ought to stop. If you agree, write to Mr. Joseph Blatchford, director of the Peace Corps, and tell him so. His address is Washington, D.C. 20525.

Imagine the outcry there would be if a similar letter were sent out from the Peace Corps appealing to potential applicants solely because they were white. But racism these days is okay if it is black. And imagine the anti-American job the Carolyn Gullatts in the Peace Corps can do on the inhabitants of the Third World. No wonder the foreign image of the United States is tarnished. The Carolyn Gullatts are out there rapping about the materialism and cold hostility of America. . . . this country's lack of sensitivity to the needs of the Black people." And we're paying her to do it.

Proud of the Peace Corps? It's enough to make one sick.

THE PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. —: I am a Black Returned Peace Corps Volunteer, from a developing country in the Third World, who wants to rap with you about the relevance of such an experience for Black people.

When I was in your position as a student, the Peace Corps never really came through as a viable alternative for Black people. Everything I ever heard or saw about the Peace Corps implied "for whites only." One day a Peace Corps recruiter—a Brother—appeared on my campus and wanted to rap with me. The thing that impressed me about the Brother is that he didn't run down the usual jive propaganda about how nice it is to help people. Rather, he talked about how I, as a Black person, could get "home" and join with the Brothers and Sisters in Africa, the Caribbean, and other countries where there are Black and Brown people who are oppressed and depressed by the economic and social conditions of their environment. He ran it down to me about how I could enhance my own image of self by living and working in places where people have grown into Black pride naturally, where Black power is the status quo, and Black action is a working reality. He ran it down about how Black people in America need to perceive themselves in relationship to the world of Black and Brown people, all of whom are victims of a generally oppressive condition. He ran it down and I listened.

My listening led me to filling out an application and eventually going overseas for two years. I returned to this country with experiences which caused me to view with stark candor, and no less anger, the nature of the American society. Being away from the materialism and cold hostility of America made me realize even more, this country's lack of sensitivity to the needs of the Black people. It made me more radically, and, perhaps, more militantly committed to doing something about these insensitivities. I lived overseas with Black and Brown peoples of the Third World and recognized more clearly

than ever that there is an irrevocable bond between peoples of color; that the future of our continued existence lives with us, pulling together to combat forces which would keep us under the economic and social whip.

Each year the Peace Corps sends hundreds of white "do-gooders" to "help" Black and Brown people throughout the world to get it together. Black Americans owe it to themselves and to the Brothers and Sisters in developing countries to get up and get involved. Take time out. Go where your talents can be used, where Black and Brown people make the decisions that affects their lives. Discover where your head is really at. Take time out—America and her problems will be here when you return—and you will probably be better equipped to deal with them.

Brothers and Sisters throughout the Third World have much to give to Black Americans. What can you give them? The Peace Corps is a way you can get a ticket over to find out.

Whether you are graduating now, or next year, fill out the enclosed "Information card and return it to the Peace Corps." You owe it to yourself.

Power,

CAROLYN GULLATT,
Returned Peace Corps Volunteer.

Because of this incident and several other similar actions which have been brought to my attention, I believe that Congress ought to do what the Peace Corps says it was trying to get the minority applicants to do—take a real look at the Peace Corps. Is this the focus which the agency is now trying to create? Should we, as a Nation, be supporting with millions of dollars an activity which seeks to put race against race and create a blatantly contrived image of Government-sponsored efforts to set aside black and brown peoples as a "Third World" force?

I would suggest that Members read carefully the editoria, and the letter and I believe that the inferences will be plain.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS ELLSWORTH MARTIN

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of my predecessor, a former colleague of many who are still serving in this House—Thomas Ellsworth Martin, formerly, when a Member of Congress, from Iowa City, Iowa; lately, a citizen of Seattle, Wash. He served 16 years in this House with great distinction. Few men have enjoyed the respect of the Members of this House that Congressman Martin enjoyed. Few Members have been loved more as a public servant in his district and in his home State than was Tom Martin. He was always on the job. He was diligent in all things he did. He was completely and utterly dedicated to the great principles of our country, and served his people thoroughly, well, and effectively while he served in the Congress.

Later he decided to run for the Senate. He was successful and served for 6 years in the other body, also with great distinction.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Martin had an enviable record in public service. He was an active leader and effective legislator. His

background is worthy of note. I begin by pointing out that he was a Republican, but first of all and always an American, highly dedicated to the ideals of his country.

During his service in Congress, his home was Iowa City, Iowa; born in Melrose, Monroe County, Iowa on January 18, 1893, and attended country school in Monroe County and grade and high schools in Russell, Iowa, and graduated from Albia High School, Albia, Iowa, in 1912. He received his B.A. degree from the State University of Iowa in 1916 and his juris doctor degree from the State University of Iowa Law School in 1927. He was awarded a university fellowship by Columbia University for 1927 and 1928; an LL.M. degree from Columbia University in 1928; an LL.D. degree from Parsons College in 1957. He was admitted to the Iowa bar in 1927 and to the U.S. Supreme Court Bar in 1939. He was a member of the Johnson County, Iowa State, and American Bar Association and served as city solicitor of Iowa City from 1933 to 1935 and as mayor of Iowa City from 1935 to 1937. He was the Republican nominee for the Railroad Commissioner of Iowa in 1932 and 1934; permanent chairman of the Iowa State presidential convention, February 28, 1936.

He was graduated from first officers' training camp, Leon Springs, Tex., in 1917 and commissioned to the U.S. Regular Army, serving with the 35th Infantry throughout World War I, retiring from the military on November 10, 1919.

Tom served as an assistant professor of military science and tactics at the University of Iowa from 1921 to 1923.

He married Dorris Jeanette Brownlee of Waterloo, Iowa, on June 5, 1920.

Tom Martin was elected to the 76th Congress and served inclusively to the 83d Congress. He was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs from 1939 to 1947, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means from 1947 to 1955.

He was elected to the U.S. Senate on November 2, 1954, and served one term beginning January 3, 1955. He served on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works Committees, Select Committee on National Water Resources, and Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Tom Martin very well, knew him as a personal friend of long standing. I knew and was close to him politically for I was his congressional committeeman for 16 years before I came to Washington as his successor when he decided to run for the U.S. Senate. As his congressional committeeman, I had the pleasure of serving him and representing him, when he could not be present, for official occasions, and to open doors for him and assist in any way in serving the people of Scott County. Always he was most generous in giving his time, most conscientious with any and all problems whether they related to the poorest of the citizenry, member of another party, or banker. He had a keen and perceptive ear and an understanding heart and mind that was felt and appreciated by all who knew him and while he was the Representative, he was in a very real sense—a personal friend.

In his service in Congress, he was outstanding. He made it his policy to yearly send out questionnaires to get the public response on the issues and problems of our country. He was conscientious in this and thorough and it gave him a working knowledge of the feelings of his constituency and qualified him better to represent his district in the Congress.

He served first on the Committee on Military Affairs during a very critical period in our Nation's history, the period following World War II. I have talked often with the chairman of that committee, Carl Vinson, under whom he served, and he told me that Tom could not only be depended upon to be on the job, but to give admirably and effectively of his talents. You see, Mr. Speaker, he had served in World War I and, therefore, knew first-hand the important things for an army in a wartime. He was on the subcommittee that dealt with material and it was his leadership and insight that gave this area the high priority it had to have in order for industry and Government to produce the implements of war that were so necessary to win the military war. In this area, he was considered the outstanding member not only of the committee, but of the Congress.

Later at the close of the war, he saw an opportunity to serve on the Ways and Means Committee and so with the help of his friends in Congress, he was given this new assignment and opportunity. Again as before, he became an invaluable member of the committee and made significant contributions to a better balanced tax law and worked incessantly to give the Government the kind of income it had to have to balance the budget. You see, he was a Representative that believed you must have a balanced budget and to do this you must be willing to tax the people to pay the bill or to cut appropriations to meet the income. This was his policy and his position and it was a sound one.

A memorial service for Senator Martin was held on Friday, July 2, at the University Congregational Church in Seattle, Wash., with burial in the Willamette National Cemetery.

I join my colleagues and the many thousands of friends in extending sympathy to his lovely wife, Dorris, and to his daughter, Mrs. Raymond Reiser, of Seattle, and son, Richard of Chicago, and, of course, all their families.

Mr. Speaker, here was a man who measured high, who served well and will be remembered as long as there are men living who knew him and he will be appreciated by all who look at the record of service and contribution made to his country, to Iowa, and to his District.

Following are some comments from Rev. Dale E. Turner, minister of the University Congregational Church which I feel are most appropriate:

Tom Martin had the marvelous gift of being able to translate the christian spirit into the activities of everyday life. His religion was not a thing of fits and starts, but it was a steady loving spirit which enriched the lives of all who knew him. He had humility without timidity, competence without arrogance and he exercised authority without being authoritarian. He was a man of strong and firm conviction, but he could disagree without being disagreeable.

Tom was always too busy to be unhappy,

too curious to be apathetic, and too intense to miss any joy around him. He was always eager to give to life more than was expected or required and was willing to take from it less than he deserved. He was a true Christian gentleman who made our country a greater country because of the vital contribution he made to its life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I learned of the death of our former colleague from Iowa, the Honorable Thomas E. Martin, a member of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate for nearly a quarter of a century.

A veteran of World War I, with long service thereafter in the Reserves, Tom Martin's first civilian public service was as city attorney and then mayor of Iowa City. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1939 from the First Congressional District of Iowa, and in 1954 won a hard-fought election to the U.S. Senate. He served one term of 6 years in that body and retired in 1961.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending every sympathy to Mrs. Martin and the members of their family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks, on the life, work, and contributions of Thomas Ellsworth Martin.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEIBERLING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE TO THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL DESEGREGATION BILL

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the general subcommittee on education, which I have the privilege to chair is under heavy pressure to take the affirmative action in the President's Emergency School Desegregation Act which already has been approved by the Senate and is now pending before the subcommittee.

The Senate bill would authorize \$500 million in fiscal 1972 and \$1 billion in fiscal 1973 for assistance to schools undergoing desegregation.

The Senate bill requires that a school district to qualify must have at least one model integrated school in the district and file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a comprehensive plan on when all the schools in the district will be desegregated.

As I watch the growing crises in finances facing America's entire school system, I fear the desegregation bill, standing alone, will do very little to solve our basic problem.

Furthermore, as I watch development of a new phenomenon, the growing trend toward resegregation as white children leave desegregated schools in ever increasing numbers, it becomes even more apparent that the desegregation bill in its present form will prove of little help.

Mr. Speaker, I am not for one moment

suggesting that we turn back the clock of landmark judicial decisions, but the inescapable fact is that we are faced with resegregation in many desegregating school districts. In Atlanta 23 percent of the white students left the school system in the last 2 years. In Mobile 12 percent, in Birmingham 13 percent, in Catham-Savannah 8 percent, in Orleans Parish 8 percent, in Houston 5 percent, in Caddo Parish 19 percent, and in Jackson, Miss., a staggering 42 percent.

This is not a phenomenon confined to the South. In Boston the percentage of black students who were completely racially isolated has increased from 0.3 percent in 1968 to 11 percent in 1970, while the school system was under the State racial imbalance law.

What we are saying is that we ought to provide funds to improve funds for the education of all children.

I have discussed this legislation with a large number of school administrators and they advise me they intend to spend most of the Federal aid in the purchase of buses and hiring of busdrivers to comply with various court-imposed desegregation plans.

School authorities in Tampa, Fla., alone, told me they need to purchase 187 buses and hire a similar number of drivers to implement a court-ordered desegregation plan for that city's 105,000 schoolchildren. Similar statements have been made by others.

Secretary Richardson, in a letter dated June 28, 1971, to the Senate, stated that it is his Department's intention to provide temporary emergency assistance only to school districts which make significant adjustments in response to the Supreme Court's Swann decision.

He has assured the Senate that regulations applicable to the existing Emergency School Desegregation Act will be promulgated by his office shortly to require strict compliance with the Swann decision by all school districts applying for Federal assistance under the Desegregation Act.

The Swann decision held that district courts may require massive busing to achieve integration in public schools.

I have held extensive hearings on this matter, and am deeply concerned that the rigid provisions calling for comprehensive desegregation plans in the Senate bill, and the avowed regulations by HEW to strictly interpret the Swann decision, will make the President's emergency school desegregation proposal available to a very limited number of school districts in America.

My fears are fortified by Secretary Richardson's comments on the proposed emergency bill. He stated:

As I have indicated, we anticipate that we will have a considerably small number of districts which will be eligible to participate in the program during the period of the continuing resolution.

What the Secretary is saying is that the very rigid standards anticipated by HEW—standards that require a greater degree of desegregation than many court orders, under which school districts throughout the Nation are now operating, require—will make fewer school districts eligible.

We will also be faced with the prospect of this emergency school desegregation

legislation becoming permanent legislation to aid a limited number of qualifying school districts, when, indeed, financial assistance is needed today literally across the board by all school districts in America.

I, therefore, propose that we restructure the administration proposal to provide some degree of assistance to every school district in America, and then provide additional assistance to those districts faced with various problems related to desegregation of their schools.

Under my proposal, we would structure a concept of assistance for every youngster attending public schools in this Nation. Such assistance would be made available directly to the school district for operating expenses and improving the quality of education of all the children in such district.

I hope the Members of Congress and the Education Committee will study these figures and then reach the same conclusion I have: to make funds available only for desegregation will bring help to only a limited number of schools qualifying while all school districts need basic assistance.

I believe that this approach, added to the existing programs under the Elementary and Secondary School Act, would provide local school districts with the kind of meaningful assistance they need to meet the challenge of the 1970's in education.

My proposal would afford U.S. Commissioner of Education Sidney Marland, an opportunity to give meaning to his nationwide effort for greater emphasis on quality education, including career education.

My proposal gives local school districts an opportunity to develop more meaningful reading programs, which President Nixon has made his No. 1 objective in American education, to improve the reading skills of American youngsters.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that with the President now winding down our involvement in Vietnam, we will be able to realign our financial priorities in fiscal year 1972 and make available the necessary funds for a meaningful school aid program.

My proposal provides for the assumption by the Federal Government over a period of 3 years of approximately one-third of the cost of elementary and secondary education in the country. It provides for a State grant program, modeled on title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, whereby every school district is assured of the proper share of funds for the education of its students.

We would preserve, as a separate part, the administration's proposal for specific assistance to those districts which have additional problems related to integration, whether such districts are under a court order, HEW title VI order; or if such districts are undergoing a voluntary plan of desegregation.

Under my proposal, we would provide the school districts of America \$3.6 billion of direct assistance, and an additional one-half billion dollars as recommended by the administration for specific programs related to desegregation.

It would require that while the \$3.6 billion would be used for improving the quality of education for all students, the

one-half billion dollars would be made available during the next 2-year period for supportive service necessary to carry out an effective integration program where applicable.

I believe that this approach will qualify all of the Nation's school systems for assistance during the present financial crisis facing our Nation's schools, and at the same time, it would provide additional assistance to those schools undergoing integration.

It would afford school administrators an opportunity to make long-range plans for improving the quality of education in their schools in order to stop the trend toward resegregation.

President Nixon has sent to Congress his revenue-sharing and education program. I believe the alternative that I am offering is consistent with the President's desire to help local school districts in financing their educational needs.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a table prepared for my committee showing the administration of direct aid to each county in States under the assistance program I am proposing to improve the quality of education for all youngsters.

I am also including a table which shows the total amount of assistance each State would get for improving the quality of education in its respective school district,

and the amount of money each State would get specifically earmarked to aid those schools faced with additional financial needs because they are undergoing integration.

Each school district's entitlement is determined by multiplying a Federal grant per pupil by the number of schoolchildren in the district with a double count for the poor children. This double counting of poor children is in recognition of the fact that poor children require more resources, and also of the fact that school districts with substantial numbers of these children are generally less able to provide these added resources.

The Federal grant per pupil used in determining each school district's entitlement is the result of three factors. First of all, the grant varies according to the rate of payment by the Federal Government, that is, 10 percent for the first year, 20 percent for the second year, and 33 1/3 percent for the third year.

Second, the grant varies according to the wealth of the State where the school district is located. Districts in the poorer States receive payments at a higher Federal rate and districts in richer States receive payments at a lesser rate. This variance in the rate of payment is in recognition of the fact that the Federal

Government has a greater obligation to improve education in the poorer States.

Third, the payment varies according to the expenditure for education from State and local sources in the State where the school district is located. Districts in States where the local school districts and the State tax themselves heavily for education receive a higher grant per pupil under the act. This variance rewards those States and allows States to increase their payments under the act by increasing their expenditures for education. This factor also helps to achieve some equalization of the Federal payments within the State since a poorer district would be receiving funds at the rate of the average expenditure from State and local sources within the State when it probably is not able to spend for education at that level.

Following are tables showing proposed distribution of Federal aid to education. These tables do not include the additional funds each county would get from the special funds earmarked for desegregation since distribution of a State allotment would not be decided for this particular program until the school district in the respective State submitted their specific request for desegregation funds.

The tables follow:

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
ALABAMA						ALABAMA—Continued					
Autauga.....	5,428	1,838	7,266	\$62.83	\$456,522.78	St. Clair.....	6,993	1,699	8,692	\$62.83	\$546,118.36
Baldwin.....	14,197	3,134	17,331	62.83	1,088,906.73	Shelby.....	8,658	2,181	10,839	62.83	681,014.37
Barbour.....	7,679	4,233	11,912	62.83	748,430.96	Sumter.....	6,348	4,401	10,749	62.83	675,359.67
Bibb.....	4,237	1,461	5,698	62.83	358,005.34	Talladega.....	18,758	4,643	23,401	62.83	1,470,284.83
Blount.....	7,069	2,061	9,130	62.83	573,637.90	Tallapoosa.....	9,158	2,053	11,211	62.83	704,387.13
Bullock.....	4,278	2,886	7,164	62.88	450,114.12	Tuscaloosa.....	26,090	6,156	32,246	62.83	2,026,016.18
Butler.....	7,516	3,811	11,327	62.83	711,675.41	Walker.....	15,033	4,458	19,491	62.83	1,224,619.53
Calhoun.....	25,295	3,800	29,095	62.83	1,828,038.85	Washington.....	4,890	1,587	6,477	62.83	406,949.91
Chamber.....	10,133	2,968	13,101	62.83	823,135.83	Wilcox.....	6,569	4,283	10,852	62.83	681,831.16
Cherokee.....	4,406	1,503	5,909	62.83	371,262.47	Winston.....	4,109	1,319	5,428	62.83	341,041.24
Chilton.....	7,046	2,103	9,149	62.83	574,831.67	State total.....	885,233	245,450	1,130,683	62.83	71,040,812.89
Choctaw.....	5,599	2,638	8,237	62.83	517,530.71	ALASKA					
Clarke.....	7,607	3,056	10,663	62.83	669,956.29	Ketchikan-Prince of.....	2,961	299	3,260	83.86	273,383.60
Clay.....	3,221	911	4,132	62.83	259,613.56	Wrangell-Petersburg.....	1,203	118	1,321	83.86	110,779.06
Cleburne.....	2,907	774	3,681	62.83	231,277.23	Sitka.....	1,288	104	1,392	83.86	116,733.12
Coffee.....	8,256	2,547	10,803	62.83	678,752.49	Lynn Canal-Icy Strait.....	2,429	255	2,684	83.86	225,080.74
Colbert.....	12,997	2,912	15,909	62.83	999,562.47	Cordova-Valdez.....	808	125	933	83.86	78,241.38
Conecuh.....	5,426	2,752	8,178	62.83	513,823.74	Palmer-Wassila Talke.....	992	182	1,174	83.86	98,451.64
Coosa.....	3,025	905	3,930	62.83	246,921.90	Seward.....	1,444	270	1,714	83.86	143,736.04
Covington.....	9,322	2,705	12,027	62.83	755,658.41	Anchorage.....	18,075	1,139	19,214	83.86	1,611,286.04
Crenshaw.....	4,208	6,573	10,781	62.83	412,981.59	Kenai-Cook Inlet.....	730	35	765	83.86	64,125.90
Cullman.....	12,371	3,992	16,363	62.83	1,028,087.29	Kodiak.....	1,704	349	2,053	83.86	172,164.58
Dale.....	7,642	2,015	9,657	62.83	606,749.31	Alutian Islands.....	1,508	169	1,677	83.86	140,633.22
Dallas.....	16,468	7,993	24,461	62.83	1,536,884.63	Bristol Bay.....	1,096	150	1,246	83.86	104,489.56
De Kalb.....	11,117	4,093	15,210	62.83	955,644.30	Bethel.....	997	165	1,162	83.86	97,445.32
Elmore.....	8,153	2,385	10,538	62.83	662,102.54	Yukon-Kuskokwim.....	1,757	1,214	2,971	83.86	249,148.06
Escambia.....	9,565	2,684	12,249	62.83	769,604.67	Fairbanks-Fort Yukon.....	1,552	764	2,316	83.86	194,219.76
Etowah.....	26,303	5,098	31,401	62.83	1,972,924.83	Barrow-Kobuk.....	9,180	916	10,096	83.86	846,650.56
Fayette.....	4,337	1,521	5,858	62.83	368,058.14	Nome.....	1,613	699	2,312	83.86	193,884.32
Franklin.....	5,879	1,933	7,812	62.83	490,827.96	Wade Hampton.....	1,840	819	2,659	83.86	222,983.74
Geneva.....	6,208	2,695	8,903	62.83	559,375.49	State total.....	52,211	8,470	60,681	83.86	5,088,708.66
Greene.....	4,515	3,366	7,881	62.83	495,163.23	ARIZONA					
Hale.....	6,307	3,919	10,226	62.83	642,499.58	Apache.....	10,112	4,698	14,810	73.45	1,087,794.50
Henry.....	4,662	2,551	7,213	62.83	453,192.79	Cochise.....	14,034	1,766	15,800	73.45	1,160,510.00
Houston.....	13,981	4,246	18,227	62.83	1,145,202.41	Cocconino.....	11,949	3,287	15,236	73.45	1,119,084.20
Jackson.....	10,612	4,088	14,700	62.83	923,601.00	Gila.....	7,182	798	7,980	73.45	5,861,131.00
Jefferson.....	161,459	25,809	187,268	62.83	11,766,048.44	Graham.....	4,050	750	4,800	73.45	352,560.00
Lamar.....	3,746	1,102	4,848	62.83	304,599.84	Greenlee.....	3,754	176	3,930	73.45	288,658.50
Lauderdale.....	16,173	3,194	19,367	62.83	1,216,828.61	Maricopa.....	172,703	23,806	196,509	73.45	14,433,586.05
Lawrence.....	7,410	3,177	10,587	62.83	665,181.28	Mohave.....	1,934	283	2,217	73.45	162,838.65
Lee.....	12,105	3,162	15,267	62.83	959,225.61	Navajo.....	12,004	4,460	16,464	73.45	1,209,280.80
Limestone.....	10,603	3,853	14,456	62.83	908,270.41	Pima.....	66,087	7,241	73,328	73.45	5,385,941.60
Lowndes.....	5,246	3,659	8,905	62.83	559,501.15	Pinal.....	18,294	3,901	22,195	73.45	1,630,222.75
Macon.....	7,304	3,845	11,149	62.83	700,491.67	Santa Cruz.....	2,897	390	3,287	73.45	241,430.15
Madison.....	30,373	6,010	36,383	62.83	2,285,943.89	Yavapai.....	6,939	716	7,655	73.45	562,259.75
Marengo.....	8,282	4,458	12,740	62.83	799,197.60	Yuma.....	12,211	1,443	13,654	73.45	1,002,886.30
Marion.....	5,922	2,176	8,098	62.83	508,797.34	State total.....	344,150	53,715	397,865	73.45	29,223,184.25
Marshall.....	12,736	3,150	15,886	62.83	998,117.38						
Mobile.....	86,337	13,350	99,687	62.83	6,263,334.21						
Monroe.....	6,990	3,374	10,364	62.83	651,170.12						
Montgomery.....	42,705	8,979	51,684	62.83	3,247,305.72						
Morgan.....	15,703	3,499	19,202	62.83	1,206,461.66						
Perry.....	5,357	3,241	8,598	62.83	540,212.34						
Pickens.....	6,504	3,111	9,615	62.83	604,110.45						
Pike.....	7,075	3,624	10,699	62.83	672,218.17						
Randolph.....	4,990	1,823	6,813	62.83	428,060.79						
Russell.....	13,635	4,152	17,787	62.83	1,117,557.21						

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
ARKANSAS						CALIFORNIA—Continued					
Arkansas	6,342	1,544	7,886	\$71.73	\$565,662.78	Modoc	2,156	282	2,438	\$64.60	\$157,494.80
Ashley	7,037	2,325	9,362	71.73	671,536.26	Mono	451	31	482	64.60	31,137.20
Baxter	2,366	918	3,284	71.73	235,561.32	Monterey	43,184	7,216	50,400	64.60	3,255,840.00
Benton	8,424	1,554	9,978	71.73	715,721.94	Napa	14,282	1,555	15,837	64.60	1,023,070.20
Boone	3,769	1,113	4,882	71.73	350,185.86	Nevada	4,779	742	5,521	64.60	356,656.60
Bradley	3,781	901	4,682	71.73	335,839.86	Orange	183,693	17,243	200,936	64.60	12,980,465.60
Calhoun	1,694	555	2,249	71.73	161,320.77	Placer	13,399	2,307	15,706	64.60	1,014,607.60
Carroll	2,489	631	3,120	71.73	223,797.60	Plumas	2,944	370	3,314	64.60	214,084.40
Ciicot	5,538	2,529	8,067	71.73	578,645.91	Riverside	71,171	14,697	85,868	64.60	5,547,072.80
Clark	5,017	1,276	6,293	71.73	451,396.89	Sacramento	124,076	22,439	146,515	64.60	9,464,869.00
Clay	5,825	2,073	7,898	71.73	566,523.54	San Benito	4,131	479	4,610	64.60	297,806.00
Cleburne	2,312	1,065	3,377	71.73	242,232.21	San Bernardino	123,533	23,111	146,644	64.60	9,473,202.40
Cleveland	1,914	706	2,620	71.73	187,932.60	San Diego	228,302	31,806	260,108	64.60	16,802,976.80
Columbia	6,868	2,383	9,251	71.73	663,574.23	San Francisco	119,514	25,361	144,875	64.60	9,358,325.00
Conway	4,115	1,698	5,813	71.73	416,966.49	San Joaquin	60,965	13,077	74,042	64.60	4,797,971.20
Craighead	12,335	3,272	15,607	71.73	1,119,490.11	San Luis Obispo	17,298	20,370	37,668	64.60	2,435,920.00
Crawford	5,467	1,269	6,736	71.73	483,173.28	San Mateo	109,656	8,083	117,749	64.60	7,606,585.40
Crittenden	14,871	6,673	21,544	71.73	1,545,351.12	Santa Barbara	37,755	6,163	43,918	64.60	2,837,102.80
Cross	5,996	2,518	8,514	71.73	610,709.22	Santa Clara	160,573	24,579	185,152	64.60	11,960,819.20
Dallas	2,968	737	3,705	71.73	265,759.65	Shasta	17,540	2,168	19,708	64.60	1,273,136.80
Desha	6,400	3,437	9,837	71.73	705,608.01	Sierra	15,714	3,286	19,000	64.60	1,227,400.00
Drew	3,936	1,543	5,479	71.73	393,008.67	Siskiyou	505	61	566	64.60	36,563.60
Faulkner	5,579	1,413	6,992	71.73	501,536.16	Solano	8,105	906	9,011	64.60	582,110.60
Franklin	2,499	802	3,301	71.73	236,780.73	Sonoma	31,766	5,653	37,419	64.60	2,417,267.40
Fulton	1,644	696	2,340	71.73	167,848.20	Stanislaus	34,261	7,454	41,715	64.60	2,694,789.00
Garland	10,147	1,830	11,977	71.73	859,110.21	Sutter	40,325	10,134	50,459	64.60	3,259,651.40
Grant	2,192	528	2,720	71.73	195,105.60	Tehama	8,996	1,595	10,591	64.60	684,178.60
Greene	6,892	2,565	9,457	71.73	678,350.61	Tulare	6,582	1,025	7,607	64.60	491,412.20
Hempstead	5,006	2,092	7,098	71.73	509,139.54	Trinity	2,368	208	2,576	64.60	166,409.60
Hot Spring	6,051	1,010	7,061	71.73	506,485.53	Tulare	44,814	13,386	58,200	64.60	3,759,720.00
Howard	2,735	821	3,556	71.73	255,071.88	Tuolumne	3,300	475	3,775	64.60	243,865.00
Independence	4,884	1,779	6,663	71.73	477,936.99	Ventura	48,116	7,427	55,543	64.60	3,588,077.80
Izard	1,639	592	2,231	71.73	160,029.63	Yolo	15,952	2,537	18,489	64.60	1,194,389.40
Jackson	6,726	2,339	9,065	71.73	650,232.45	Yuba	8,341	1,822	10,163	64.60	656,529.80
Jefferson	22,376	7,333	29,709	71.73	2,131,026.57	State total	3,627,277	624,366	4,251,643	64.60	274,656,137.80
Johnson	2,895	958	3,853	71.73	276,375.69	COLORADO					
Lafayette	3,126	1,705	4,831	71.73	346,527.63	Adams	34,283	3,232	37,515	67.72	2,540,515.80
Lawrence	4,485	1,694	6,179	71.73	443,219.67	Alamosa	2,558	431	2,989	67.72	202,415.08
Lee	6,636	4,018	10,654	71.73	764,211.42	Arapahoe	30,867	1,800	32,667	67.72	2,212,209.24
Lincoln	3,923	2,270	6,193	71.73	444,223.89	Archuleta	760	220	980	67.72	65,688.40
Little River	2,567	907	3,474	71.73	249,190.02	Baca	1,735	234	1,969	67.72	133,340.68
Logan	3,739	1,256	4,995	71.73	358,291.35	Bent	1,973	358	2,331	67.72	157,855.32
Londke	6,973	2,797	9,770	71.73	700,802.10	Blaine	1,433	131	1,564	67.72	106,883.32
Madison	2,415	1,142	3,557	71.73	255,143.61	Boilder	15,961	1,270	17,231	67.72	1,166,883.32
Marion	1,433	568	2,001	71.73	143,531.73	Chaffee	1,952	148	2,100	67.72	142,212.00
Miller	8,424	2,260	10,684	71.73	766,363.32	Cheyenne	853	39	892	67.72	60,406.24
Mississippi	20,738	9,057	29,795	71.73	2,137,195.35	Clear Creek	637	27	664	67.72	44,966.08
Monroe	5,334	2,483	7,817	71.73	560,713.41	Conejos	2,898	900	3,798	67.72	257,200.56
Montgomery	1,350	311	1,661	71.73	119,143.53	Costilla	1,479	676	2,155	67.72	145,936.60
Nevada	2,743	950	3,693	71.73	264,898.89	Crowley	1,115	314	1,429	67.72	96,771.88
Newada	1,783	1,048	2,831	71.73	203,067.63	Custer	341	36	377	67.72	25,530.44
Quachita	8,735	2,897	11,632	71.73	834,363.36	Delta	3,984	758	4,742	67.72	321,128.24
Berry	1,289	387	1,676	71.73	120,219.48	Denver	106,156	16,676	122,832	67.72	8,318,183.04
Phillips	13,289	6,573	19,862	71.73	1,424,701.26	Dolores	626	36	662	67.72	44,830.64
Pike	2,018	514	2,532	71.73	181,620.36	Douglas	1,304	124	1,428	67.72	96,704.16
Poinsett	9,413	3,887	13,300	71.73	954,009.05	Eagle	1,219	207	1,426	67.72	96,568.72
Polk	2,932	633	3,565	71.73	255,717.40	Elbert	982	163	1,145	67.72	77,539.40
Pope	4,948	1,495	6,443	71.73	462,156.39	El Paso	33,902	3,373	37,275	67.72	2,524,263.00
Prairie	2,974	1,072	4,046	71.73	290,219.58	Fremont	4,464	471	4,935	67.72	334,198.20
Pulaski	56,777	9,271	66,048	71.73	4,737,623.04	Garfield	2,915	263	3,178	67.72	215,214.16
Randolph	3,307	1,178	4,485	71.73	321,709.05	Gilpin	148	148	296	67.72	10,022.56
St. Francis	10,438	5,764	16,202	71.73	1,162,169.46	Grand	906	139	1,045	67.72	70,767.40
Saline	6,703	822	7,525	71.73	539,768.25	Gunnison	1,209	128	1,337	67.72	90,541.64
Scott	1,763	648	2,411	71.73	172,941.03	Huerfano	40	40	80	67.72	5,398.40
Searcy	2,181	889	3,070	71.73	220,211.10	Hinsdale	2,171	688	2,859	67.72	193,611.48
Sebastian	16,578	2,649	19,227	71.73	1,379,152.71	Jackson	431	12	443	67.72	29,999.96
Sevier	2,513	517	3,030	71.73	217,341.90	Jefferson	33,469	1,681	35,150	67.72	2,380,358.00
Sharp	1,519	657	2,176	71.73	156,084.48	Kiowa	697	89	786	67.72	53,227.92
Stone	1,742	979	2,721	71.73	195,177.33	Kit Carson	1,919	211	2,130	67.72	144,243.60
Union	12,874	2,412	15,286	71.73	1,096,464.78	Lake	1,907	130	2,037	67.72	137,945.64
Van Buren	1,736	649	2,385	71.73	171,076.05	La Plata	5,197	810	6,007	67.72	406,794.04
Washington	11,988	1,927	13,915	71.73	998,122.95	Larimer	11,724	1,461	13,185	67.72	892,888.20
White	8,190	2,660	10,850	71.73	778,270.50	Las Animas	5,565	1,211	6,776	67.72	458,870.72
Woodruff	4,278	2,452	6,730	71.73	482,742.90	Lincoln	1,348	85	1,433	67.72	97,042.76
Yell	2,882	793	3,675	71.73	263,607.75	Logan	5,600	439	6,039	67.72	408,961.08
State total	467,465	149,669	617,134	71.73	44,267,021.82	Mesa	13,351	1,568	14,919	67.72	1,010,314.68
CALIFORNIA						Mineral	106	106	212	67.72	14,432.32
Alameda	199,697	37,887	237,584	64.60	15,347,926.40	Moffat	1,830	210	2,040	67.72	138,148.80
Alpine	67	26	93	64.60	6,007.80	Montezuma	3,980	727	4,707	67.72	318,758.04
Amador	2,057	131	2,188	64.60	141,344.80	Montrose	4,997	882	5,879	67.72	398,125.88
Butte	19,518	4,136	23,654	64.60	1,528,048.40	Morgan	5,922	842	6,764	67.72	458,058.08
Calaveras	1,822	236	2,058	64.60	142,443.00	Otero	6,722	1,326	8,048	67.72	545,010.56
Colusa	3,554	441	3,995	64.60	225,777.00	Duray	402	55	457	67.72	30,948.04
Contra Costa	114,020	15,006	129,026	64.60	8,335,079.60	Park	411	62	473	67.72	32,031.56
Del Norte	4,738	561	5,299	64.60	342,315.40	Phillips	1,178	94	1,272	67.72	86,139.84

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
CONNECTICUT						GEORGIA—Continued					
Fairfield	150,546	41,134	164,680	\$70.74	\$11,649,463.20	Berrien	3,484	1,354	4,838	\$63.65	\$307,938.70
Hartford	155,713	18,872	174,585	70.74	12,350,142.90	Bibb	35,824	6,030	41,854	63.65	2,664,007.10
Litchfield	28,242	1,491	29,733	70.74	2,103,312.42	Bleckley	2,661	867	3,528	63.65	224,557.20
Middlesex	19,603	1,881	21,484	70.74	1,519,778.16	Brantley	1,963	410	2,373	63.65	151,041.45
New Haven	148,070	17,222	165,292	70.74	11,692,756.08	Brooks	4,647	2,435	7,082	63.65	450,769.30
New London	41,269	3,888	45,157	70.74	3,194,406.18	Bryan	1,965	673	2,638	63.65	167,908.70
Tolland	15,185	943	16,128	70.74	1,140,894.72	Bulloch	7,045	2,698	9,743	63.65	620,141.95
Windham	15,951	1,676	17,627	70.74	1,246,933.98	Burke	6,900	4,170	11,070	63.65	704,605.50
State total	574,579	60,107	634,686	70.74	44,897,687.64	Butts	2,638	642	3,280	63.65	208,772.00
DELAWARE						Calhoun					
Kent	14,047	1,734	15,781	69.33	1,094,096.73	Camden	2,313	1,447	3,760	63.65	239,324.00
New Castle	72,600	7,971	80,571	69.33	5,585,987.43	Candler	2,902	466	3,368	63.65	214,373.20
Sussex	18,012	2,970	20,982	69.33	1,454,682.06	Carroll	1,951	1,017	2,968	63.65	188,913.20
State total	104,659	12,675	117,334	69.33	8,134,766.22	Catoosa	9,375	1,940	11,315	63.65	720,199.75
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						Charlton					
Total	137,050	33,066	170,116	73.88	12,568,170.08	Chatam	5,931	575	6,506	63.65	414,106.90
FLORIDA						Chattahoochee					
Alachua	16,597	3,113	19,710	71.96	1,418,331.06	Chattooga	1,605	289	1,894	63.65	120,553.10
Baker	2,024	533	2,557	71.96	184,001.72	Charke	47,644	7,140	54,784	63.65	3,487,001.60
Bay	17,174	2,583	19,757	71.96	1,421,713.72	Cherokee	1,976	89	2,065	63.65	131,437.25
Bradford	3,494	572	4,066	71.96	292,589.36	Clay	5,217	1,002	6,219	63.65	395,839.35
Brevard	26,732	2,007	28,739	71.96	2,068,058.44	Clarke	5,894	885	6,779	63.65	431,483.35
Broward	72,616	9,000	81,616	71.96	5,873,087.36	Clayton	9,613	1,424	11,037	63.65	702,505.05
Calhoun	2,216	798	3,014	71.96	216,887.44	Clayton	1,395	925	2,320	63.65	147,668.00
Charlotte	2,182	313	2,495	71.96	179,540.20	Clinch	13,073	807	13,880	63.65	883,462.00
Citrus	2,082	416	2,498	71.96	179,756.08	Cobb	1,934	530	2,464	63.65	156,833.60
Clay	4,962	963	5,925	71.96	426,363.00	Cobb	30,423	1,852	32,275	63.65	2,054,303.75
Collier	3,710	611	4,321	71.96	310,939.16	Cofer	6,467	2,407	8,874	63.65	564,830.10
Columbia	5,710	1,501	7,211	71.96	518,903.56	Colquitt	9,977	2,968	12,945	63.65	823,949.25
Dade	197,180	22,769	219,949	71.96	15,827,530.04	Columbia	3,905	766	4,671	63.65	297,309.15
De Soto	2,409	389	2,798	71.96	201,344.08	Cook	3,396	1,163	4,559	63.65	290,180.35
Dixie	1,181	346	1,527	71.96	109,882.92	Coweta	7,993	1,618	9,611	63.65	611,740.15
Duval	112,678	14,349	127,027	71.96	9,140,862.92	Crawford	1,770	796	2,566	63.65	163,325.80
Escambia	45,721	5,561	51,282	71.96	3,690,252.72	Crisp	5,289	2,220	7,509	63.65	478,584.35
Flagler	1,067	314	1,381	71.96	99,376.76	Dade	2,571	591	3,162	63.65	201,261.30
Franklin	1,632	504	2,136	71.96	153,706.56	Dawson	1,058	539	1,597	63.65	101,649.05
Gadsden	11,068	3,782	14,850	71.96	1,068,606.00	Decatur	7,245	2,083	9,328	63.65	593,727.20
Gilchrist	783	242	1,025	71.96	73,759.00	De Kalb	62,748	4,368	67,116	63.65	4,271,933.40
Glades	689	222	911	71.96	65,555.56	Dodge	4,895	2,200	7,095	63.65	451,596.75
Gulf	2,821	409	3,230	71.96	232,430.80	Dooley	3,597	1,933	5,530	63.65	351,984.50
Hamilton	2,274	744	3,018	71.96	217,175.28	Dougherty	19,920	3,716	23,636	63.65	1,504,431.40
Hardee	3,147	678	3,825	71.96	275,247.00	Douglas	4,670	744	5,414	63.65	344,601.10
Hendry	2,033	340	2,373	71.96	170,761.08	Early	4,192	2,360	6,552	63.65	417,034.80
Hernando	2,660	436	3,096	71.96	222,788.16	Echols	527	139	666	63.65	42,390.90
Highlands	5,019	707	5,726	71.96	412,042.96	Effingham	3,119	938	4,057	63.65	258,228.05
Hillsborough	92,956	12,658	105,614	71.96	7,599,983.44	Elbert	4,917	1,489	6,406	63.65	407,741.90
Holmes	3,099	1,372	4,471	71.96	321,733.16	Emanuel	5,151	2,211	7,362	63.65	468,591.30
Indian River	5,874	733	6,607	71.96	475,439.72	Evans	1,985	813	2,798	63.65	178,092.70
Jackson	10,187	3,528	13,715	71.96	986,931.40	Fannin	4,197	1,212	5,409	63.65	344,282.85
Jefferson	2,813	1,093	3,906	71.96	281,075.76	Fayette	2,408	500	2,908	63.65	185,094.20
Lafayette	809	211	1,020	71.96	73,399.20	Floyd	16,846	2,268	19,114	63.65	1,216,606.10
Lake	12,804	2,469	15,273	71.96	1,099,045.08	Forsyth	3,411	733	4,144	63.65	263,765.60
Lee	11,940	1,511	13,451	71.96	967,933.96	Franklin	3,459	1,123	4,582	63.65	291,644.30
Leon	17,433	2,764	20,197	71.96	1,453,376.12	Fulton	126,395	17,744	144,139	63.65	9,174,447.35
Levy	2,795	627	3,422	71.96	246,247.12	Gilmer	2,499	1,036	3,535	63.65	225,002.75
Liberty	900	215	1,115	71.96	80,235.40	Glascok	757	306	1,063	63.65	67,659.95
Madison	4,393	1,543	5,936	71.96	427,154.56	Glynn	10,883	1,589	12,472	63.65	793,842.80
Manatee	13,697	1,725	15,422	71.96	1,109,767.12	Gordon	4,889	975	5,864	63.65	373,243.60
Marion	13,242	3,138	16,380	71.96	1,178,704.80	Grady	5,333	2,231	7,564	63.65	481,448.60
Martin	3,538	415	3,953	71.96	284,457.88	Greene	3,288	1,358	4,646	63.65	295,717.90
Monroe	9,296	882	10,178	71.96	732,408.88	Gwinnett	11,590	1,566	13,156	63.65	837,379.40
Nassau	4,901	1,013	5,914	71.96	425,571.44	Habersham	4,581	843	5,424	63.65	345,237.60
Oakalosa	15,417	1,513	16,930	71.96	1,218,282.80	Hall	13,002	2,262	15,264	63.65	971,553.60
Okeechobee	1,652	261	1,913	71.96	137,659.48	Hancock	3,280	1,719	4,999	63.65	318,186.35
Orange	61,555	6,345	67,900	71.96	4,886,084.00	Harris	3,872	706	4,578	63.65	291,389.70
Osceola	3,819	648	4,467	71.96	321,445.32	Harris	3,471	1,322	4,793	63.65	305,074.45
Palm Beach	48,015	7,497	55,512	71.96	3,994,643.52	Hart	4,286	1,235	5,521	63.65	351,411.65
Pasco	7,647	1,234	8,881	71.96	639,076.76	Heard	1,498	653	2,151	63.65	136,911.15
Pinellas	63,840	7,192	71,032	71.96	5,111,462.72	Henry	5,105	1,237	6,342	63.65	403,668.30
Polk	48,241	6,238	54,479	71.96	3,920,308.84	Houston	11,220	1,839	13,059	63.65	831,205.35
Putnam	8,468	1,858	10,326	71.96	743,058.96	Irwin	2,814	1,434	4,248	63.65	270,385.20
St. Johns	6,942	1,398	8,340	71.96	600,146.40	Jackson	4,979	1,105	6,084	63.65	387,246.65
St. Lucie	6,943	1,306	8,249	71.96	597,124.08	Jasper	1,775	705	2,480	63.65	157,852.00
Santa Rosa	7,237	1,061	8,298	71.96	597,124.08	Jeff Davis	2,768	750	3,518	63.65	223,920.70
Sarasota	14,838	1,477	16,315	71.96	1,174,027.40	Jefferson	5,574	2,693	8,267	63.65	526,194.55
Seminole	13,966	3,083	17,049	71.96	1,226,846.04	Jenkins	2,801	1,393	4,194	63.65	266,948.10
Sumter	3,104	659	3,763	71.96	270,785.48	Johnson	2,369	808	3,177	63.65	202,216.00
Suwannee	4,194	1,374	5,568	71.96	400,673.28	Jones	2,505	793	3,298	63.65	209,917.70
Taylor	3,709	749	4,458	71.96	320,797.68	Lamar	2,866	743	3,609	63.65	229,712.80
Union	1,269	265	1,534	71.96	110,386.64	Lanier	1,443	469	1,912	63.65	121,698.85
Volusia	24,234	3,684	27,918	71.96	2,008,979.28	Laurens	8,849	3,420	12,269	63.65	780,921.85
Wakulla	1,541	433	1,974	71.96	142,049.04	Lee	2,052	965	3,017	63.65	192,032.05
Walton	4,474	1,350	5,824	71.96	419,095.04	Liberty	3,977	1,133	5,110	63.65	325,251.50
Washington	3,220	1,031	4,251	71.96	305,901.96	Lincoln	1,942	764	2,706	63.65	172,286.90
State total	1,119,563	160,755	1,280,318	71.96	92,131,683.28	Long	1,226	655	1,881	63.65	119,725.60
GEORGIA						Lowndes					
Appling	4,202	1,650	5,852	63.65							

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
GEORGIA—Continued						ILLINOIS					
Polk	7,278	1,538	8,816	\$63.65	\$561,138.40	Adams	15,268	1,836	17,104	\$66.74	\$1,141,520.96
Pulaski	2,289	866	3,155	63.65	200,815.75	Alexander	3,844	1,785	5,629	66.74	375,679.46
Putnam	2,297	643	2,940	63.65	187,131.00	Bond	3,073	1,489	3,562	66.74	237,727.88
Quitman	805	523	1,328	63.65	84,527.20	Boone	5,128	301	5,429	66.74	362,331.46
Rabun	2,108	664	2,772	63.65	176,437.80	Brown	1,430	449	1,879	66.74	125,404.46
Randolph	3,273	1,803	5,076	63.65	323,087.40	Bureau	9,015	1,146	10,161	66.74	678,145.14
Richmond	31,929	5,597	37,526	63.65	2,388,529.90	Calhoun	1,325	247	1,572	66.74	104,915.28
Rockdale	2,904	488	3,392	63.65	215,900.80	Carroll	4,732	863	5,595	66.74	373,410.30
Schley	1,066	578	1,644	63.65	104,640.60	Cass	3,371	474	3,845	66.74	256,615.30
Screven	4,771	2,298	7,069	63.65	449,941.85	Champaign	25,421	2,376	27,797	66.74	1,855,171.78
Seminole	2,094	1,246	3,340	63.65	212,591.00	Christian	8,932	859	9,791	66.74	653,451.34
Spalding	9,322	1,659	10,981	63.65	698,940.65	Clark	3,752	600	4,352	66.74	290,452.48
Stephens	5,019	997	6,016	63.65	382,918.40	Clay	3,790	571	4,361	66.74	291,053.14
Stewart	2,294	1,428	3,722	63.65	236,905.30	Clinton	6,179	473	6,652	66.74	443,954.48
Sumter	7,161	2,744	9,905	63.65	630,453.25	Colts	9,447	868	10,315	66.74	688,423.10
Talbot	2,290	1,153	3,443	63.65	219,146.95	Cook	1,101,612	188,764	1,290,376	66.74	86,119,694.24
Taliaferro	1,035	452	1,487	63.65	94,647.55	Crawford	4,817	360	5,177	66.74	345,512.98
Tattnall	3,701	1,478	5,179	63.65	329,643.35	Cumberland	2,420	362	2,782	66.74	185,670.68
Taylor	2,468	1,316	3,784	63.65	240,851.60	De Kalb	11,775	1,010	12,785	66.74	853,270.90
Telfair	3,378	1,666	5,044	63.65	321,050.60	De Witt	4,115	424	4,539	66.74	302,932.86
Terrill	3,944	1,954	5,898	63.65	375,407.70	Douglas	4,778	469	5,247	66.74	350,184.78
Thomas	9,200	2,542	11,742	63.65	747,378.30	Du Page	84,932	3,056	87,988	66.74	5,872,319.12
Tift	6,739	2,461	9,200	63.65	585,580.00	Edgar	5,271	814	6,085	66.74	406,112.90
Toombs	4,873	1,668	6,541	63.65	416,334.65	Edwards	1,766	326	2,092	66.74	139,620.08
Towns	1,131	456	1,587	63.65	101,012.55	Effingham	5,943	543	6,486	66.74	432,875.64
Treutlen	1,707	785	2,492	63.65	158,615.80	Fayette	5,034	784	5,818	66.74	388,293.32
Troup	12,972	3,195	16,167	63.65	1,029,029.55	Ford	4,178	434	4,612	66.74	307,804.88
Turner	2,509	1,008	3,517	63.65	223,857.05	Franklin	8,555	1,883	10,438	66.74	696,632.12
Twiggs	2,498	677	3,175	63.65	202,088.75	Fulton	9,671	1,055	10,726	66.74	715,853.24
Union	1,888	817	2,705	63.65	172,173.25	Gallatin	2,067	652	2,719	66.74	181,466.06
Upson	6,343	1,277	7,620	63.65	485,013.00	Greene	4,114	645	4,759	66.74	317,615.66
Walker	12,319	1,528	13,847	63.65	881,361.55	Grundy	5,630	397	6,027	66.74	402,241.98
Walton	5,679	1,499	7,178	63.65	456,879.70	Hamilton	2,278	583	2,861	66.74	190,043.14
Ware	9,555	1,891	11,446	63.65	728,537.90	Hancock	5,751	790	6,541	66.74	436,546.34
Warren	2,403	1,349	3,752	63.65	238,814.80	Hardin	1,526	558	2,084	66.74	139,086.16
Washington	5,469	2,249	7,718	63.65	491,250.70	Henderson	2,060	249	2,309	66.74	154,102.66
Wayne	5,433	1,537	6,970	63.65	443,640.50	Henry	12,134	1,138	13,272	66.74	885,773.28
Webster	1,118	756	1,874	63.65	119,280.10	Iroquois	8,405	996	9,401	66.74	627,422.74
Wheeler	1,811	794	2,605	63.65	165,808.25	Jackson	8,647	1,770	10,417	66.74	695,230.58
White	1,975	575	2,550	63.65	162,307.50	Jasper	2,899	474	3,373	66.74	225,114.02
Whitfield	11,367	1,307	12,674	63.65	806,700.10	Jefferson	7,733	1,769	9,502	66.74	634,163.48
Wilcox	2,403	1,211	3,614	63.65	230,031.10	Jersey	4,197	459	4,656	66.74	310,741.44
Wilkes	3,061	1,134	4,195	63.65	267,011.75	John Daviess	5,580	667	6,247	66.74	416,924.78
Wilkinson	2,567	565	3,132	63.65	199,351.80	Johnson	1,622	423	2,045	66.74	136,483.30
Worth	5,367	2,989	8,356	63.65	531,859.40	Kane	47,395	2,115	49,510	66.74	3,304,297.40
State total	1,040,019	243,385	1,283,404	63.65	81,688,664.60	Kankakee	20,009	2,324	22,333	66.74	1,490,504.42
HAWAII						Kendall	4,509	290	4,799	66.74	320,285.26
Hawaii	18,234	2,373	20,607	74.18	1,528,627.26	Knox	13,487	996	14,483	66.74	966,595.42
Honolulu	128,504	14,639	143,143	74.18	10,618,347.74	Lake	70,361	3,375	73,736	66.74	4,921,140.64
Kaialoa	7,961	650	8,611	74.18	638,763.98	La Salle	25,905	1,499	27,404	66.74	1,828,942.96
Kaui	12,802	991	13,793	74.18	1,023,164.74	Lawrence	4,287	812	5,099	66.74	340,307.26
State total	167,501	18,653	186,154	74.18	13,808,903.72	Lee	8,478	877	9,355	66.74	624,352.70
IDAHO						Livingston	9,688	973	10,661	66.74	711,515.14
Ada	24,477	1,753	26,230	67.95	1,782,328.50	Logan	6,284	510	6,794	66.74	453,431.56
Adams	765	65	830	67.95	56,398.50	McDonough	6,270	656	6,926	66.74	462,241.24
Annock	13,532	885	14,417	67.95	979,635.15	McHenry	21,999	1,422	23,421	66.74	1,563,117.54
Bear Lake	2,163	120	2,283	67.95	155,129.85	McLean	18,663	1,433	20,096	66.74	1,341,207.04
Benevah	1,467	106	1,573	67.95	106,885.35	Macon	28,206	3,115	31,321	66.74	2,090,363.54
Bingham	8,804	966	9,770	67.95	663,871.50	Macoupin	9,814	1,123	10,937	66.74	729,935.38
Blaine	1,143	119	1,262	67.95	85,752.90	Madison	54,313	5,572	59,885	66.74	3,996,724.90
Boise	413	17	430	67.95	29,218.50	Marion	9,200	1,554	10,754	66.74	717,721.96
Bonner	4,307	390	4,697	67.95	319,161.15	Marshall	3,253	347	3,600	66.74	240,254.00
Bonneville	13,825	866	14,691	67.95	998,253.45	Mason	3,612	483	4,095	66.74	273,300.30
Boundary	1,579	181	1,760	67.95	119,592.00	Massac	3,444	923	4,367	66.74	291,453.58
Butte	1,037	48	1,085	67.95	73,725.75	Menard	2,177	195	2,372	66.74	158,307.28
Camas	269	28	297	67.95	20,181.15	Mercer	4,248	542	4,790	66.74	319,684.60
Canyon	15,119	1,925	17,044	67.95	1,158,139.80	Morgan	3,570	347	3,917	66.74	261,420.58
Caribou	1,899	216	2,115	67.95	143,714.25	Montgomery	7,175	983	8,158	66.74	544,464.92
Cassia	4,827	304	5,131	67.95	348,651.45	Morgan	6,916	665	7,581	66.74	505,955.94
Clark	267	36	303	67.95	20,588.85	Moultrie	3,212	283	3,495	66.74	233,256.30
Clearwater	2,149	184	2,333	67.95	158,527.35	Ogle	9,591	958	10,549	66.74	704,040.26
Custer	852	107	959	67.95	65,164.05	Peoria	42,447	4,713	47,160	66.74	3,147,458.40
Elmore	3,834	172	4,006	67.95	272,207.70	Perry	4,436	658	5,094	66.74	339,973.56
Franklin	2,813	194	3,007	67.95	204,325.65	Piatt	3,870	334	4,204	66.74	280,574.96
Fremont	2,605	137	2,742	67.95	186,318.90	Pike	4,752	955	5,707	66.74	380,885.18
Gem	2,467	201	2,668	67.95	181,290.60	Pope	903	288	1,191	66.74	79,487.34
Gooding	2,764	427	3,191	67.95	26,828.45	Pulaski	2,700	1,380	4,080	66.74	272,299.20
Idaho	3,748	482	4,230	67.95	187,428.50	Putnam	1,088	73	1,161	66.74	77,485.14
Jefferson	3,787	290	4,077	67.95	277,032.15	Randolph	6,317	620	6,937	66.74	462,975.38
Jerome	3,591	299	3,890	67.95	264,325.50	Richland	3,937	537	4,474	66.74	298,594.76
Kootenai	7,773	576	8,349	67.95	567,314.55	Rock Island	35,074	2,287	37,361	66.74	2,493,473.14
Latah	4,319	235	4,554	67.95	309,444.30	St. Clair	64,885	17,278	82,163	66.74	5,483,558.62
Lemhi	1,555	301	1,856	67.95	126,115.20	Saline	5,639	1,747	7,386	66.74	492,941.64
Lewis	1,156	76	1,232	67.95	83,714.40	Sangamon	32,866	2,822	35,688	66.74	2,381,817.12
Lincoln	1,072	76	1,148	67.95	78,006.60	Schuyler	2,107	350	2,457	66.74	163,980.18
Madison	2,868	204	3,072	67.95	208,742.40	Scott	1,446	295	1,741	66.74	116,19

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
INDIANA						IOWA—Continued					
Adams	6,753	444	7,197	\$67.80	\$487,956.60	Buchanan	6,073	931	7,004	\$76.89	\$538,537.56
Allen	56,856	4,784	61,640	67.80	4,179,192.00	Buena Vista	5,249	893	6,142	76.89	472,258.38
Bartholomew	11,963	922	12,885	67.80	873,603.00	Butler	4,503	786	5,289	76.89	406,671.21
Benton	3,290	318	3,608	67.80	244,622.40	Calhoun	4,122	547	4,669	76.89	358,999.41
Blackford	3,666	208	3,874	67.80	262,657.20	Carroll	6,385	901	7,286	76.89	560,220.54
Boone	6,855	584	7,439	67.80	504,364.20	Cass	4,288	793	5,081	76.89	390,678.09
Brown	1,879	237	2,116	67.80	143,464.80	Cedar	4,530	1,081	5,611	76.89	431,429.79
Carroll	4,205	391	4,596	67.80	311,608.80	Cerro Gordo	12,324	1,106	13,430	76.89	1,032,632.70
Cass	9,313	524	9,837	67.80	666,948.60	Cherokee	4,629	945	5,574	76.89	428,584.86
Clark	16,894	1,682	18,576	67.80	1,259,452.80	Chickasaw	3,999	777	4,776	76.89	367,226.64
Clay	5,502	656	6,158	67.80	417,512.40	Clarke	1,907	359	2,266	76.89	174,232.74
Clinton	7,625	527	8,152	67.80	552,705.60	Clay	5,001	683	5,684	76.89	437,042.76
Crawford	2,090	595	2,685	67.80	182,043.00	Clayton	5,621	1,425	7,046	76.89	541,766.94
Davies	6,867	793	7,660	67.80	519,348.00	Clinton	13,638	1,520	15,158	76.89	1,165,498.62
Dearborn	7,334	593	7,927	67.80	537,450.60	Crawford	4,963	932	5,895	76.89	453,266.55
Decatur	5,126	624	5,750	67.80	389,850.00	Dallas	5,892	700	6,592	76.89	506,858.88
De Kalb	7,300	464	7,764	67.80	526,399.20	Davis	2,284	480	2,764	76.89	212,523.96
Delaware	26,843	2,339	29,182	67.80	1,978,539.60	Decatur	2,366	569	2,935	76.89	225,672.15
Dubois	7,242	532	7,774	67.80	527,077.20	Delaware	4,975	1,073	6,047	76.89	464,953.83
Elkhart	27,471	1,701	29,172	67.80	1,977,861.60	Des Moines	10,535	729	11,264	76.89	866,088.96
Fayette	6,369	523	6,892	67.80	467,277.60	Dickinson	3,157	590	3,747	76.89	288,106.83
Floyd	12,922	1,308	14,230	67.80	964,794.00	Dubouque	19,583	2,021	21,604	76.89	1,661,131.56
Fountain	4,383	419	4,802	67.80	325,575.60	Emmet	4,050	578	4,628	76.89	355,846.92
Franklin	4,844	672	5,516	67.80	373,984.80	Fayette	7,213	1,200	8,413	76.89	646,875.57
Fulton	4,171	399	4,570	67.80	309,846.00	Floyd	5,375	650	6,025	76.89	463,262.25
Gibson	7,008	876	7,884	67.80	534,535.20	Franklin	3,941	487	4,428	76.89	340,468.92
Grant	18,244	1,441	19,685	67.80	1,334,643.00	Fremont	2,410	375	2,785	76.89	214,138.65
Greene	6,009	904	6,913	67.80	468,701.40	Greene	3,679	536	4,215	76.89	324,091.35
Hamilton	10,181	444	10,625	67.80	720,375.00	Grundy	3,494	474	3,968	76.89	305,099.52
Hancock	6,789	415	7,204	67.80	488,431.20	Guthrie	3,372	803	4,175	76.89	321,015.75
Harrison	5,202	580	5,782	67.80	392,019.60	Hamilton	5,045	642	5,687	76.89	437,273.43
Hendricks	10,368	569	10,937	67.80	741,528.60	Hancock	3,861	944	4,805	76.89	369,456.45
Henry	12,266	1,213	13,479	67.80	913,876.20	Hardin	5,228	684	5,912	76.89	454,573.68
Howard	17,621	976	18,597	67.80	1,260,876.60	Harrison	4,614	734	5,348	76.89	411,207.72
Huntington	8,043	478	8,521	67.80	577,723.80	Henry	4,020	398	4,418	76.89	339,700.02
Jackson	7,630	807	8,437	67.80	572,028.60	Howard	3,458	892	4,350	76.89	334,471.50
Jasper	4,843	622	5,465	67.80	370,527.00	Humboldt	3,452	470	3,922	76.89	301,562.58
Jay	5,547	442	5,989	67.80	406,054.20	Ida	2,610	567	3,177	76.89	244,279.53
Jefferson	5,390	795	6,185	67.80	419,343.00	Iowa	4,088	735	4,823	76.89	370,840.47
Jennings	4,244	494	4,738	67.80	321,236.40	Jackson	5,200	1,055	6,255	76.89	480,946.95
Johnson	11,033	577	11,610	67.80	787,158.00	Jasper	8,643	607	9,250	76.89	711,232.50
Knox	9,987	1,260	11,247	67.80	762,546.60	Jefferson	3,677	450	4,127	76.89	317,325.03
Kosciusko	9,924	866	10,790	67.80	727,494.00	Johnson	10,189	1,006	11,195	76.89	860,783.55
La Grange	4,953	587	5,540	67.80	375,612.00	Jones	5,282	935	6,217	76.89	478,025.13
Lake	131,671	13,909	145,580	67.80	9,870,234.00	Kfokuk	3,791	583	4,374	76.89	336,316.86
La Porte	23,400	1,709	25,109	67.80	1,702,390.20	Kossuth	7,070	1,227	8,297	76.89	637,956.33
Lawrence	9,283	853	10,136	67.80	687,220.80	Lee	10,648	1,154	11,802	76.89	907,455.78
Madison	30,153	1,891	32,044	67.80	2,172,583.20	Linn	31,607	2,598	34,205	76.89	2,630,022.45
Marion	160,552	15,052	175,604	67.80	11,939,512.00	Louisia	2,571	271	2,842	76.89	218,521.38
Marshall	8,648	788	9,436	67.80	639,760.80	Lucas	2,503	443	2,946	76.89	226,517.94
Martin	2,985	435	3,420	67.80	231,876.00	Lyon	4,020	1,048	5,068	76.89	389,678.52
Miami	8,867	644	9,511	67.80	644,845.80	Madison	4,922	505	5,427	76.89	263,502.03
Marshall	11,836	852	12,688	67.80	860,246.40	Mahaska	5,630	854	6,484	76.89	498,554.76
Montgomery	7,373	646	8,019	67.80	543,688.20	Marion	5,953	883	6,836	76.89	525,620.04
Morgan	9,086	735	9,821	67.80	665,863.80	Marshall	9,026	910	9,936	76.89	763,979.04
Newton	3,016	302	3,318	67.80	224,960.40	Mills	2,943	556	3,499	76.89	269,038.11
North	7,215	433	7,648	67.80	518,534.40	Mitchell	3,762	714	4,476	76.89	344,159.64
Ohio	1,015	73	1,088	67.80	73,766.40	Monona	3,567	825	4,392	76.89	337,700.88
Orange	4,081	707	4,788	67.80	324,626.40	Monroe	2,615	520	3,135	76.89	241,050.15
Owen	2,699	494	3,193	67.80	216,485.40	Montgomery	3,289	609	3,898	76.89	299,717.22
Parke	3,420	498	3,918	67.80	265,640.40	Muscataine	8,047	901	8,948	76.89	688,011.72
Perry	4,718	662	5,380	67.80	364,764.00	O'Brien	4,803	631	5,434	76.89	417,820.26
Pike	2,798	458	3,256	67.80	220,756.80	Osceola	2,673	701	3,374	76.89	259,426.86
Porter	15,179	682	15,861	67.80	1,075,375.80	Page	4,451	678	5,129	76.89	394,368.81
Posey	4,687	592	5,279	67.80	357,916.20	Palo Alto	4,161	931	5,092	76.89	391,523.88
Pulaski	3,459	481	3,940	67.80	267,132.00	Plymouth	6,485	1,276	7,761	76.89	596,743.29
Putnam	5,340	484	5,824	67.80	394,867.20	Pocahontas	3,828	591	4,419	76.89	339,776.91
Randolph	7,095	610	7,705	67.80	522,399.00	Polk	61,443	6,524	67,967	76.89	5,225,982.63
Ripley	5,417	553	5,970	67.80	404,766.00	Pottawattamie	20,918	2,494	23,412	76.89	1,800,148.68
Rush	5,066	660	5,726	67.80	388,222.80	Poweshiek	4,515	612	5,127	76.89	394,215.03
St. Joseph	58,814	4,323	63,137	67.80	4,280,688.60	Ringgold	1,990	711	2,701	76.89	207,679.89
Scott	3,862	572	4,434	67.80	300,625.20	Sac	4,469	488	4,957	76.89	381,143.73
Shelby	8,392	549	8,941	67.80	606,199.80	Scott	28,397	3,108	31,505	76.89	2,422,419.45
Spencer	3,976	450	4,426	67.80	300,082.80	Shelby	4,238	1,059	5,297	76.89	407,286.33
Starke	4,915	661	5,576	67.80	378,052.80	Sioux	7,341	1,307	8,648	76.89	664,944.72
Steuben	3,785	332	4,117	67.80	279,132.60	Story	9,764	730	10,494	76.89	806,883.66
Sullivan	5,053	689	5,742	67.80	389,307.60	Tama	5,161	1,042	6,203	76.89	476,948.67
Switzerland	1,754	300	2,054	67.80	139,261.20	Taylor	2,360	717	3,077	76.89	236,590.53
Tippecanoe	18,366	1,043	19,409	67.80	1,315,930.20	Union	3,118	683	3,801	76.89	292,258.89
Tipton	4,179	278	4,457	67.80	302,184.60	Van Buren	2,788	476	3,264	76.89	212,600.85
Union	1,717	218	1,935	67.80	131,193.00	Wapello	11,246	1,369	12,615	76.89	969,967.35
Vanderburgh	39,294	4,356	43,650	67.80	2,995,947.00	Warren	5,293	481	5,774	76.89	443,952.86
Vermillion	3,976	432	4,408	67.80	298,862.40	Washington	4,957	745	5,702	76.89	438,426.78
Vigo	23,572	2,818	26,390	67.80	1,789,242.00	Wayne	2,064	552	2,616	76.89	201,144.24
Wabash	7,833	760	8,593	67.80	582,605.40	Webster	12,013	1,272	13,285	76.89	1,021,483.65
Warren											

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
KANSAS—Continued					
Cheyenne	1,207	183	1,390	\$73.99	\$102,846.10
Clark	801	78	879	73.99	65,037.21
Clay	2,451	233	2,684	73.99	198,589.16
Cloud	3,387	272	3,659	73.99	270,729.41
Coffey	1,924	349	2,273	73.99	168,179.27
Comanche	790	113	903	73.99	66,812.97
Cowley	8,063	707	8,770	73.99	648,892.30
Crawford	7,374	1,060	8,434	73.99	624,031.66
Decatur	1,373	131	1,504	73.99	111,280.96
Dickinson	4,811	615	5,426	73.99	401,469.74
Doniphan	2,421	378	2,799	73.99	207,098.01
Douglas	8,387	649	9,036	73.99	668,573.64
Edwards	1,304	179	1,483	73.99	109,727.17
Elk	1,094	164	1,258	73.99	93,079.42
Ellis	5,419	448	5,867	73.99	434,099.33
Ellsworth	1,821	255	2,076	73.99	153,603.24
Finney	4,459	553	5,012	73.99	370,837.88
Ford	5,339	470	5,809	73.99	429,807.91
Franklin	4,315	559	4,874	73.99	360,627.26
Geary	5,578	963	6,541	73.99	483,968.59
Gove	1,143	119	1,262	73.99	93,375.38
Graham	1,482	224	1,706	73.99	126,226.94
Grant	1,533	75	1,608	73.99	118,975.92
Gray	1,159	197	1,356	73.99	100,330.55
Greenwood	562	26	588	73.99	43,506.12
Hamilton	2,558	483	3,041	73.99	225,003.59
Harper	3,886	42	3,928	73.99	286,662.72
Harvey	2,299	157	2,456	73.99	181,719.44
Haskell	6,267	563	6,830	73.99	505,351.70
Hodgeman	868	83	951	93.99	70,364.49
Jackson	890	87	977	73.99	72,288.23
Jackson	2,386	459	2,845	73.99	210,501.55
Jefferson	2,813	332	3,145	73.99	232,698.55
Jewell	1,595	297	1,892	73.99	139,989.08
Johnson	39,810	1,624	41,434	73.99	3,066,701.66
Kearny	904	50	954	73.99	70,586.46
Kingman	2,594	322	2,916	73.99	215,754.84
Kiowa	1,163	99	1,262	73.99	93,375.38
Labelle	5,939	1,299	7,238	73.99	535,539.62
Lane	788	71	859	73.99	63,557.41
Leavenworth	10,829	1,144	11,973	73.99	885,882.27
Lincoln	1,263	146	1,409	73.99	104,251.91
Linn	1,866	360	2,226	73.99	164,701.74
Logan	1,180	85	1,265	73.99	93,597.35
Lyon	5,477	839	6,316	73.99	467,320.84
McPherson	5,750	366	6,116	73.99	452,522.84
Marion	3,601	446	4,047	73.99	299,437.53
Marshall	3,585	615	4,200	73.99	310,758.00
Meade	1,391	200	1,591	73.99	117,718.09
Miami	4,538	602	5,140	73.99	380,308.60
Mitchell	2,101	228	2,329	73.99	172,322.71
Montgomery	10,695	1,628	12,323	73.99	911,778.77
Morris	1,752	399	2,151	73.99	159,152.49
Morton	921	79	1,000	73.99	73,990.00
Nemaha	3,263	629	3,892	73.99	287,969.08
Neosho	4,526	601	5,127	73.99	379,346.73
Ness	1,425	216	1,641	73.99	121,417.59
Norton	1,940	322	2,262	73.99	167,365.38
Osage	3,083	327	3,410	73.99	252,305.90
Osborne	1,691	306	1,997	73.99	147,758.03
Ottawa	1,486	159	1,645	73.99	121,713.55
Pawnee	2,177	199	2,376	73.99	175,800.24
Phillips	2,075	264	2,339	73.99	173,062.61
Pottawatomie	2,816	502	3,318	73.99	245,498.82
Pratt	2,957	268	3,225	73.99	238,617.75
Rawlins	1,410	191	1,601	73.99	118,457.99
Reno	14,212	1,219	15,431	73.99	1,141,739.69
Republic	2,133	411	2,544	73.99	188,230.56
Rice	3,376	125	3,501	73.99	259,038.99
Riley	7,310	709	8,019	73.99	593,325.81
Rooks	2,633	267	2,900	73.99	214,571.00
Rush	1,541	210	1,751	73.99	129,556.49
Russell	2,864	157	3,021	73.99	223,523.79
Saline	11,621	904	12,525	73.99	926,724.75
Scott	1,426	91	1,517	73.99	112,242.83
Sedgwick	84,976	10,953	95,929	73.99	7,097,786.71
Seward	4,246	288	4,534	73.99	335,470.66
Shawnee	30,376	3,327	33,703	73.99	2,493,684.97
Sheridan	1,261	299	1,560	73.99	115,424.40
Sherman	1,660	216	1,876	73.99	138,805.24
Smith	1,732	311	2,043	73.99	151,161.59
Stafford	1,784	219	2,003	73.99	148,201.97
Stanton	590	29	619	73.99	45,799.81
Stevens	1,276	99	1,375	73.99	101,736.25
Summer	6,432	404	6,836	73.99	505,795.64
Thomas	1,874	88	1,962	73.99	145,168.38
Trego	1,464	154	1,618	73.99	119,715.82
Wabaunsee	1,534	308	1,842	73.99	136,289.58
Wallace	610	55	665	73.99	49,203.35
Washington	2,543	628	3,171	73.99	234,622.29
Wichita	779	197	976	73.99	72,214.24
Wilson	3,045	358	3,403	73.99	215,787.97
Woodson	1,179	281	1,460	73.99	108,025.40
Wyandotte	44,563	7,855	52,418	73.99	3,878,407.82
State total	518,043	61,843	579,886	73.99	42,905,765.14

KENTUCKY					
Adair	3,994	2,143	6,137	64.49	395,775.13
Allen	2,801	1,293	4,094	64.49	264,022.06
Anderson	2,031	407	2,438	64.49	157,226.62
Ballard	1,929	436	2,365	64.49	152,518.85
Barren	6,839	2,641	9,480	64.49	611,365.20
Bath	2,314	1,118	3,432	64.49	221,329.68

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
KENTUCKY—Continued					
Bell	11,015	5,590	16,605	\$64.49	\$1,070,856.45
Boone	5,890	382	6,272	64.49	404,481.28
Bourbon	4,603	1,080	5,683	64.49	366,496.67
Boyd	12,941	2,048	14,989	64.49	966,640.61
Boyle	4,480	1,174	5,654	64.49	364,626.46
Bracken	1,724	363	2,087	64.49	134,590.63
Breathitt	5,126	3,656	8,782	64.49	566,351.18
Breckinridge	3,909	1,276	5,185	64.49	334,380.65
Bullitt	4,444	565	5,009	64.49	323,030.41
Butler	2,655	1,316	3,971	64.49	256,089.79
Caldwell	2,993	908	3,901	64.49	251,575.49
Calloway	4,161	843	5,004	64.49	322,707.96
Campbell	20,588	1,722	22,310	64.49	1,438,771.90
Carlisle	1,207	234	1,441	64.49	92,930.09
Carroll	1,985	443	2,428	64.49	156,581.72
Carter	6,174	2,364	8,538	64.49	550,615.62
Casey	4,537	2,641	7,178	64.49	462,909.22
Christian	11,208	2,791	13,999	64.49	902,795.51
Clark	5,235	1,075	6,310	64.49	406,931.90
Clay	7,079	4,340	11,419	64.49	736,411.31
Clinton	2,523	1,563	4,086	64.49	263,506.14
Crittenden	2,053	715	2,768	64.49	178,508.32
Cumberland	2,022	1,241	3,263	64.49	210,430.87
Daviess	18,776	2,876	21,652	64.49	1,396,337.48
Edmonson	2,352	1,048	3,400	64.49	219,266.00
Elliott	1,930	2,872	4,802	64.49	310,215.28
Estill	3,426	1,548	4,974	64.49	320,773.26
Fayette	27,771	4,625	32,396	64.49	2,089,218.04
Fleming	2,692	822	3,514	64.49	226,617.86
Floyd	14,117	5,966	20,083	64.49	1,295,152.67
Franklin	6,395	844	7,239	64.49	466,843.11
Fulton	2,759	979	3,738	64.49	241,063.62
Gallatin	945	147	1,092	64.49	70,423.08
Garrard	2,311	735	3,046	64.49	196,436.54
Grant	2,348	539	2,887	64.49	186,182.63
Graves	6,887	1,483	8,370	64.49	539,781.30
Grayson	4,400	1,919	6,319	64.49	407,512.31
Green	2,765	878	3,643	64.49	234,937.07
Greenup	8,587	2,275	10,862	64.49	700,490.38
Hancock	1,423	352	1,775	64.49	114,469.75
Hardin	12,358	1,957	14,315	64.49	923,174.35
Harlan	16,929	7,074	24,003	64.49	1,547,953.47
Harrison	3,194	651	3,845	64.49	247,964.05
Hart	3,696	1,858	5,554	64.49	358,177.46
Henderson	8,685	1,454	10,139	64.49	653,864.11
Henry	2,702	711	3,413	64.49	220,104.37
Hickman	1,632	633	2,265	64.49	146,069.85
Hopkins	9,418	2,048	11,466	64.49	739,442.34
Jackson	3,365	2,021	5,386	64.49	347,343.14
Jefferson	146,341	19,766	166,107	64.49	10,712,240.43
Jessamine	3,029	559	3,588	64.49	231,390.12
Johnson	5,697	2,763	8,460	64.49	545,585.40
Kenton	28,946	2,506	31,452	64.49	2,028,339.49
Knott	6,129	3,582	9,711	64.49	626,262.39
Knox	7,848	4,992	12,840	64.49	828,051.60
Larue	2,601	733	3,334	64.49	215,009.66
Laurel	7,344	3,236	10,580	64.49	682,304.20
Lawrence	3,601	1,766	5,367	64.49	346,117.83
Lee	2,282	1,284	3,566	64.49	229,971.34
Leslie	3,845	2,148	5,993	64.49	386,488.57
Letcher	10,030	4,457	14,487	64.49	934,266.63

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
KENTUCKY—Continued						MARYLAND					
Trimble	1,326	174	1,500	\$64.49	\$96,735.00	Allegany	19,849	2,681	22,530	\$73.12	\$1,647,393.60
Union	3,989	863	4,852	64.49	312,905.48	Anne Arundel	50,304	4,446	54,750	73.12	4,003,320.00
Warren	10,301	2,889	13,190	64.49	850,623.03	Baltimore	121,986	4,816	126,802	73.12	9,271,762.24
Washington	3,149	998	4,147	64.49	267,440.03	Baltimore City	207,501	61,225	268,726	73.12	19,649,245.12
Wayne	4,250	2,723	6,973	64.49	449,688.77	Calvert	4,734	1,263	5,997	73.12	438,500.64
Webster	3,249	819	4,068	64.49	262,345.32	Caroline	4,633	997	5,630	73.12	411,665.60
Whitley	7,324	3,645	10,969	64.49	707,390.81	Cecil	11,674	1,153	12,827	73.12	937,910.24
Wolfe	1,931	1,509	3,440	64.49	221,845.60	Charles	11,179	1,306	12,485	73.12	912,903.20
Woodford	2,874	626	3,500	64.49	225,715.00	Chesapeake	9,550	2,127	11,677	73.12	853,822.24
State total	781,061	224,036	1,005,097	64.49	64,818,705.53	Dorchester	6,645	1,697	8,342	73.12	609,967.04
LOUISIANA						Frederick	16,898	2,016	18,914	73.12	1,382,991.68
Acadia	14,263	4,635	18,898	76.91	1,453,445.18	Garrett	5,592	1,160	6,752	73.12	493,706.24
Allen	5,794	1,630	7,424	76.91	570,979.84	Harford	19,221	1,989	21,210	73.12	1,550,875.20
Ascension	8,314	1,912	10,226	76.91	786,481.66	Howard	9,146	1,645	10,791	73.12	715,917.92
Assumption	5,325	1,559	6,884	76.91	529,448.44	Kent	3,530	669	4,199	73.12	307,030.88
Avoyelles	11,159	5,123	16,282	76.91	1,252,248.62	Montgomery	94,779	3,558	98,337	73.12	7,190,401.44
Beauregard	5,209	1,283	6,492	76.91	499,299.72	Prince Georges	91,181	6,722	97,903	73.12	7,158,667.36
Bienville	4,627	1,632	6,259	76.91	481,379.69	Queen Annes	4,017	888	4,905	73.12	358,653.60
Bossier	15,322	3,039	18,361	76.91	1,412,144.51	St. Marys	10,508	2,128	12,636	73.12	923,344.32
Caddo	57,776	11,420	69,196	76.91	5,321,864.36	Somerset	4,655	1,309	5,964	73.12	436,087.68
Calcasieu	39,000	4,789	43,789	76.91	3,367,811.99	Talbot	4,953	911	5,864	73.12	428,775.68
Caldwell	2,534	1,117	3,651	76.91	280,798.41	Washington	21,421	2,402	23,823	73.12	1,741,937.76
Cameron	1,796	1,998	1,994	76.91	153,358.54	Wicomico	11,515	2,007	13,522	73.12	988,728.64
Catahoula	3,386	1,631	5,017	76.91	385,857.47	Worcester	5,683	1,516	7,199	73.12	526,390.88
Claiborne	5,287	2,048	7,335	76.91	564,134.85	State total	751,154	109,631	860,785	73.12	62,940,599.20
Concordia	6,280	2,498	8,778	76.91	675,115.98	MASSACHUSETTS					
De Soto	7,185	2,961	10,146	76.91	780,328.86	Barnstable	14,950	2,108	17,058	67.70	1,154,826.60
East Baton Rouge	59,999	7,189	67,188	76.91	5,167,429.08	Berkshire	33,166	4,099	37,265	67.70	2,522,840.50
East Carroll	4,701	2,510	7,211	76.91	554,598.01	Bristol	89,289	12,446	101,735	67.70	6,887,459.50
East Feliciana	4,280	1,838	6,118	76.91	470,535.38	Dukes	1,261	160	1,421	67.70	96,201.70
Evangeline	9,342	4,430	13,772	76.91	1,059,204.52	Essex	129,250	14,213	143,463	67.70	9,712,445.10
Franklin	8,260	4,586	12,846	76.91	987,985.86	Franklin	13,437	1,319	14,756	67.70	998,981.20
Grant	3,750	1,041	4,791	76.91	368,475.81	Hampden	98,181	12,216	110,397	67.70	7,473,876.90
Iberia	14,505	2,698	17,203	76.91	1,323,082.73	Hampshire	21,636	1,453	23,089	67.70	1,563,125.30
Iberville	8,724	2,972	11,696	76.91	899,539.36	Middlesex	276,323	21,759	298,082	67.70	20,180,151.40
Jackson	4,442	1,009	5,451	76.91	419,236.41	Nantucket	727	80	807	67.70	54,633.90
Jefferson	57,253	4,963	62,216	76.91	4,785,032.56	Norfolk	121,254	6,884	128,138	67.70	8,674,942.60
Jefferson Davis	8,720	2,175	10,895	76.91	837,834.45	Plymouth	59,834	6,919	66,753	67.70	4,519,178.10
Lafayette	21,905	4,990	26,895	76.91	2,068,494.45	Suffolk	153,044	42,289	195,333	67.70	13,224,044.10
Lafourche	15,725	2,513	18,238	76.91	1,402,684.58	Worcester	132,847	13,136	145,983	67.70	9,883,049.10
La Salle	3,508	777	4,285	76.91	329,559.35	State total	1,145,199	139,081	1,284,280	67.70	86,945,756.00
Lincoln	6,221	1,589	7,810	76.91	600,667.10	MICHIGAN					
Livingston	8,202	2,169	10,371	76.91	797,633.61	Alcona	1,650	237	1,887	77.53	146,299.11
Madison	4,905	2,609	7,514	76.91	577,901.74	Alger	2,656	342	2,998	77.53	232,434.94
Morehouse	10,293	3,990	14,283	76.91	1,098,505.53	Allegan	15,810	1,716	17,526	77.53	1,358,790.78
Natchitoches	10,209	4,509	14,718	76.91	1,131,961.38	Alpena	7,680	681	8,361	77.53	648,228.33
Orleans	143,970	26,866	170,836	76.91	13,138,996.76	Antrim	2,749	371	3,120	77.53	241,893.60
Ouchita	26,792	5,876	32,668	76.91	2,512,495.88	Arenac	2,551	460	3,011	77.53	233,442.83
Plaquemines	6,493	1,028	7,521	76.91	578,440.11	Baraga	1,960	335	2,295	77.53	177,931.35
Pointe Coupee	7,101	3,706	10,807	76.91	831,166.37	Barry	8,183	864	9,047	77.53	701,413.91
Rapides	28,251	6,624	34,875	76.91	2,682,236.25	Bay	28,469	2,364	30,833	77.53	2,390,482.49
Red River	2,945	1,508	4,453	76.91	342,480.23	Benzil	1,976	215	2,191	77.53	169,868.23
Richland	7,545	3,876	11,421	76.91	878,389.11	Berrien	38,712	5,299	44,011	77.53	3,412,172.83
Sabine	5,434	1,783	7,217	76.91	555,059.47	Branch	7,952	887	8,839	77.53	685,287.67
St. Bernard	9,585	613	10,198	76.91	784,328.18	Calhoun	33,824	4,005	37,829	77.53	2,932,882.37
St. Charles	6,193	1,023	7,216	76.91	554,982.56	Cass	10,105	1,265	11,370	77.53	881,516.10
St. Helena	3,029	1,712	4,741	76.91	364,630.31	Charlevoix	3,499	304	3,803	77.53	294,846.59
St. James	5,826	1,711	7,537	76.91	579,670.67	Cheboygan	3,882	720	4,602	77.53	356,793.06
St. John the Baptist	5,577	1,216	6,793	76.91	522,449.63	Chippewa	8,314	1,012	9,326	77.53	723,044.78
St. Landry	25,961	12,643	38,604	76.91	2,969,033.64	Clare	2,959	456	3,415	77.53	264,764.95
St. Martin	8,982	3,823	12,805	76.91	994,832.55	Clinton	10,630	1,177	11,807	77.53	882,989.17
St. Mary	13,882	2,565	16,447	76.91	1,264,838.77	Crawford	9,177	1,334	10,511	77.53	803,425.02
St. Tammany	10,745	2,578	13,323	76.91	1,024,571.93	Delta	9,473	799	10,272	77.53	796,388.16
Tangipahoa	16,805	5,625	22,430	76.91	1,725,091.30	Dickinson	5,705	607	6,312	77.53	489,369.36
Tensas	3,955	2,681	6,636	76.91	510,374.76	Eaton	13,389	1,120	14,509	77.53	1,124,509.73
Terrebonne	18,112	2,704	20,816	76.91	1,600,958.56	Emmet	4,113	628	4,741	77.53	367,569.73
Union	4,926	1,494	6,420	76.91	493,762.20	Genesee	95,408	11,354	106,762	77.53	8,277,257.86
Vermilion	10,151	2,695	12,846	76.91	987,985.86	Gladwin	3,074	359	3,433	77.53	266,160.49
Vernon	5,107	1,634	6,741	76.91	518,450.31	Gobeigic	6,210	556	6,766	77.53	524,567.98
Washington	12,801	3,482	16,283	76.91	1,252,325.53	Grand Traverse	7,917	753	8,670	77.53	672,185.10
Webster	10,963	2,621	13,584	76.91	1,044,745.44	Gratiot	9,657	1,091	10,748	77.53	833,292.44
West Baton Rouge	4,435	1,052	5,487	76.91	422,005.17	Hillsdale	8,838	1,123	9,961	77.53	772,276.33
West Carroll	4,431	2,471	6,902	76.91	536,985.62	Houghton	7,730	1,153	8,883	77.53	688,698.99
West Feliciana	3,037	1,570	4,607	76.91	354,324.37	Huron	9,607	1,684	11,291	77.53	875,391.23
Winn	4,534	1,564	6,098	76.91	468,997.18	Ingham	49,097	5,196	54,293	77.53	4,209,336.29
State total	875,849	214,776	1,090,625	76.91	83,879,968.75	Ionia	10,970	1,047	12,017	77.53	931,678.01
MAINE						Iosco	3,719	394	4,113	77.53	318,880.89
Androscoggin	20,600	2,377	22,977	72.90	1,675,023.30	Iron	4,426	375	4,801	77.53	372,221.53
Aroostook	29,424	5,615	35,039	72.90	2,554,343.10	Isabella	8,619	1,061	9,680	77.53	750,490.40
Cumberland	42,713	6,869	49,582	72.90	3,614,527.80	Jackson	31,831	2,454	34,285	77.53	2,658,116.05
Franklin	5,042	613	5,655	72.90	412,249.50	Kalamazoo	40,478	3,638	44,116	77.53	3,420,313.48
Hancock	7,545	1,091	8,636	72.90	629,564.40	Kalkaska	1,171	280	1,451	77.53	112,496.03
Kennebec	21,135	2,732	23,867	72.90	1,739,904.30	Leetonia	91,978	8,470	100,448	77.53	7,787,733.44
Knox	6,571	1,154	7,725	72.90							

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
MICHIGAN—Continued					
Menominee	6,806	887	7,693	\$77.53	\$596,438.29
Midland	15,222	1,419	16,641	77.53	1,290,176.73
Missaukee	2,001	349	2,350	77.53	182,195.50
Monroe	28,162	2,152	30,314	77.53	2,350,244.42
Montcalm	9,345	1,074	10,419	77.53	807,785.07
Montgomery	1,189	281	1,470	77.53	113,969.10
Muskegon	41,063	5,255	46,318	77.52	3,591,034.54
Newaygo	6,680	975	7,655	77.53	593,492.15
Oakland	186,929	13,222	200,151	77.53	15,517,707.03
Oceana	4,516	562	5,078	77.53	393,697.34
Ogemaw	2,653	509	3,162	77.53	245,149.86
Ontonagon	2,692	355	3,047	77.53	236,233.91
Oscoda	3,717	492	4,209	77.53	326,323.77
Oscoda	886	270	1,107	77.53	85,825.71
Otsego	1,958	220	2,228	77.53	172,736.84
Ottawa	27,452	1,546	28,998	77.53	2,248,214.94
Presque Isle	3,672	403	4,075	77.53	315,934.75
Roscommon	1,667	290	1,957	77.53	151,726.21
Saginaw	50,687	6,619	57,306	77.53	4,442,934.18
St. Clair	28,587	3,563	32,150	77.53	2,492,589.50
St. Joseph	10,462	839	11,301	77.53	876,166.53
Sanilac	8,602	1,085	9,687	77.53	751,033.11
Schoolcraft	2,365	448	2,813	77.53	218,091.89
Shiawassee	14,261	1,205	15,466	77.53	1,199,078.98
Tuscola	11,187	944	12,131	77.53	94,516.43
Van Buren	12,412	1,661	14,073	77.53	1,091,079.69
Washtenaw	35,743	3,071	38,814	77.53	3,009,249.42
Wayne	630,162	101,895	732,057	77.53	56,756,379.21
Wexford	4,777	374	5,151	77.53	399,357.03
State total	1,960,772	232,544	2,193,316	77.53	170,047,789.48

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
MINNESOTA					
Aitkin	3,210	803	4,013	84.77	340,182.01
Anoka	23,874	1,592	25,466	84.77	2,158,752.82
Becker	6,733	1,501	8,234	84.77	697,996.18
Beltrami	6,376	1,564	7,940	84.77	673,073.80
Benton	4,925	856	5,781	84.77	490,055.37
Big Stone	2,530	730	3,260	84.77	276,350.20
Blue Earth	10,332	1,313	11,645	84.77	987,146.65
Brown	7,041	1,035	8,076	84.77	684,602.52
Carlton	7,251	824	8,075	84.77	684,517.75
Carver	5,695	523	6,218	84.77	527,099.86
Cass	4,443	1,176	5,619	84.77	476,322.63
Chippewa	4,423	955	5,378	84.77	455,893.06
Chisago	3,385	348	3,733	84.77	316,446.41
Clay	9,889	705	10,594	84.77	898,053.38
Clearwater	2,418	642	3,060	84.77	259,396.20
Cook	869	72	941	84.77	79,768.57
Cottonwood	4,275	854	5,129	84.77	434,785.33
Crow Wing	8,598	1,031	9,629	84.77	816,250.33
Dakota	21,102	1,405	22,507	84.77	1,907,918.39
Dodge	3,682	498	4,180	84.77	354,338.60
Douglas	5,680	1,226	6,906	84.77	585,421.62
Fairbault	6,278	984	7,262	84.77	615,599.74
Fillmore	6,154	1,193	7,347	84.77	622,805.19
Freeborn	9,938	1,314	17,252	84.77	953,832.04
Goodhue	8,204	842	9,046	84.77	766,829.42
Grant	2,293	585	2,878	84.77	243,968.06
Hennepin	191,463	19,111	210,574	84.77	17,850,357.98
Houston	4,609	781	5,390	84.77	456,910.30
Hubbard	2,686	546	3,232	84.77	273,976.64
Isanti	3,040	369	3,409	84.77	288,980.93
Itasca	11,011	1,379	12,390	84.77	1,050,300.30
Jackson	4,172	1,121	5,293	84.77	448,687.61
Kanabec	2,488	546	3,034	84.77	257,192.18
Kandiyohi	7,576	1,095	8,671	84.77	735,040.67
Kittson	2,358	373	2,731	84.77	231,506.87
Koochiching	5,335	445	5,780	84.77	489,970.60
Lac Quiparie	3,559	1,269	4,828	84.77	409,269.56
Lake	3,590	215	3,805	84.77	322,549.85
Lake of the Woods	1,203	200	1,403	84.77	118,932.31
Le Sueur	5,112	931	6,043	84.77	512,265.11
Lincoln	2,623	803	3,426	84.77	290,422.02
Lyon	6,261	1,235	7,496	84.77	635,435.92
McLeod	6,326	881	7,207	84.77	610,937.39
Mahnomen	1,936	473	2,409	84.77	204,210.93
Marshall	3,967	618	4,585	84.77	388,670.45
Martin	7,092	1,083	8,175	84.77	692,994.75
Meeker	5,179	1,223	6,402	84.77	542,697.54
Millie Lacs	3,874	618	4,492	84.77	380,786.84
Morrison	7,816	2,055	9,871	84.77	826,764.67
Mower	13,603	1,219	14,822	84.77	1,256,460.94
Murray	4,360	776	5,136	84.77	435,378.27
Nicollet	5,340	658	5,998	84.77	508,450.46
Nobles	6,521	1,368	7,889	84.77	668,750.53
Norman	2,916	416	3,332	84.77	282,453.64
Olmsted	15,394	1,395	16,789	84.77	1,423,203.53
Otter Tail	12,373	2,480	14,853	84.77	1,259,088.81
Pennington	3,249	448	3,697	84.77	313,394.69
Pine	4,545	876	5,421	84.77	459,538.17
Pipestone	3,692	725	4,417	84.77	374,429.09
Polk	9,698	1,277	10,975	84.77	930,350.75
Pope	3,199	721	3,920	84.77	332,298.40
Ramsey	100,306	10,773	111,079	84.77	9,416,166.83
Red Lake	1,804	254	2,058	84.77	174,456.66
Redwood	5,947	1,302	7,249	84.77	614,497.73
Renville	6,385	1,230	7,615	84.77	645,523.55
Rice	8,331	807	9,138	84.77	774,628.26
Rock	3,450	572	4,022	84.77	340,944.94
Roseau	3,464	679	4,143	84.77	351,202.11
St. Louis	57,271	5,265	62,536	84.77	5,301,176.72
Scott	5,967	713	6,680	84.77	566,263.60
Sherburne	3,210	269	3,479	84.77	294,914.83

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
MINNESOTA—Continued					
Sibley	4,119	740	4,859	\$84.77	\$411,897.43
Sterans	21,933	3,409	25,342	84.77	2,148,241.34
Steele	6,174	624	6,798	84.77	576,266.46
Stevens	3,253	696	3,949	84.77	334,756.73
Swift	4,284	987	5,271	84.77	446,822.67
Todd	6,531	1,972	8,503	84.77	720,759.31
Traverse	2,045	474	2,519	84.77	213,535.63
Wabasha	4,617	598	5,215	84.77	442,075.55
Wadena	3,359	776	4,135	84.77	350,523.95
Waseca	4,016	451	4,467	84.77	378,667.59
Washington	13,789	857	14,655	84.77	1,242,304.35
Watsonwan	3,722	827	4,549	84.77	385,618.73
Wilkin	3,010	534	3,544	84.77	300,424.88
Windna	9,882	1,041	10,923	84.77	925,942.71
Wright	8,406	1,012	9,418	84.77	798,363.86
Yellow Medicine	4,083	1,186	5,269	84.77	446,653.13
State total	857,131	112,348	969,479	84.77	82,182,734.83

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
MISSISSIPPI					
Adams	10,710	3,199	13,909	69.80	970,848.20
Alcorn	6,692	2,441	9,133	69.80	637,483.40
Amite	5,055	2,425	7,480	69.80	522,104.00
Attala	6,247	3,480	9,727	69.80	678,944.60
Benton	2,347	1,221	3,568	69.80	249,046.40
Bolivar	17,794	10,950	28,744	69.80	2,006,331.20
Calhoun	4,557	2,240	6,797	69.80	474,430.60
Carroll	3,567	2,198	5,765	69.80	402,397.00
Chickasaw	4,706	2,529	7,235	69.80	505,003.00
Choctaw	2,426	1,291	3,717	69.80	259,446.60
Claiborne	3,113	1,974	5,087	69.80	355,072.60
Clarke	4,831	2,025	6,856	69.80	478,548.80
Clay	5,602	2,297	7,899	69.80	551,350.20
Coahoma	13,874	7,283	21,157	69.80	1,476,758.60
Copiah	7,806	3,793	11,599	69.80	809,610.20
Covington	4,034	2,075	6,109	69.80	426,408.20
De Soto	7,553	3,784	11,337	69.80	791,322.60
Forrest	13,337	2,502	15,839	69.80	1,108,354.20
Franklin	2,561	832	3,393	69.80	236,831.40
George	3,226	753	3,979	69.80	277,734.20
Greene	2,541	928	3,469	69.80	242,136.20
Grenada	5,228	2,150	7,378	69.80	514,984.40
Hancock	3,909	874	4,783	69.80	333,853.40
Harrison	27,102	3,971	31,073	69.80	2,168,895.40
Hinds	48,094	11,656	59,750	69.80	4,170,550.00
Holmes	8,531	6,426	14,957	69.80	1,043,998.60
Humphreys	6,326	4,010	10,336	69.80	721,452.80
Issaquena	1,171	717	1,888	69.80	131,782.40
Itawamba	3,878	1,427	5,305	69.80	370,289.00
Jackson	15,304	1,461	16,765	69.80	1,170,197.00
Jasper	5,121	2,304	7,425	69.80	518,265.00
Jefferson	3,114	2,102	5,216	69.80	364,076.80
Jefferson Davis	4,331	2,502	6,833	69.80	476,943.40
Jones	16,230	3,632	19,862	69.80	1,386,367.60
Kemper	3,963	2,568	6,531	69.80	455,863.80
Lafayette	5,127	2,015	7,142	69.80	498,511.60
Lamar	3,957	916	4,873	69.80	340,13

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
MISSOURI						MISSOURI—Continued					
Adair	3,783	690	4,473	\$68.01	\$304,208.73	Taney	2,316	697	3,013	\$68.01	\$204,914.13
Andrew	2,575	445	3,020	68.01	205,390.21	Texas	4,517	1,178	5,695	68.01	387,316.95
Atchison	2,030	437	2,517	68.01	171,181.17	Vernon	4,058	682	4,740	68.01	322,367.40
Audrain	6,471	737	7,208	68.01	490,216.08	Warren	1,956	209	2,165	68.01	147,241.65
Barry	4,340	1,154	5,494	68.01	373,546.94	Washington	4,294	1,028	5,322	68.01	361,948.22
Barton	2,482	583	3,071	68.01	208,958.71	Wayne	2,259	770	3,029	68.01	206,002.29
Bates	3,484	706	4,190	68.01	284,961.90	Webster	3,360	937	4,297	68.01	292,238.97
Benton	1,830	462	2,292	68.01	155,878.92	Worth	884	363	1,247	68.01	80,808.47
Bollinger	2,457	735	3,192	68.01	217,087.92	Wright	3,522	1,127	4,649	68.01	316,178.49
Boone	9,866	962	10,828	68.01	736,412.28	State total	975,603	160,363	1,135,966	68.01	77,257,047.66
Buchanan	18,944	1,850	20,794	68.01	1,414,199.94	MONTANA					
Butler	9,245	3,167	12,412	68.01	844,140.12	Beaverhead	1,487	145	1,632	82.93	135,341.76
Caldwell	1,827	468	2,295	68.01	156,082.95	Big Horn	3,045	600	3,645	82.93	302,279.85
Callaway	4,688	632	5,320	68.01	361,813.20	Blaine	2,309	462	2,771	82.93	229,799.03
Camden	2,090	404	2,494	68.01	169,616.94	Broadwater	717	65	782	82.93	64,851.26
Cape Girardeau	9,889	1,594	11,483	68.01	780,958.83	Carbon	2,207	283	2,490	82.93	206,495.70
Carroll	3,123	672	3,795	68.01	258,097.95	Carters	667	139	806	82.93	66,841.58
Carter	1,028	498	1,526	68.01	103,783.26	Cascade	17,789	1,711	19,500	82.93	1,617,135.00
Cass	6,738	711	7,449	68.01	506,606.49	Chouteau	2,035	250	2,285	82.93	189,495.05
Cedar	1,927	467	2,394	68.01	162,815.94	Custer	3,163	195	3,358	82.93	278,478.94
Chariton	2,895	803	3,698	68.01	251,500.98	Daniels	992	130	1,122	82.93	93,047.46
Christian	2,952	536	3,488	68.01	237,218.88	Dawson	3,588	466	4,054	82.93	336,198.22
Clark	2,071	384	2,455	68.01	166,964.55	Deer Lodge	4,587	206	4,793	82.93	397,483.49
Clay	22,225	921	23,146	68.01	1,574,159.46	Fallon	1,119	113	1,232	82.93	102,169.76
Clinton	2,647	430	3,077	68.01	209,266.77	Fergus	3,611	393	4,004	82.93	332,051.72
Cole	8,542	649	9,191	68.01	625,079.91	Flathead	8,855	586	9,441	82.93	782,942.13
Cooper	3,261	425	3,686	68.01	250,684.86	Gallatin	5,950	376	6,326	82.93	524,615.18
Crawford	3,680	662	4,342	68.01	254,765.46	Garfield	538	146	684	82.93	56,724.12
Dade	2,125	541	2,666	68.01	197,705.07	Golden Valley	3,253	944	4,207	82.93	348,886.51
Dallas	2,125	782	2,907	68.01	169,480.92	Granite	327	40	367	82.93	30,435.31
Daviess	1,968	524	2,492	68.01	137,856.27	Hill	5,010	521	5,531	82.93	458,685.83
De Kalb	1,573	454	2,027	68.01	137,856.27	Jefferson	925	77	1,002	82.93	83,095.86
Dent	2,355	632	2,987	68.01	203,145.87	Judith Basin	816	95	911	82.93	75,549.23
Douglas	2,566	1,112	3,678	68.01	250,140.78	Lake	3,684	558	4,242	82.93	351,789.06
Dunklin	11,135	4,671	15,806	68.01	1,074,966.06	Lewis and Clark	6,856	445	7,301	82.93	605,471.93
Franklin	10,646	924	11,570	68.01	786,875.70	Liberty	734	25	759	82.93	62,934.87
Gasconade	2,713	321	3,034	68.01	206,342.34	Lincoln	3,524	249	3,773	82.93	312,894.89
Gentry	1,781	573	2,354	68.01	160,095.54	McCone	1,006	217	1,223	82.93	101,423.39
Greene	27,726	3,272	30,998	68.01	2,108,173.98	Madison	1,247	145	1,392	82.93	115,438.56
Grundy	2,471	620	3,091	68.01	212,218.91	Meagher	625	81	706	82.93	58,548.58
Harrison	2,437	808	3,245	68.01	220,692.45	Mineral	895	54	949	82.93	78,700.57
Henry	4,281	771	5,052	68.01	343,586.52	Missoula	10,832	915	11,747	82.93	974,178.71
Hickory	1,067	315	1,382	68.01	93,989.82	Musselshell	1,239	133	1,372	82.93	113,779.96
Holt	1,780	401	2,181	68.01	148,329.81	Park	3,282	358	3,640	82.93	301,865.20
Howard	2,307	525	2,832	68.01	192,604.32	Petroleum	235	35	270	82.93	22,391.10
Howell	5,602	1,521	7,123	68.01	484,435.23	Phillips	1,609	223	1,832	82.93	151,927.76
Iron	2,076	532	2,608	68.01	177,370.08	Pondera	2,216	235	2,451	82.93	203,261.43
Jackson	130,350	14,952	145,302	68.01	9,881,989.02	Powder River	663	114	777	82.93	64,436.61
Jasper	17,961	2,495	20,456	68.01	1,391,212.56	Powell	1,613	135	1,748	82.93	144,961.64
Jefferson	17,762	1,172	18,934	68.01	1,287,701.34	Prairie	706	80	786	82.93	65,182.98
Johnson	5,614	686	6,300	68.01	428,463.00	Ravalli	3,375	526	3,901	82.93	323,509.93
Knox	1,480	308	1,788	68.01	121,601.88	Richland	2,930	502	3,432	82.93	284,615.76
Laclede	4,641	1,140	5,781	68.01	393,165.81	Roosevelt	3,591	872	4,463	82.93	370,116.59
Lafayette	5,608	792	6,400	68.01	435,264.00	Rosebud	1,774	163	1,937	82.93	192,646.39
Lawrence	5,224	973	6,193	68.01	421,185.93	Sanders	1,773	163	1,936	82.93	160,552.48
Lewis	2,314	223	2,537	68.01	172,541.37	Sheridan	1,823	137	1,960	82.93	162,542.80
Lincoln	3,398	449	3,847	68.01	290,674.74	Silver Bow	11,412	1,054	12,466	82.93	1,033,805.38
Linn	3,561	713	4,274	68.01	294,483.30	Stillwater	1,512	122	1,634	82.93	135,507.62
Livingston	3,603	727	4,330	68.01	250,412.82	Sweet Grass	773	153	926	82.93	76,793.18
McDonald	2,815	867	3,682	68.01	199,881.39	Teton	2,075	137	2,212	82.93	183,441.16
Macon	3,330	714	4,044	68.01	275,032.44	Toole	2,151	168	2,319	82.93	192,314.67
Madison	2,447	492	2,939	68.01	199,881.39	Treasure	374	11	385	82.93	31,928.05
Maries	1,895	589	2,484	68.01	168,936.84	Valley	4,252	457	4,709	82.93	390,517.37
Marion	6,497	1,030	7,527	68.01	511,911.27	Wheatland	770	57	827	82.93	68,583.11
Mercer	1,196	411	1,607	68.01	109,292.07	Wibaux	505	98	603	82.93	50,006.79
Miller	3,515	687	4,202	68.01	285,778.02	Yellowstone	21,362	1,835	23,197	82.93	1,923,727.21
Mississippi	6,306	3,051	9,357	68.01	636,369.57	Yellowstone National Park	4	4	8	82.93	331.72
Moniteau	2,377	547	2,924	68.01	198,861.24	State total	175,175	18,821	193,996	82.93	16,088,088.28
Monroe	2,395	575	2,970	68.01	201,989.70	NEBRASKA					
Montgomery	2,411	425	2,836	68.01	192,876.36	Adams	6,505	539	7,044	73.18	515,479.92
Morgan	2,086	450	2,536	68.01	172,473.36	Antelope	2,520	440	2,960	73.18	216,612.80
New Madrid	9,835	5,439	15,274	68.01	1,038,784.74	Arthur	168	168	336	73.18	12,294.24
Newton	7,676	1,369	9,045	68.01	615,150.45	Banner	358	24	382	73.18	27,954.76
Nodaway	4,845	1,057	5,902	68.01	401,395.02	Blaine	267	83	350	73.18	25,613.00
Oregon	2,405	997	3,402	68.01	231,370.02	Boone	2,423	580	3,003	73.18	219,759.54
Osage	2,818	557	3,375	68.01	229,533.75	Box Butte	3,110	284	3,394	73.18	248,372.92
Ozark	1,774	707	2,481	68.01	168,732.81	Boyd	1,209	590	1,799	73.18	131,650.82
Pemiscot	11,795	6,519	18,314	68.01	1,245,535.14	Brown	1,074	195	1,269	73.18	92,865.42
Perry	3,945	683	4,628	68.01	314,750.28	Buffalo	5,948	602	6,550	73.18	479,329.00
Pettis	7,673	944	8,617	68.01	586,042.17	Burt	2,528	483	3,011	73.18	220,344.98
Phelps	5,376	797	6,173	68.01	419,825.73	Butler	2,576	597	3,173	73.18	232,200.14
Pike	3,816	899	4,715	68.01	320,667.15	Cass	4,412	521	4,933	73.18	360,996.94
Platte	5,795	422	6,217	68.01	422,818.17	Cedar	4,041	971	5,012	73.18	366,778.16
Polk	2,847	772	3,646	68.01	247,964.49	Chase	1,131	140	1,271	73.18	93,011.78
Pulaski	6,468	509	6,977	68.01	474,505.77	Cherry	2,072	174	2,246	73.18	164,362.28
Putnam	1,525	446	1,971	68.01	134,047.71	Cheyenne	4,174	280	4,454	73.18	325,943.72
Ralls	1,943	263	2,206	68.01	150,030.06	Clay	2,171	269	2,440	73.18	

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
NEBRASKA—Continued						NEW JERSEY					
Fillmore	2,194	271	2,465	\$73.18	\$180,388.70	Atlantic	33,251	9,177	42,428	\$81.51	\$3,458,306.28
Franklin	1,256	187	1,443	73.18	105,598.74	Bergen	185,099	7,703	192,802	81.51	15,715,291.02
Frontier	1,091	184	1,275	73.18	93,304.50	Burlington	48,190	5,260	53,450	81.51	4,356,709.50
Furnas	1,819	222	2,041	73.18	149,360.38	Camden	91,146	16,367	107,513	81.51	8,763,384.63
Gage	5,850	943	6,793	73.18	497,111.74	Cape May	9,091	1,576	10,667	81.51	869,467.17
Garfield	866	137	1,003	73.18	73,399.54	Cumberland	24,537	6,145	30,682	81.51	2,500,889.82
705	129	834	73.18	61,032.12	Essex	189,144	52,576	241,720	81.51	19,702,597.20	
Gosper	643	59	702	73.18	51,372.36	Gloucester	32,978	3,989	36,967	81.51	3,013,180.17
Grant	243	-----	243	73.18	17,782.74	Hudson	122,325	20,373	142,698	81.51	11,631,313.98
Greeley	1,258	318	1,576	73.18	115,331.68	Hunterdon	12,345	1,900	13,245	81.51	1,103,237.85
Hall	8,857	919	9,776	73.18	715,407.68	Mercer	55,654	9,631	65,285	81.51	5,321,380.35
Hamilton	2,342	209	2,551	73.18	186,682.18	Middlesex	104,987	9,502	114,489	81.51	9,331,998.39
Harlan	1,280	197	1,477	73.18	108,086.86	Monmouth	77,658	12,924	90,582	81.51	7,383,338.82
Harrison	525	83	608	73.18	44,493.44	Morris	62,474	3,228	65,702	81.51	5,355,370.02
Hayes	1,283	186	1,469	73.18	107,501.42	Ocean	23,459	4,768	28,227	81.51	2,300,782.77
Hitchcock	3,606	658	4,264	73.18	312,039.52	Passaic	87,629	15,248	102,877	81.51	8,385,504.27
Holt	313	68	381	73.18	27,881.58	Salem	14,464	2,328	16,792	81.51	1,368,715.92
Howard	1,586	316	1,902	73.18	139,188.36	Somerset	33,359	2,527	35,886	81.51	2,925,067.86
Jefferson	2,690	424	3,114	73.18	227,882.52	Sussex	11,711	1,535	13,246	81.51	1,079,681.46
Johnson	1,511	425	1,936	73.18	141,676.48	Union	116,047	8,908	124,955	81.51	10,185,082.05
Kearney	1,528	116	1,644	73.18	120,307.92	Warren	14,302	1,252	15,554	81.51	1,267,806.54
Keith	2,004	154	2,158	73.18	157,922.44	State total	1,349,850	196,207	1,546,057	81.51	126,019,106.07
Keya Paha	378	58	436	73.18	31,906.48	NEW MEXICO					
Kimball	2,220	167	2,387	71.38	174,680.66	Bernalillo	69,738	9,996	79,734	75.36	6,008,754.24
Knox	3,402	779	4,181	73.18	305,965.58	Catron	780	179	959	75.36	72,270.24
Lancaster	31,415	2,216	33,631	73.18	2,461,116.58	Chaves	14,885	1,889	16,774	75.36	1,264,088.64
Lincoln	7,513	774	8,287	73.18	606,442.66	Colfax	3,773	850	4,623	75.36	348,389.28
Logan	278	56	334	73.18	24,442.12	Curry	8,155	1,303	9,458	75.36	712,754.88
Loup	282	93	375	73.18	27,442.50	De Baca	800	179	979	75.36	73,777.44
McPherson	186	12	198	73.18	14,489.64	Dona Ana	16,147	3,017	19,164	75.36	1,444,199.04
Madison	5,663	533	6,196	73.18	453,423.28	Eddy	15,022	2,400	17,062	75.36	1,285,792.32
Merrick	2,108	331	2,439	73.18	178,486.02	Grant	5,270	771	6,041	75.36	455,249.76
Morrill	1,924	180	2,104	73.18	153,970.72	Guadalupe	1,788	558	2,346	75.36	176,794.56
Nance	1,273	279	1,552	73.18	113,575.36	Harding	558	116	674	75.36	50,792.64
Nemaha	2,119	455	2,574	73.18	188,365.32	Hidalgo	1,444	199	1,643	75.36	123,816.48
Nuckolls	1,995	455	2,450	73.18	179,291.00	Lea	15,357	1,514	16,871	75.36	1,271,398.56
Otoe	3,914	599	4,513	73.18	330,261.34	Lincoln	2,081	334	2,415	75.36	181,994.40
Pawnee	1,234	395	1,629	73.18	119,210.22	Los Alamos	4,117	80	4,197	75.36	316,285.92
Perkins	1,161	135	1,296	73.18	94,841.28	Luna	2,749	621	3,370	75.36	253,963.20
Phelps	2,332	2283	2,615	73.18	191,365.70	McKinley	11,049	3,688	14,737	75.36	1,110,580.32
Pierce	2,222	443	2,665	73.18	195,024.70	Mora	2,143	6,841	2,984	75.36	224,874.24
Platte	6,551	684	7,235	73.18	529,457.30	Otero	9,937	1,122	11,059	75.36	833,406.24
Polk	1,807	304	2,111	73.18	154,482.98	Quay	3,605	683	4,288	75.36	323,143.68
Red Willow	3,178	271	3,449	73.18	252,397.82	Rio Arriba	8,227	3,315	11,542	75.36	869,805.12
Richardson	3,257	616	3,873	73.18	283,426.14	Roosevelt	4,044	709	4,753	75.36	358,186.08
Rock	664	127	791	73.18	57,885.38	Sandoval	4,786	2,178	6,964	75.36	524,807.04
Saline	2,712	478	3,190	73.18	233,444.20	San Juan	16,301	4,114	20,415	75.36	1,538,474.40
Sarpy	7,863	361	8,224	73.18	601,832.32	San Miguel	6,768	3,061	9,829	75.36	740,713.44
Sauers	4,233	767	5,000	73.18	365,900.00	Santa Fe	12,589	2,876	15,465	75.36	1,165,442.40
Scotts Bluff	9,025	1,149	10,174	73.18	744,533.32	Sierra	1,161	221	1,382	75.36	104,147.52
Seward	3,130	693	3,823	73.18	279,767.14	Socorro	2,826	1,005	3,831	75.36	288,704.16
Sheridan	2,421	346	2,767	73.18	202,489.06	Taos	5,551	2,663	8,214	75.36	619,007.04
Sherman	1,392	339	1,731	73.18	122,674.58	Torrance	1,936	555	2,491	75.36	187,721.76
Sioux	659	139	798	73.18	58,397.64	Union	1,735	241	1,976	75.36	148,911.36
Stanton	1,581	380	1,961	73.18	143,505.98	Valencia	11,851	2,116	13,967	75.36	1,052,553.12
Thayer	2,118	402	2,520	73.18	184,413.60	State total	267,173	53,034	320,207	75.36	2,413,079.52
Thomas	304	24	328	73.18	24,003.04	NEW YORK					
Thurston	2,054	855	2,909	73.18	212,880.62	Albany	59,175	5,941	65,116	102.26	6,658,762.16
Valley	1,670	381	2,051	73.18	150,092.18	Allegany	10,847	1,300	12,147	102.26	1,242,152.22
Washington	2,891	332	3,223	73.18	235,859.14	Bronx	273,629	128,899	402,528	102.26	41,162,513.28
Wayne	2,237	265	2,502	73.18	183,096.36	Broome	48,656	3,671	52,327	102.26	5,350,959.02
Webster	1,467	214	1,681	73.18	123,015.58	Cattaraugus	19,667	2,323	21,990	102.26	2,248,697.40
Wheeler	319	68	387	73.18	28,320.66	Cayuga	18,192	2,074	20,266	102.26	2,072,401.16
York	3,197	362	3,559	73.18	260,447.62	Chautauqua	34,142	3,103	37,245	102.26	3,808,673.70
State total	336,352	46,711	383,063	73.18	28,032,550.34	Chemung	23,567	2,097	25,664	102.26	2,624,400.64
NEVADA						Chenango	11,036	1,272	12,308	102.26	1,258,616.08
Churchill	1,952	207	2,169	58.22	126,279.18	Clinton	16,613	2,072	28,685	102.26	1,910,728.10
Clark	28,966	3,493	32,459	58.22	1,889,762.98	Columbia	10,343	1,230	11,573	102.26	1,183,454.98
Douglas	838	89	927	58.22	53,969.94	Cortland	9,486	970	10,459	102.26	1,069,537.34
Elko	2,941	251	3,192	58.22	185,838.24	Delaware	10,864	1,485	12,349	102.26	1,262,808.74
Esmeralda	118	-----	118	58.22	6,869.96	Dutchess	33,679	3,048	36,727	102.26	3,755,703.02
Eureka	142	116	142	58.22	8,267.24	Erie	244,296	29,494	273,790	102.26	27,991,629.80
Humboldt	1,254	116	1,370	58.22	79,761.40	Franklin	9,012	1,164	10,176	102.26	1,040,597.76
Lander	389	28	417	58.22	24,277.74	Fullton	11,496	2,016	13,512	102.26	1,385,737.12
Lincoln	702	259	961	59.22	55,949.42	Genesee	11,930	1,128	13,058	102.26	1,351,311.08
Lyon	1,569	124	1,693	58.22	98,566.46	Greene	13,588	1,291	14,879	102.26	1,521,526.54
Mineral	1,788	157	1,945	58.22	113,237.90	Hamilton	6,752	569	7,321	102.26	748,645.46
Nye	857	96	953	58.22	55,483.66	Herkimer	1,049	67	1,116	102.26	114,122.16
Ormsby	1,611	191	1,802	58.22	104,912.44	Jefferson	15,884	1,223	17,107	102.26	1,749,361.82
Pershing	755	58	813	58.22	47,332.86	Kings	21,631	2,192	23,823	102.26	2,436,139.98
Storey	144	-----	144	58.22	8,383.68	Lewis	528,031	213,374	741,405	102.26	75,816,075.30
Washoe	18,178	1,099	19,277	58.22	1,122,306.94	Livingston	6,272	664	6,936	102.26	709,275.36
White Pine	2,653	148	2,801	58.22	163,074.22	Madison	9,896	802	10,698	102.26	1,093,977.48
State total	64,867	6,316	71,183	58.22	4,144,274.26	Monroe	13,651	1,549	15,200	102.26	1,554,352.00
NEW HAMPSHIRE						Montgomery	131,448	13,816	145,264	102.26	14,854,696.64
Belknap	6,715	448	7,163	69.67	499,046.21	Nassau	12,753	1,223	13,976	102.26	1,429,185.76

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
NEW YORK—Continued					
Rensselaer	32,369	3,254	35,623	\$102.26	\$3,642,807.98
Richmond	49,241	6,278	55,519	102.26	5,677,372.94
Rockland	29,875	3,588	33,466	102.26	3,422,233.16
St. Lawrence	28,445	3,565	32,010	102.26	3,273,342.60
Saratoga	21,687	1,586	23,273	102.26	2,379,896.98
Schenectady	33,507	3,058	36,565	102.26	3,739,136.90
Schoharie	5,429	695	6,124	102.26	626,240.24
Schuyler	3,855	445	4,300	102.26	439,718.00
Seneca	7,457	560	8,017	102.26	819,818.42
Steuben	24,421	1,899	26,320	102.26	2,691,483.20
Suffolk	161,257	25,085	186,342	102.26	19,055,332.92
Sullivan	9,900	1,314	11,214	102.26	1,146,743.64
Tioga	9,854	881	10,735	102.26	1,097,761.10
Tompkins	13,333	1,271	14,604	102.26	1,493,405.04
Ulster	25,109	2,743	27,852	102.26	2,848,145.52
Warren	10,699	1,507	12,206	102.26	1,248,185.56
Washington	11,552	1,088	12,640	102.26	1,292,566.40
Wayne	15,547	1,355	16,902	102.26	1,728,398.52
Westchester	175,614	19,018	194,632	102.26	19,903,068.32
Wyoming	8,429	608	9,037	102.26	924,123.62
Yates	4,537	499	5,036	102.26	514,981.36
State total	3,577,503	699,198	4,276,701	102.26	437,335,444.26

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
NORTH CAROLINA					
Alamance	22,081	2,533	24,614	64.36	1,584,157.04
Alexander	4,214	624	4,838	64.36	311,373.68
Alleghany	2,036	664	2,700	64.36	173,772.00
Anson	8,047	3,753	11,800	64.36	759,448.00
Ashe	5,414	2,116	7,530	64.36	484,630.80
Avery	3,480	1,395	4,875	64.36	313,755.00
Beaufort	10,561	5,117	15,678	64.36	1,009,036.08
Bertie	7,627	4,363	11,990	64.36	771,676.40
Bladen	9,644	4,337	13,981	64.36	899,817.16
Brunswick	6,103	2,480	8,583	64.36	552,401.88
Buncombe	31,185	4,908	36,093	64.36	2,322,945.48
Burke	13,120	1,980	15,100	64.36	971,836.00
Cabarrus	17,081	2,483	19,564	64.36	1,259,139.04
Caldwell	13,902	1,567	15,469	64.36	1,003,308.04
Camden	1,616	567	2,183	64.36	140,497.88
Carteret	7,441	1,237	8,678	64.36	558,516.08
Caswell	6,327	2,738	9,065	64.36	583,423.40
Catawba	19,547	1,727	21,274	64.36	1,369,194.64
Chatham	7,607	1,608	9,215	64.36	593,077.40
Cherokee	4,810	1,924	6,734	64.36	433,400.24
Chowan	3,556	1,434	4,990	64.36	321,156.40
Clay	1,570	658	2,228	64.36	143,394.08
Cleveland	18,570	4,982	23,552	64.36	1,515,806.72
Columbus	15,724	7,434	23,158	64.36	1,490,448.88
Craven	15,160	4,500	19,660	64.36	1,265,317.60
Cumberland	34,992	8,748	43,740	64.36	2,815,106.40
Currituck	1,708	387	2,095	64.36	134,834.20
Dare	1,336	312	1,648	64.36	106,065.28
Davidson	20,686	2,762	23,448	64.36	1,509,113.28
Davie	4,369	649	5,018	64.36	322,958.48
Duplin	12,305	6,237	18,542	64.36	1,193,363.12
Durham	26,354	5,494	31,848	64.36	2,049,737.28
Edgecombe	16,806	8,124	24,930	64.36	1,604,494.80
Forsyth	45,238	7,023	52,261	64.36	3,363,517.96
Franklin	8,536	4,425	12,961	64.36	834,169.96
Gaston	34,420	4,320	38,740	64.36	2,493,306.40
Gates	2,643	1,402	4,045	64.36	260,336.20
Graham	1,978	717	2,695	64.36	173,450.20
Granville	8,469	4,223	12,692	64.36	816,857.12
Greene	5,662	3,884	9,546	64.36	614,380.56
Halifax	59,538	6,899	66,437	64.36	4,275,885.32
Halifax	19,590	9,595	29,185	64.36	1,813,986.60
Harnett	13,733	1,833	15,566	64.36	1,000,278.64
Haywood	10,444	1,923	12,367	64.36	795,940.12
Henderson	9,021	1,602	10,623	64.36	683,696.28
Hertford	6,854	3,011	9,865	64.36	634,911.40
Hoke	5,075	2,615	7,690	64.36	494,928.40
Hyde	1,641	881	2,522	64.36	162,315.92
Iredell	16,300	2,952	19,252	64.36	1,239,058.72
Jackson	4,681	1,561	6,242	64.36	401,735.12
Johnston	19,072	9,406	28,478	64.36	1,832,844.08
Jones	3,611	1,814	5,425	64.36	349,153.00
Lee	7,480	1,819	9,299	64.36	598,483.64
Lenoir	15,546	6,668	22,214	64.36	1,429,693.04
Lincoln	7,871	1,401	9,272	64.36	596,745.92
McDowell	7,343	1,095	8,438	64.36	543,069.68
Macon	4,111	1,623	5,734	64.36	369,040.24
Madison	4,478	2,286	6,764	64.36	435,331.04
Martin	8,832	4,183	12,015	64.36	837,645.40
Mecklenburg	68,395	9,505	77,900	64.36	5,013,644.00
Mitchell	3,925	1,304	5,229	64.36	336,538.44
Montgomery	5,279	1,391	6,670	64.36	429,281.20
Moore	10,136	3,114	13,250	64.36	852,770.00
Nash	18,676	8,887	27,563	64.36	1,773,954.38
New Hanover	18,880	3,917	22,797	64.36	1,467,214.92
Northampton	8,647	4,772	13,419	64.36	863,646.84
Onslow	16,424	3,569	19,993	64.36	1,286,749.48
Orange	9,121	1,668	10,789	64.36	694,380.04
Pamlico	3,007	838	3,845	64.36	247,464.20
Pasquotank	6,670	1,713	8,383	64.36	539,529.88
Pender	5,778	2,583	8,361	64.36	538,113.96
Perquimans	2,565	1,120	3,685	64.36	237,166.60
Person	7,866	3,121	10,987	64.36	707,123.32
Pitt	20,455	10,451	30,906	64.36	1,989,110.16
Polk	2,941	892	3,833	64.36	246,691.88
Randolph	16,183	2,229	18,412	64.36	1,184,996.32
Richmond	11,496	3,473	14,969	64.36	963,404.84
Robeson	29,507	16,874	46,381	64.36	2,985,081.16
Rockingham	18,087	3,560	21,647	64.36	1,393,200.92

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
NORTH CAROLINA—Con.					
Rowan	20,676	2,994	23,670	\$64.36	\$1,523,401.20
Rutherford	11,922	2,891	14,813	64.36	953,364.68
Samson	14,951	7,184	22,135	64.36	1,424,608.60
Scotland	8,486	3,704	12,190	64.36	784,548.40
Stanly	10,868	1,490	12,358	64.36	795,360.88
Stokes	6,059	1,778	7,837	64.36	504,389.32
Surry	12,851	3,081	15,932	64.36	1,025,383.52
Swain	2,516	617	3,133	64.36	202,947.88
Transylvania	4,507	866	5,373	64.36	345,806.28
Tyrrell	1,399	804	2,203	64.36	141,785.08
Union	12,664	2,877	15,541	64.36	1,000,218.76
Vance	9,252	3,691	12,943	64.36	833,011.48
Wake	39,690	9,883	49,573	64.36	3,190,518.28
Warren	6,685	4,015	10,700	64.36	688,652.00
Washington	4,276	1,433	5,709	64.36	367,431.24
Watauga	4,363	1,855	6,218	64.36	400,190.48
Wayne	21,859	8,257	30,116	64.36	1,938,265.76
Wilkes	13,116	3,755	16,871	64.36	1,085,817.56
Wilson	16,888	6,909	23,797	64.36	1,531,574.92
Yadkin	5,776	1,312	7,088	64.36	456,183.68
Yancey	4,141	1,500	5,641	64.36	363,054.76
State total	1,223,129	348,197	1,571,326	64.36	101,130,541.36

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
NORTH DAKOTA					
Adams	1,240	175	1,415	72.95	103,224.25
Barnes	4,489	489	4,978	72.95	363,145.10
Benson	2,747	1,020	3,767	72.95	274,802.65
Billings	492	145	637	72.95	46,469.15
Bottineau	3,240	357	3,597	72.95	262,401.15
Bowman	1,132	116	1,248	72.95	91,041.60
Burke	1,648	351	1,999	72.95	145,827.05
Burleigh	8,833	791	9,624	72.95	702,070.80
Cass	16,258	1,117	17,375	72.95	1,267,506.25
Cavalier	2,836	395	3,231	72.95	235,701.45
Dickey	2,258	442	2,700	72.95	196,965.00
Divide	1,519	306	1,825	72.95	133,133.75
Dunn	2,027	587	2,614	72.95	190,691.30
Eddy	1,396	268	1,664	72.95	121,388.80
Emmons	2,597	625	3,222	72.95	235,044.90
Foster	1,504	179	1,683	72.95	122,774.85
Golden Valley	930	166	1,096	72.95	79,953.20
Grand Forks	11,289	772	12,061	72.95	879,849.95
Grant	1,943	729	2,672	72.95	194,922.40
Griggs	1,461	205	1,666	72.95	121,534.70
Hettinger	2,022	338	2,360	72.95	172,162.00
Kidder	1,649	521	2,170	72.95	158,301.50
La Moure	2,455	415	2,870	72.95	209,366.50
Logan	1,666	628	2,294	72.95	167,347.30
McHenry	3,415	717	4,132	72.95	301,429.40
McIntosh	1,692	593	2,285	72.95	166,690.75
McKenzie	2,103	435	2,538	72.95	185,147.10
McLean	4,357	1,082	5,439	72.95	396,775.05
Mercer	1,941	442	2,383	72.95	173,839.85
Morton	5,983	1,013	6,996		

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
OHIO—Continued					
Fairfield	15,460	1,006	16,466	\$63.50	\$1,045,591.00
Fayette	6,153	897	7,050	63.50	447,675.00
Franklin	149,259	20,123	169,382	63.50	10,755,757.00
Fullon	7,797	444	8,241	63.50	523,303.50
Gallia	6,069	1,125	7,194	63.50	456,819.00
Geauga	13,500	846	14,346	63.50	910,971.00
Greene	24,983	1,908	26,891	63.50	1,707,578.50
Guernsey	8,434	1,049	9,483	63.50	602,170.50
Hamilton	192,220	25,941	218,161	63.50	13,853,223.50
Hancock	13,190	811	14,001	63.50	889,063.50
Hardin	7,252	883	8,135	63.50	516,572.50
Harrison	4,555	626	5,181	63.50	328,993.50
Henry	6,465	432	6,897	63.50	437,959.50
Highland	7,225	1,569	8,794	63.50	558,419.00
Hocking	5,162	856	6,018	63.50	382,143.00
Holmes	5,977	1,109	7,086	63.50	449,961.00
Huron	12,636	882	13,518	63.50	858,393.00
Jackson	8,146	2,070	10,216	63.50	648,716.00
Jefferson	24,315	2,585	26,900	63.50	1,708,150.00
Knox	9,558	783	10,341	63.50	656,653.50
Lake	38,841	1,419	40,260	63.50	2,556,510.00
Lawrence	14,445	2,663	17,108	63.50	1,086,358.00
Licking	21,641	1,811	23,452	63.50	1,489,202.00
Logan	8,798	822	9,620	63.50	610,870.00
Lorain	56,227	4,449	60,676	63.50	3,852,926.00
Lucas	107,378	12,929	120,307	63.50	7,639,494.50
Madison	6,528	643	7,171	63.50	455,358.50
Marion	71,630	6,647	78,277	63.50	4,970,589.50
Mathion	14,823	1,273	16,096	63.50	1,022,096.00
Medina	17,117	800	17,917	63.50	1,137,729.50
Meigs	5,729	1,317	7,046	63.50	447,421.00
Merger	8,903	789	9,692	63.50	615,442.00
Mercer	18,459	1,119	19,578	63.50	1,243,203.00
Miami	3,792	936	4,728	63.50	300,228.00
Monroe	127,376	12,862	140,238	63.50	8,905,113.00
Montgomery	3,125	398	3,523	63.50	223,710.50
Morrow	5,309	522	5,831	63.50	370,268.50
Muskingum	18,819	2,048	20,867	63.50	1,325,054.50
Noble	2,726	588	3,314	63.50	210,439.00
Ottawa	9,138	551	9,689	63.50	615,251.50
Paulding	4,492	382	4,874	63.50	309,499.00
Perry	7,026	951	7,977	63.50	506,539.50
Pickaway	8,077	897	8,974	63.50	569,849.00
Pike	5,677	1,600	7,277	63.50	452,089.50
Portage	23,413	1,346	24,759	63.50	1,572,196.50
Preble	8,868	580	9,448	63.50	599,948.00
Putnam	7,946	1,048	8,994	63.50	571,119.00
Richland	29,047	2,172	31,219	63.50	1,982,406.50
Ross	14,950	2,214	17,164	63.50	1,089,914.00
Sandusky	14,821	932	15,753	63.50	1,000,315.00
Scioto	21,614	4,415	26,029	63.50	1,652,841.50
Seneca	15,239	991	16,230	63.50	1,030,605.00
Shelby	8,992	708	9,700	63.50	615,950.00
Stark	83,081	5,335	88,416	63.50	5,627,116.00
Summit	126,242	11,495	137,737	63.50	8,746,299.50
Trumbull	59,739	3,678	63,417	63.50	3,582,479.50
Tuscarawas	18,850	1,561	20,411	63.50	1,296,098.50
Union	5,804	474	6,278	63.50	398,653.00
Van Wert	7,232	570	7,802	63.50	495,427.00
Vinton	2,914	813	3,727	63.50	236,664.50
Warren	18,486	1,406	19,892	63.50	1,263,142.00
Washington	12,503	1,342	13,845	63.50	879,157.50
Wayne	18,899	1,482	20,381	63.50	1,294,193.50
Williams	7,441	532	7,973	63.50	506,285.50
Wood	17,688	975	18,663	63.50	1,185,100.50
Wyandot	5,642	449	6,091	63.50	386,778.50
State total	2,331,304	252,984	2,584,288	63.50	164,102,288.00

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
OKLAHOMA					
Adair	3,756	2,301	6,057	68.00	411,876.00
Alfalfa	1,829	159	1,988	68.00	135,184.00
Atoka	2,875	1,575	4,450	68.00	302,600.00
Beaver	1,886	187	2,073	68.00	140,964.00
Beckham	3,986	766	4,752	68.00	323,136.00
Blaine	2,927	691	3,618	68.00	246,024.00
Bryan	5,669	2,017	7,686	68.00	522,648.00
Caddo	7,534	2,440	9,974	68.00	678,232.00
Canadian	5,636	698	6,334	68.00	430,712.00
Carter	9,505	2,185	11,690	68.00	794,320.00
Cherokee	4,186	1,951	6,137	68.00	417,316.00
Choctaw	4,050	2,424	6,474	68.00	440,232.00
Cimarron	1,244	115	1,359	68.00	92,412.00
Cleveland	9,236	803	10,039	68.00	682,652.00
Coal	1,427	641	2,068	68.00	140,624.00
Comanche	19,570	2,739	22,309	68.00	1,517,012.00
Cotton	2,017	447	2,464	68.00	167,552.00
Craig	3,334	680	4,014	68.00	272,952.00
Creek	10,189	1,930	12,119	68.00	824,092.00
Custer	4,593	642	5,235	68.00	355,980.00
Delaware	3,328	1,766	5,094	68.00	346,392.00
Dewey	1,424	350	1,774	68.00	120,632.00
Ellis	1,339	183	1,522	68.00	103,496.00
Garfield	11,670	1,184	12,854	68.00	874,072.00
Garvin	7,326	1,476	8,802	68.00	598,536.00
Grady	7,025	1,501	8,526	68.00	579,768.00
Grant	1,834	239	2,073	68.00	140,964.00
Greer	1,841	380	2,221	68.00	151,028.00
Harmon	1,478	418	1,896	68.00	128,928.00
Harper	1,443	181	1,624	68.00	110,432.00
Haskell	2,525	1,200	3,725	68.00	253,300.00
Hughes	3,772	1,371	5,144	68.00	349,792.00
Jackson	6,743	1,626	8,369	68.00	569,092.00
Jefferson	1,957	517	2,474	68.00	168,232.00

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
OKLAHOMA—Continued					
Johnston	2,114	804	2,918	\$68.00	\$198,424.00
Kay	12,578	1,310	13,888	68.00	944,384.00
Kingfisher	437	3,026	3,463	68.00	205,768.00
Kiowa	3,517	887	4,404	68.00	299,472.00
Latimer	1,851	765	2,616	68.00	177,888.00
Le Flore	7,778	2,712	10,490	68.00	713,320.00
Lincoln	4,639	1,183	5,822	68.00	395,896.00
Logan	4,159	870	5,029	68.00	341,972.00
Love	1,527	520	2,047	68.00	139,196.00
McClain	3,394	689	4,083	68.00	277,644.00
McCurain	7,307	3,181	10,488	68.00	713,184.00
McIntosh	3,391	1,840	5,231	68.00	355,708.00
Major	1,887	216	2,103	68.00	143,004.00
Marshall	1,660	506	2,166	68.00	147,288.00
Mayes	5,245	1,393	6,638	68.00	451,384.00
Murray	2,441	576	3,017	68.00	205,156.00
Muskogee	15,302	4,343	19,645	68.00	1,335,860.00
Noble	2,463	386	2,849	68.00	193,732.00
Nowata	2,689	501	3,190	68.00	216,920.00
Okfuskee	3,238	1,311	4,549	68.00	309,332.00
Oklahoma	104,698	15,287	119,985	68.00	8,158,980.00
Okmulgee	9,333	2,949	12,282	68.00	835,176.00
Ossage	8,171	1,157	9,328	68.00	634,304.00
Ottawa	7,075	1,306	8,381	68.00	569,908.00
Pawnee	2,635	478	3,113	68.00	211,684.00
Payne	8,281	849	9,130	68.00	620,840.00
Pittsburg	8,109	2,291	10,400	68.00	707,200.00
Pontotoc	6,464	1,252	7,716	68.00	524,688.00
Pottawatomie	9,656	1,642	11,298	68.00	768,264.00
Pushmataha	2,274	1,078	3,352	68.00	227,936.00
Roger Mills	1,269	303	1,572	68.00	106,896.00
Rogers	5,182	799	5,981	68.00	406,708.00
Seminole	7,181	2,277	9,458	68.00	643,144.00
Sequoyah	5,140	2,018	7,158	68.00	486,744.00
Stephens	9,850	1,134	10,984	68.00	746,912.00
Texas	3,582	379	3,961	68.00	269,348.00
Tillman	3,712	1,613	5,325	68.00	362,100.00
Tulsa	84,392	11,078	95,470	68.00	6,491,960.00
Wagoner	4,403	1,506	5,909	68.00	401,812.00
Washington	10,869	628	11,497	68.00	781,796.00
Washita	4,264	534	4,798	68.00	326,264.00
Woods	2,520	273	2,793	68.00	189,924.00
Woodward	3,079	235	3,314	68.00	225,352.00
State total	561,063	113,279	674,342	68.00	45,855,256.00

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
OREGON					
Baker	4,282	394	4,676	84.21	393,765.96
Benton	8,370	442	8,812	84.21	742,058.52
Clackamas	30,197	2,781	32,978	84.21	2,777,077.38
Clatsop	6,279	671	6,950	84.21	585,259.50
Columbia	5,998	597	6,595	84.21	555,364.95
Coos	14,484	1,505	15,989	84.21	1,346,433.69
Crook	2,642	273	2,915	84.21	250,019.49
Curry	3,597	327	3,924	84.21	325,892.70
Deschutes	6,000	750	6,750	84.21	568,417.50
Douglas	18,916	1,952	20,868	84.21	

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
PENNSYLVANIA—Con.						SOUTH CAROLINA—Con.					
Clinton	8,920	1,002	9,922	\$77.01	\$764,093.22	Saluda	4,267	1,454	5,721	\$64.76	\$370,491.96
Columbia	12,202	1,181	13,383	77.01	1,030,624.83	Spartanburg	41,849	7,524	49,373	64.76	3,197,395.48
Crawford	19,337	2,934	22,271	77.01	1,715,089.71	Sumter	22,092	8,671	30,763	64.76	1,992,211.88
Cumberland	29,943	2,006	31,949	77.01	2,460,392.49	Union	8,243	2,090	10,333	64.76	669,165.08
Dauphin	48,014	7,092	55,106	77.01	4,243,713.06	Williamsburg	14,980	10,110	25,090	64.76	1,624,828.40
Delaware	132,170	11,573	143,743	77.01	11,069,648.43	York	22,572	4,559	27,131	64.76	1,757,003.56
Elk	9,285	462	9,747	77.01	750,616.47	State total	679,648	210,640	890,288	64.76	576,550,50.88
Erie	61,934	8,208	70,142	77.01	5,401,635.42	SOUTH DAKOTA					
Fayette	43,146	12,625	55,771	77.01	4,294,924.71	Aurora	1,184	400	1,584	71.86	113,826.24
Forest	1,137	144	1,281	77.01	98,649.81	Beadle	5,721	961	6,682	71.86	480,168.52
Franklin	21,326	2,396	23,722	77.01	1,826,831.22	Bennett	912	342	1,254	71.86	90,112.44
Fulton	2,846	595	3,441	77.01	264,991.41	Bon Homme	2,220	742	2,962	71.86	212,849.32
Greene	10,164	2,491	12,655	77.01	974,561.55	Brookings	4,497	860	5,357	71.86	384,954.02
Huntingdon	9,814	2,241	12,055	77.01	928,355.55	Brown	8,720	1,372	10,092	71.86	725,211.12
Indiana	18,897	2,932	21,829	77.01	1,681,051.29	Bruile	1,660	366	2,026	71.86	145,588.36
Jefferson	11,216	1,587	12,803	77.01	985,959.03	Butte	2,321	269	2,590	71.86	186,045.54
Juniata	4,134	628	4,762	77.01	366,721.62	Campbell	1,052	237	1,289	71.86	92,627.54
Lackawanna	50,073	6,093	56,166	77.01	4,325,343.66	Chapmink	3,056	1,284	4,340	71.86	311,872.40
Lancaster	65,876	6,432	72,308	77.01	5,568,439.08	Chapmink	1,939	606	2,545	71.86	182,883.70
Lawrence	27,638	3,087	30,725	77.01	2,366,132.25	Clay	2,252	313	2,565	71.86	184,320.90
Lebanon	21,600	1,531	23,131	77.01	1,781,318.31	Codington	5,612	1,020	6,632	71.86	476,575.52
Lehigh	48,529	30,86	51,615	77.01	3,974,871.15	Corson	1,748	548	2,296	71.86	164,990.56
Luzerne	74,917	11,625	86,542	77.01	6,664,589.42	Custer	1,183	139	1,322	71.86	94,998.92
Lycoming	25,243	2,968	28,211	77.01	2,172,529.11	Davison	4,272	708	4,980	71.86	357,862.80
McKean	13,354	1,931	15,285	77.01	1,177,097.85	Day	2,834	744	3,578	71.86	257,115.08
Mercer	30,958	3,759	34,717	77.01	2,673,556.17	Deuel	1,735	396	2,131	71.86	153,133.66
Mifflin	11,073	2,092	13,165	77.01	1,013,836.65	Dewey	1,557	493	2,050	71.86	147,313.00
Monroe	8,496	831	9,327	77.01	718,272.27	Douglas	1,482	574	2,056	71.86	147,744.16
Montgomery	120,185	5,269	125,454	77.01	9,661,212.54	Edmunds	1,662	448	2,110	71.86	151,624.60
Montour	3,343	262	3,605	77.01	277,261.05	Fall River	2,669	308	2,977	71.86	213,927.22
Northampton	44,804	3,582	48,386	77.01	3,726,205.86	Faulk	1,234	284	1,518	71.86	109,083.48
Northumberland	23,844	3,399	27,243	77.01	2,097,983.43	Grant	2,739	816	3,555	71.86	255,462.30
Perry	6,930	775	7,705	77.01	593,362.05	Gregory	2,067	515	2,582	71.86	185,542.52
Philadelphia	406,109	108,091	514,200	77.01	39,598,542.00	Haakon	943	164	1,107	71.86	79,549.02
Pike	1,904	172	2,076	77.01	159,872.76	Hamlin	1,615	468	2,083	71.86	149,684.38
Potter	4,264	819	5,083	77.01	391,441.83	Hand	1,890	555	2,445	71.86	175,697.70
Schuylkill	37,585	5,603	43,188	77.01	3,325,907.88	Hanson	1,326	649	1,975	71.86	141,923.50
Snyder	5,891	627	6,446	77.01	496,406.46	Harding	634	73	707	71.86	50,805.02
Somerset	19,452	3,933	23,385	77.01	1,800,878.85	Hughes	3,355	330	3,685	71.86	264,804.10
Sullivan	1,610	218	1,828	77.01	140,774.28	Hutchinson	2,731	971	3,702	71.86	266,025.72
Susquehanna	8,566	1,096	9,662	77.01	744,070.62	Hyde	645	343	988	71.86	70,997.68
Tioga	9,246	1,475	10,721	77.01	825,624.21	Jackson	536	71	607	71.86	43,619.02
Union	5,025	516	5,541	77.01	426,712.41	Jerauld	1,123	380	1,513	71.86	108,724.18
Venango	15,727	1,968	17,695	77.01	1,362,691.95	Jones	621	103	724	71.86	52,026.64
Warren	10,661	633	11,294	77.01	869,750.94	Kingsbury	2,460	388	2,848	71.86	204,657.28
Washington	51,927	7,042	58,969	77.01	4,541,202.69	Lake	3,049	3,597	6,646	71.86	258,480.42
Wayne	6,213	664	6,877	77.01	529,597.77	Lawrence	4,540	549	4,899	71.86	352,042.14
Westmoreland	84,685	8,867	93,552	77.01	7,204,439.52	Lincoln	3,257	696	3,953	71.86	284,062.58
Wyoming	4,155	649	4,804	77.01	369,956.04	Lynn	1,256	278	1,534	71.86	110,233.24
York	56,106	5,924	62,030	77.01	4,776,930.30	McCook	2,343	684	3,027	71.86	217,520.22
State total	2,586,012	363,369	2,949,381	77.01	2,271,133,830.81	McPherson	1,586	593	2,179	71.86	156,582.94
RHODE ISLAND						Marshall	1,881	459	2,340	71.86	168,152.40
Bristol	9,288	619	9,907	79.16	784,238.12	Meade	2,915	408	3,323	71.86	238,790.78
Kent	28,412	2,104	30,516	79.16	2,415,646.56	Mellette	791	376	1,167	71.86	83,860.62
Newport	16,648	2,975	19,623	79.16	1,553,356.68	Miner	1,513	493	2,006	71.86	144,151.16
Providence	121,150	18,061	139,211	79.16	11,019,942.76	Minnehaha	21,842	2,272	24,114	71.86	1,732,832.04
Washington	12,676	1,148	13,824	79.16	1,094,307.84	Moody	2,336	424	2,760	71.86	198,333.60
State total	188,174	24,907	213,081	79.16	16,867,491.96	Pennington	14,107	1,645	15,752	71.86	1,131,938.72
SOUTH CAROLINA						Perkins	1,672	375	2,047	71.86	147,097.42
Abbeville	5,979	1,635	7,614	64.76	493,082.64	Potter	1,273	196	1,469	71.86	105,562.34
Aiken	23,487	5,513	29,000	64.76	1,878,040.00	Roberts	5,535	1,390	4,925	71.86	353,910.50
Allendale	3,679	1,930	5,609	64.76	363,238.84	Sanborn	1,253	196	1,449	71.86	104,125.14
Anderson	25,395	4,988	30,383	64.76	1,967,603.08	Shannon	1,883	1,882	3,765	71.86	270,552.90
Bamberg	5,056	2,442	7,498	64.76	485,570.48	Spink	2,798	840	3,638	71.86	261,426.68
Barnwell	5,649	2,469	8,118	64.76	525,270.68	Stanley	1,139	85	1,224	71.86	87,956.64
Beaufort	10,439	3,114	13,553	64.76	877,692.28	Sully	692	153	845	71.86	60,721.70
Berkeley	13,072	4,879	17,951	64.76	1,162,506.76	Todd	1,476	1,498	2,974	71.86	213,711.64
Calhoun	4,201	2,913	7,114	64.76	460,702.64	Tripp	2,432	510	2,942	71.86	211,412.12
Charleston	59,905	14,568	74,473	64.76	4,822,871.48	Turner	2,774	873	3,647	71.86	262,073.42
Cherokee	9,974	2,665	12,639	64.76	818,501.64	Union	2,866	610	3,476	71.86	249,785.36
Chester	9,033	2,726	11,759	64.76	761,512.84	Walworth	2,210	293	2,503	71.86	179,865.58
Chesterfield	10,711	4,977	15,688	64.76	1,015,954.88	Washabaugh	291	51	342	71.86	24,576.12
Clarendon	10,934	6,188	17,122	64.76	1,108,820.72	Yankton	3,869	906	4,775	71.86	343,131.50
Colleton	8,996	4,226	13,222	64.76	856,256.72	Ziebach	715	160	875	71.86	62,877.50
Darlington	16,799	6,937	23,736	64.76	1,537,143.36	State total	177,015	38,771	215,786	71.86	15,506,381.96
Dillon	10,482	5,716	16,198	64.76	1,048,982.48	TENNESSEE					
Dorchester	7,687	2,644	10,331	64.76	669,035.56	Anderson	17,108	2,557	19,665	61.97	1,218,640.05
Edgefield	5,061	2,150	7,212	64.76	467,049.12	Bedford	5,640	1,101	6,741	61.97	417,739.77
Fairfield	6,514	2,700	9,214	64.76	596,698.64	Benton	2,627	707	3,334	61.97	206,607.98
Florence	26,652	10,554	37,206	64.76	2,409,460.56	Bledsoe	2,296	1,092	3,388	61.97	209,954.36
Georgetown	12,255	4,915	17,170	64.76	1,111,929.20	Blount	15,883	3,086	18,969	61.97	1,175,508.93
Greenville	52,119	7,150	59,269	64.76	3,838,260.44	Bradley	10,055	1,620	11,675	61.97	723,499.75
Greenwood	11,409	2,547	13,956	64.76	903,790.56	Campbell	8,382	3,571	11,953	61.97	740,727.41
Hampton	5,724	2,820	8,544	64.76	553,309.44	Cannon	2,071	612	2,683	61.97	166,265.51
Horry	20,936	7,972	28,908	64.76	1,872,082.08	Carroll	5,708	2,132	7,840	61.97	4

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
TENNESSEE—Con.						TEXAS—Continued					
Dyer	7,648	2,773	10,421	\$61.97	\$645,789.37	Burnet	2,192	546	2,738	\$62.88	\$172,165.44
Fayette	8,239	5,640	13,879	61.97	860,081.63	Caldwell	4,532	1,589	6,121	62.88	384,888.48
Fentress	4,438	2,093	6,531	61.97	404,726.07	Calhoun	5,002	813	5,815	62.88	365,647.20
Franklin	6,849	1,722	8,571	61.97	531,144.87	Callahan	1,765	234	1,999	62.88	125,697.12
Gibson	11,106	3,876	14,982	61.97	928,434.54	Cameron	46,602	17,096	63,698	62.88	4,005,330.24
Giles	5,604	2,101	7,705	61.97	477,478.85	Camp	2,047	615	2,662	62.88	167,386.56
Grainger	3,365	1,467	4,832	61.97	299,439.04	Carson	2,151	138	2,289	62.88	143,932.32
Greene	10,594	3,465	14,059	61.97	871,236.23	Cass	6,207	2,217	8,424	62.88	529,701.12
Grundy	3,388	1,312	4,700	61.97	291,259.00	Castro	2,698	668	3,366	62.88	211,654.08
Hamblen	8,164	1,506	9,670	61.97	599,249.90	Chambers	2,949	412	3,361	62.88	211,339.68
Hamilton	58,257	9,050	67,307	61.97	4,171,014.79	Cherokee	7,674	2,223	9,897	62.88	622,323.36
Hancock	2,297	1,456	3,753	61.97	232,573.41	Childress	1,940	291	2,231	62.88	140,285.28
Hardeman	5,667	3,061	8,728	61.97	540,874.16	Clay	1,903	215	2,118	62.88	133,179.84
Hardin	4,731	2,055	6,786	61.97	420,528.42	Cochran	1,849	300	2,149	62.88	135,129.12
Hawkins	8,134	2,990	11,124	61.97	689,354.28	Coke	891	15	1,011	62.88	63,571.68
Haywood	7,317	4,604	11,921	61.97	738,744.37	Coleman	2,669	635	3,304	62.88	207,755.52
Henderson	3,977	1,622	5,599	61.97	346,970.03	Collin	9,656	1,771	11,427	62.88	718,529.76
Henry	5,224	1,319	6,543	61.97	405,469.71	Collingsworth	1,586	335	1,921	62.88	120,792.48
Hickman	3,121	995	4,116	61.97	255,068.52	Colorado	4,826	1,212	6,038	62.88	379,669.44
Houston	1,227	423	1,650	61.97	102,250.50	Comal	5,247	630	5,877	62.88	369,545.76
Humphreys	2,931	757	3,688	61.97	228,545.36	Comanche	2,366	691	3,057	62.88	192,224.16
Jackson	2,440	1,353	3,793	61.97	235,052.21	Concho	914	162	1,076	62.88	67,658.88
Jefferson	5,022	1,107	6,129	61.97	379,814.13	Cooke	5,545	788	6,333	62.88	398,219.04
Johnson	3,029	1,639	4,668	61.97	289,275.96	Corryell	4,305	514	4,819	62.88	303,018.72
Knox	58,960	8,722	67,682	61.97	4,194,253.54	Cottle	1,066	377	1,443	62.88	90,735.84
Lake	2,787	1,525	4,312	61.97	267,214.64	Crane	1,319	95	1,414	62.88	88,912.32
Lauderdale	6,122	3,297	9,419	61.97	583,695.43	Crockett	1,200	97	1,297	62.88	81,555.36
Lawrence	7,583	2,000	9,583	61.97	593,858.51	Crosby	2,950	641	3,591	62.88	225,802.08
Lewis	1,748	507	2,255	61.97	139,742.35	Cuiberson	848	165	1,013	62.88	63,697.44
Lincoln	6,162	2,102	8,264	61.97	512,120.08	Dallam	1,543	208	1,751	62.88	110,102.88
Loudon	6,267	1,306	7,573	61.97	469,298.81	Dallas	225,581	25,026	250,607	62.88	15,758,168.16
Loudon	8,735	2,334	11,069	61.97	685,945.93	Dawson	5,254	916	6,170	62.88	387,969.60
McMinn	4,786	2,256	7,042	61.97	436,392.74	Deaf Smith	3,886	712	4,598	62.88	289,122.24
Macon	3,018	1,109	4,127	61.97	255,750.19	Delta	1,377	479	1,856	62.88	116,705.28
Madison	14,999	4,814	19,813	61.97	1,227,811.61	Denton	9,743	1,086	10,829	62.88	680,927.52
Marion	6,242	2,030	8,272	61.97	512,615.84	De Witt	5,365	2,172	7,537	62.88	473,926.56
Marshall	4,146	1,141	5,287	61.97	327,635.39	Dickens	1,189	346	1,535	62.88	96,520.80
Mauzy	10,371	2,268	12,639	61.97	783,238.83	Dimmit	3,269	1,480	4,749	62.88	298,617.12
Meigs	1,614	806	2,420	61.97	149,967.40	Donley	1,027	151	1,178	62.88	74,072.64
Monroe	6,726	2,459	9,185	61.97	569,194.45	Duval	4,001	1,599	5,600	62.88	352,128.00
Montgomery	11,969	2,206	14,175	61.97	878,424.75	Eastland	4,108	666	4,774	62.88	300,189.12
Moore	839	261	1,100	61.97	681,67.00	Ector	25,113	2,132	27,245	62.88	1,713,165.60
Morgan	4,176	1,694	5,870	61.97	363,763.90	Edwards	572	130	702	62.88	44,141.76
Obion	6,310	1,862	8,172	61.97	506,418.84	Ellis	10,457	2,800	13,257	62.88	833,600.16
Overton	4,036	1,880	5,916	61.97	366,614.52	El Paso	83,703	10,184	93,887	62.88	5,903,614.56
Perry	1,345	618	1,963	61.97	121,647.11	Erath	3,056	504	3,560	62.88	223,852.80
Pickett	1,284	545	1,829	61.97	113,343.13	Falls	5,474	2,880	8,354	62.88	525,299.52
Polk	3,513	775	4,288	61.97	265,727.36	Fannin	5,156	1,673	6,829	62.88	429,407.52
Putnam	6,910	2,054	8,964	61.97	555,499.08	Fayette	4,695	1,807	6,502	62.88	408,845.76
Rhea	4,323	1,288	5,611	61.97	347,713.67	Fisher	1,992	566	2,558	62.88	160,847.04
Roane	11,133	2,359	13,492	61.97	836,099.24	Floyd	3,312	540	3,852	62.88	242,213.76
Robertson	6,945	2,013	8,958	61.97	555,127.26	Foard	766	232	998	63.88	62,754.24
Rutherford	11,813	2,247	14,060	61.97	871,298.20	Fort Bend	11,177	2,969	14,146	62.88	889,500.48
Scott	5,130	2,087	7,217	61.97	447,237.49	Franklin	1,175	360	1,535	62.88	96,520.80
Sequitah	1,827	444	2,271	61.97	140,733.87	Freestone	3,236	1,616	4,852	62.88	305,093.76
Sevier	6,301	2,118	8,419	61.97	521,725.43	Frio	3,202	1,550	4,752	62.88	298,805.76
Shelby	156,714	27,014	183,728	61.97	11,385,624.16	Gaines	3,542	472	4,014	62.88	252,400.32
Smith	2,825	1,098	3,923	61.97	243,108.31	Galveston	36,399	5,006	41,405	62.88	2,603,546.40
Stewart	1,971	794	2,765	61.97	171,347.05	Garza	1,870	231	2,101	62.88	132,110.88
Sullivan	29,953	4,807	34,760	61.97	2,154,077.20	Gillespie	2,339	279	2,618	62.88	164,619.84
Sumner	9,336	2,217	11,553	61.97	715,939.41	Glasscock	286	286	572	62.88	35,336.64
Tarrant	8,646	4,056	12,702	61.97	787,142.94	Goliad	1,369	671	2,040	63.88	128,275.20
Tipton	4,231	1,420	5,651	61.97	351,675.18	Gonzales	4,660	1,964	6,624	62.88	416,517.12
Trousdale	4,068	1,026	5,094	61.97	315,675.18	Gray	7,949	2,580	8,529	62.88	536,303.52
Union	2,421	985	3,406	61.97	211,069.82	Grayson	16,307	2,050	18,357	62.88	1,154,288.16
Van Buren	1,123	449	1,572	61.97	97,416.84	Gregg	17,270	3,032	20,302	62.88	1,276,589.52
Warren	5,937	1,469	7,406	61.97	458,949.82	Grimes	7,270	1,347	8,617	62.88	558,619.20
Washington	15,473	2,793	18,266	61.97	1,131,944.22	Guadalupe	7,638	1,300	8,938	62.88	589,059.84
Wayne	3,455	1,351	4,806	61.97	297,827.82	Hall	10,180	1,714	11,894	62.88	747,894.72
Weakley	5,148	1,469	6,617	61.97	410,055.49	Hall	1,805	484	2,289	62.88	143,932.32
White	4,161	1,810	5,971	61.97	370,022.87	Hamilton	1,731	361	2,092	62.88	131,544.96
Williamson	6,449	1,766	8,215	61.97	509,083.55	Hansford	1,682	102	1,784	62.88	112,177.92
Wilson	6,687	1,368	8,055	61.97	499,168.35	Hardeman	2,002	438	2,440	62.88	153,427.20
State total	903,112	222,334	1,125,446	61.97	69,743,888.62	Hardin	6,760	1,166	7,926	62.88	498,386.88
TEXAS						Harris	312,653	35,756	348,409	62.88	21,907,957.92
Anderson	7,012	2,225	9,237	62.88	580,822.56	Harrison	12,277	3,655	15,932	62.88	1,001,804.16
Andrews	3,748	134	3,882	62.88	244,100.16	Hartley	543	47	590	62.88	37,099.20
Angelina	10,031	1,717	11,748	62.88	738,714.24	Haskell	2,832	674	3,506	62.88	220,457.28
Aransas	1,796	294	2,090	62.88	131,419.20	Hays	4,904	1,564	6,468	62.88	406,707.84
Archer	1,467	114	1,581	62.88	99,413.28	Hemphill	817	114	931	62.88	58,541.28
Armstrong	462	26	488	62.88	30,685.44	Henderson	5,254	1,697	6,951	62.88	437,078.88
Atascosa	5,786	1,999	7,785	62.88	489,520.80	Hidalgo	57,345	24,184	81,529	62.88	5,126,543.52
Austin	3,165	996	4,161	62.88	261,643.68	Hill	5,432	1,682	7,114	62.88	447,328.32
Bailey	2,392	425	2,817	62.88	177,132.95	Hockley	6,471	986	7,457	62.88	468,896.16
Bandera	857	257	1,114	62.88	70,048.32	Hood	1,170	209	1,379	62.88	86,711.52
Bastrop	4,338	1,563	5,901	62.88	371,0						

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
TEXAS—Continued						TEXAS—Continued					
Kerr	3,268	403	3,671	\$62.88	\$230,832.48	Ward	4,107	243	4,350	\$62.88	\$273,528.00
Kimble	933	232	1,165	62.88	73,255.20	Washington	4,427	2,010	6,437	62.88	404,758.56
King	152	41	193	62.88	12,135.84	Webb	18,884	7,554	26,438	62.88	1,662,421.44
Kinney	625	229	854	62.88	53,699.52	Wharton	10,729	3,317	14,046	62.88	883,212.48
Kleberg	7,672	1,893	9,565	62.88	601,447.20	Wheeler	1,884	256	2,140	62.88	134,563.20
Knox	1,993	493	2,486	62.88	156,319.68	Wichita	27,419	2,339	29,758	62.88	1,871,183.04
Lamar	7,893	2,741	10,634	62.88	668,665.92	Wilbarger	4,271	612	4,883	62.88	307,043.04
Lamb	6,104	1,173	7,277	62.88	457,577.76	Willacy	6,647	2,659	9,306	62.88	585,161.28
Lampasas	2,313	503	2,816	62.88	177,070.08	Williamson	8,655	2,650	11,305	62.88	710,858.40
La Salle	1,891	1,101	2,922	62.88	188,136.96	Wilson	3,773	1,350	5,123	62.88	322,134.25
Lavaca	5,079	1,983	7,062	62.88	444,058.56	Winkler	3,869	175	4,044	62.88	254,286.72
Lee	2,288	962	3,250	62.88	204,360.00	Wise	3,945	523	4,468	62.88	280,947.84
Leon	2,532	1,190	3,722	62.88	234,039.36	Wood	4,123	882	5,005	62.88	314,714.40
Liberty	8,814	2,216	11,030	62.88	693,566.40	Yoakum	2,301	178	2,479	62.88	155,879.52
Limestone	4,358	1,562	5,920	62.88	372,249.60	Young	4,148	277	4,425	62.88	278,244.00
Lipscomb	813	59	872	62.88	54,831.36	Zapata	1,284	663	1,947	62.88	122,427.36
Live Oak	2,361	659	3,020	62.88	189,897.60	Zavala	4,229	1,696	5,925	62.88	372,564.00
Llano	1,064	800	1,864	62.88	117,208.32						
Loving	69	69	69	62.88	4,338.72	State total	2,429,218	444,855	2,874,073	62.88	180,721,710.24
Lubbock	38,628	3,948	42,576	62.88	2,677,178.88	UTAH					
Lynn	3,117	571	3,688	62.88	231,901.44	Beaver	1,355	36	1,391	68.63	95,464.33
McCulloch	2,064	488	2,552	62.88	160,469.76	Box Elder	7,618	419	8,037	68.63	551,579.31
McLennan	34,311	5,843	40,154	62.88	2,524,883.52	Cache	9,189	640	9,829	68.63	674,564.27
McMullen	1,249	73	322	62.88	20,247.36	Carbon	6,429	589	7,018	68.63	481,645.34
Madison	1,570	827	2,397	62.88	150,723.36	Daggett	313	21	334	68.63	22,922.42
Marion	2,191	1,024	3,215	62.88	202,159.20	Davis	20,518	1,147	21,665	68.63	1,486,868.95
Martin	1,413	135	1,548	62.88	97,338.24	Duchesne	2,336	411	2,747	68.63	188,526.61
Mason	922	155	1,077	62.88	74,009.76	Emery	1,728	308	2,036	68.63	139,730.68
Matagorda	7,296	2,048	9,344	62.88	587,550.72	Garfield	1,083	86	1,169	68.63	80,228.47
Maverick	4,609	2,032	6,641	62.88	417,586.08	Grand	1,626	138	1,764	68.63	121,063.32
Medina	5,792	1,337	7,129	62.88	448,271.52	Iron	3,230	181	3,411	68.63	234,096.93
Menard	666	264	930	62.88	58,478.40	Juab	1,402	108	1,510	68.63	103,631.30
Midland	18,556	1,226	19,782	62.88	1,243,892.16	Kane	832	67	899	68.63	61,698.37
Milam	5,606	1,920	7,526	62.88	473,234.88	Millard	2,664	428	3,092	68.63	212,203.96
Mills	932	236	1,168	62.88	73,443.84	Morgan	846	50	896	68.63	61,492.16
Mitchell	3,057	787	3,844	62.88	241,710.72	Piute	458	74	532	68.63	36,591.46
Montague	3,111	527	3,638	62.88	228,757.44	Rich	481	61	542	68.63	37,197.46
Montgomery	7,219	1,820	9,039	62.88	568,372.32	Salt Lake	103,621	8,792	112,413	68.63	7,714,904.19
Moore	4,482	153	4,635	62.88	291,448.80	San Juan	2,702	1,651	4,353	68.63	298,746.39
Morris	3,409	749	4,158	62.88	261,455.04	Sanpete	3,113	410	3,523	68.63	241,783.49
Motley	721	205	926	62.88	58,226.88	Sevier	3,241	313	3,554	68.63	243,911.02
Nacogdoches	6,805	1,952	8,757	62.88	550,640.16	Summit	1,696	89	1,785	68.63	122,504.55
Navarro	7,850	2,492	10,342	62.88	650,304.96	Tooele	5,166	363	5,529	68.63	379,455.27
Newton	3,005	1,192	4,197	62.88	263,907.36	Uintah	3,589	464	4,053	68.63	278,157.39
Noian	4,745	468	5,213	62.88	327,793.44	Utah	29,644	2,244	31,888	68.63	2,188,473.44
Nueces	64,555	12,716	77,271	62.88	4,858,800.48	Wasatch	1,648	63	1,711	68.63	117,425.93
Ochiltree	2,453	111	2,564	62.88	161,224.32	Washington	3,288	333	3,621	68.63	248,509.23
Oldham	415	401	816	62.88	51,310.08	Wayne	606	138	744	68.63	51,060.72
Orange	17,015	1,704	18,719	62.88	1,177,050.72	Weber	31,368	2,792	34,160	68.63	2,344,400.80
Palo Pinto	4,581	692	5,273	62.88	331,566.24	State total	251,790	22,416	274,206	68.63	18,818,757.78
Panola	4,541	1,564	6,105	62.88	383,882.40	VERMONT					
Parker	5,520	510	6,030	62.88	379,166.40	Addison	5,077	842	5,919	82.02	485,476.38
Parmer	2,693	267	2,960	62.88	186,124.80	Bennington	5,976	865	6,841	82.02	536,820.90
Pecos	3,301	352	3,653	62.88	229,700.64	Caledonia	5,845	865	6,710	82.02	550,354.20
Polk	3,689	1,353	5,042	62.88	317,040.96	Chittenden	17,832	2,037	19,829	82.02	1,634,576.58
Potter	26,449	1,650	28,099	62.88	1,766,865.12	Essex	1,632	101	1,733	82.02	142,140.66
Presidio	1,583	390	1,973	62.88	124,062.24	Franklin	7,848	1,383	9,231	82.02	757,126.62
Rains	716	300	1,016	62.88	63,886.08	Grand Isle	683	175	858	82.02	70,373.16
Randall	8,563	406	8,969	62.88	563,970.72	Lamoille	2,764	336	3,100	82.02	254,262.00
Reagan	1,123	96	1,219	62.88	76,650.72	Orange	4,163	521	4,684	82.02	384,181.68
Real	507	233	740	62.88	46,531.20	Orleans	5,607	999	6,606	82.02	541,824.12
Red River	3,885	1,648	5,533	62.88	347,915.04	Rutland	11,408	1,419	12,827	82.02	1,052,070.54
Reeves	5,101	942	6,043	62.88	379,983.84	Washington	9,829	968	10,797	82.02	885,569.94
Refugio	3,204	855	4,059	62.88	255,229.92	Windham	6,797	826	7,623	82.02	625,238.46
Roberts	238	23	261	62.88	16,411.68	Windsor	10,783	992	11,775	82.02	965,785.50
Robertson	4,277	2,154	6,431	62.88	404,381.28	State total	96,304	12,033	108,337	82.02	8,885,800.74
Rockwall	1,462	544	2,006	62.88	126,137.28	VIRGINIA					
Runnels	3,803	997	4,800	62.88	301,824.00	Accomack	7,217	2,609	9,826	70.24	690,178.24
Rusk	9,169	2,587	11,756	62.88	739,217.28	Albemarle	6,866	1,268	8,134	70.24	571,332.16
Sabine	1,898	658	2,556	62.88	160,721.28	Alleghany	3,273	659	3,932	70.24	276,183.68
San Augustine	2,055	723	2,778	62.88	174,680.64	Amelia	2,354	842	3,196	70.24	224,487.04
San Jacinto	1,730	866	2,596	62.88	163,236.48	Amherst	4,827	846	5,773	70.24	405,495.52
San Antonio	14,400	4,703	19,103	62.88	1,201,196.64	Appomattox	4,289	665	4,954	70.24	348,512.96
San Saba	1,463	553	2,016	62.88	126,766.08	Arlington	32,962	1,415	34,377	70.24	2,414,640.48
Schleicher	787	61	848	62.88	53,322.24	Augusta	9,604	1,440	11,044	70.24	775,730.56
Scurry	5,609	593	6,202	62.88	389,981.76	Bath	1,260	316	1,576	70.24	110,698.24
Shackelford	847	74	921	62.88	57,912.48	Bedford	7,861	1,594	9,455	70.24	664,119.20
Shelby	5,070	1,808	6,878	62.88	432,488.64	Bland	1,497	523	2,020	70.24	141,884.80
Sherman	670	52	722	62.88	45,399.36	Botetourt	4,358	879	5,237	70.24	367,846.88
Smith	21,627	3,806	25,427	62.88	1,598,849.76	Brunswick	5,352	2,260	7,612	70.24	534,666.88
Somervell	5,533	145	5,678	62.88	365,577.44	Buchanan	12,547	4,241	16,788	70.24	1,179,188.12
Starr	5,487	3,260	8,747	62.88	550,011.36	Buckingham	3,067	1,368	4,435	70.24	311,514.40
Stephens	1,820	193	2,013	62.88	126,577.44	Campbell	8,732	1,689	10,421	70.24	731,971.04
Stevenson	271	66	337	62.88	21,190.56	Caroline	3,477	905	4,382	70.24	307,791.68
Stonewall	760	216	976	62.88	61,370.88	Carroll	6,388	1,435	7,823	70.24	549,487.52
Sutton	1,031	82	1,113	62.88	69,985.44	Charles City	1,707	371	2,078	70.24	145,958.72
Swisher	3,056	323	3,379	62.88	212,471.52	Charlotte	3,728	1,435	5,163	70.24	362,649.12

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
VIRGINIA—Continued					
Floyd	2,722	689	3,411	\$70.24	\$239,588.64
Fluvanna	1,918	482	2,400	70.24	168,576.00
Franklin	7,040	1,690	8,730	70.24	613,195.20
Frederick	5,554	705	6,259	70.24	439,632.16
Goochland	4,942	1,313	6,255	70.24	439,351.20
Grovespring	2,937	758	3,695	70.24	259,536.80
Grovespring	2,239	623	2,862	70.24	201,026.88
Grayson	4,451	1,228	5,679	70.24	398,892.96
Greene	1,243	296	1,539	70.24	108,095.96
Greensville	5,144	2,259	7,403	70.24	519,986.72
Halifax	9,808	4,393	14,201	70.24	997,478.24
Hanover	6,535	805	7,340	70.24	515,561.60
Henrico	28,434	1,174	29,608	70.24	2,079,665.92
Henry	11,109	1,556	12,665	70.24	889,589.60
Highland	693	243	936	70.24	65,744.64
Isle of Wight	4,781	1,021	5,802	70.24	407,532.48
James City	2,658	614	3,272	70.24	229,825.28
King and Queen	1,644	392	2,036	70.24	143,008.64
King George	1,882	283	2,165	70.24	152,069.60
King William	2,081	539	2,620	70.24	184,028.80
Lancaster	2,282	591	2,873	70.24	201,799.52
Lee	7,970	4,989	12,959	70.24	910,240.16
Loudoun	6,200	1,379	7,579	70.24	532,348.96
Louisiana	3,372	966	4,338	70.24	304,701.12
Lunenburg	3,446	1,206	4,652	70.24	326,756.48
Madison	2,126	770	2,896	70.24	203,415.04
Mathews	1,481	257	1,738	70.24	122,077.12
Mecklenburg	9,324	4,384	13,708	70.24	962,849.92
Middlesex	1,557	539	2,096	70.24	147,223.04
Montgomery	7,373	1,433	8,806	70.24	618,533.44
Nansemond	9,062	2,911	11,973	70.24	840,983.52
Nelson	3,472	1,150	4,622	70.24	324,649.28
New Kent	1,195	196	1,391	70.24	97,703.84
Norfolk	15,033	2,158	17,191	70.24	1,207,495.84
Northampton	4,250	1,818	6,068	70.24	426,216.32
Northumberland	2,623	638	3,261	70.24	229,052.64
Nottoway	3,850	1,226	5,076	70.24	356,538.24
Orange	3,287	825	4,112	70.24	288,826.88
Page	4,028	927	4,955	70.24	348,039.20
Patrick	4,112	813	4,925	70.24	345,932.00
Pittsylvania	16,847	5,428	22,275	70.24	1,564,596.00
Powhatan	1,549	392	1,941	70.24	136,335.84
Prince Edward	3,372	1,144	4,516	70.24	317,203.84
Prince George	4,345	490	4,835	70.24	339,610.40
Prince William	11,931	1,190	13,121	70.24	921,619.04
Princess Anne	20,514	3,726	24,240	70.24	1,702,617.60
Pulaski	7,445	1,269	8,714	70.24	612,071.36
Rappahannock	1,384	375	1,759	70.24	123,552.16
Richmond	1,593	408	2,001	70.24	140,550.24
Roanoke	14,610	1,768	16,378	70.24	1,150,390.72
Rockbridge	5,532	1,269	6,801	70.24	477,702.24
Rockingham	10,135	1,541	11,676	70.24	820,122.24
Russell	7,827	2,868	10,695	70.24	751,216.80
Scott	7,296	3,174	10,470	70.24	735,412.80
Shenandoah	5,253	742	5,995	70.24	421,088.80
Smyth	8,019	1,708	9,727	70.24	683,224.48
Southampton	7,744	3,198	10,942	70.24	768,566.08
Spotsylvania	3,815	644	4,459	70.24	313,200.16
Stafford	4,183	441	4,624	70.24	324,789.76
Surry	1,848	794	2,642	70.24	185,574.08
Sussex	3,869	1,772	5,641	70.24	396,223.84
Tazewell	13,409	4,061	17,470	70.24	1,227,092.80
Warren	3,813	570	4,383	70.24	307,861.92
Washington	9,998	3,229	13,227	70.24	925,064.48
Westmoreland	2,964	873	3,837	70.24	269,510.88
Wise	13,294	3,839	17,133	70.24	1,203,421.92
Wythe	6,077	1,884	7,961	70.24	559,180.64
York	5,386	501	5,887	70.24	413,502.88
Alexandria City	19,422	1,421	20,843	70.24	1,464,012.32
Bristol City	4,054	964	5,018	70.24	352,464.32
Buena Vista City	1,550	217	1,767	70.24	124,114.08
Charlottesville City	5,685	712	6,397	70.24	449,325.28
Cliftonforge City	1,190	173	1,363	70.24	95,737.12
Colonial Heights City	2,226	130	2,356	70.24	165,485.44
Covington City	2,596	288	2,884	70.24	202,572.16
Danville City	10,766	2,020	12,786	70.24	898,088.64
Falls Church City	2,893	147	3,040	70.24	213,529.60
Fredericksburg City	2,603	406	3,009	70.24	211,352.16
Galax City	1,268	252	1,520	70.24	106,764.80
Hampton City	21,309	2,073	23,382	70.24	1,642,351.68
Harrisonburg City	2,467	363	2,830	70.24	198,775.20
Hopewell City	4,598	501	5,099	70.24	358,153.76
Lynchburg City	12,026	1,881	13,907	70.24	976,827.68
Martinsville City	4,821	647	5,468	70.24	384,072.32
Newport News City	27,617	4,921	32,538	70.24	2,285,469.12
Norfolk City	65,345	20,074	85,419	70.24	5,999,830.56
Norton City	1,359	490	1,849	70.24	129,873.76
Petersburg City	8,837	2,715	11,552	70.24	811,412.48
Portsmouth City	27,296	6,760	34,056	70.24	2,392,093.44
Bradford City	2,029	166	2,195	70.24	154,176.80
Richmond City	43,381	14,452	57,833	70.24	4,062,189.92
Roanoke City	21,787	4,400	26,187	70.24	1,839,374.88
South Norfolk City	5,654	1,521	7,175	70.24	503,972.00
Staunton City	4,229	490	4,719	70.24	331,462.56
Suffolk City	2,927	503	3,430	70.24	240,923.20
Virginia Beach City	1,627	197	1,824	70.24	128,117.76
Waynesboro City	3,957	268	4,225	70.24	296,764.00
Williamsburg City	751	74	825	70.24	57,948.00
Winchester City	3,188	335	3,523	70.24	247,455.52
South Boston City	1,478	347	1,825	70.24	128,188.00
State total	979,760	208,157	1,187,917	70.24	83,439,290.08

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
WASHINGTON					
Adams	2,759	295	3,054	\$71.66	\$218,849.64
Asotin	3,405	410	3,815	71.66	273,382.90
Benton	18,064	1,796	19,860	71.66	1,423,167.60
Chelan	10,460	1,145	11,605	71.66	831,614.30
Clallam	7,604	833	8,437	71.66	604,595.42
Clark	24,399	2,084	26,483	71.66	1,897,771.78
Columbia	1,096	104	1,200	71.66	85,992.00
Cowlitz	15,464	1,439	16,903	71.66	1,211,268.98
Douglas	4,358	277	4,635	71.66	332,144.10
Ferry	1,102	70	1,172	71.66	83,985.52
Whitman	6,346	322	6,668	71.66	477,828.88
Yakima	40,186	9,819	50,005	71.66	3,583,358.30
State total	699,462	80,090	779,552	71.66	55,862,696.32
WEST VIRGINIA					
Barbour	4,189	1,534	5,723	75.61	432,716.03
Berkeley	7,839	1,057	8,896	75.61	672,626.56
Boone	9,229	2,863	12,092	75.61	914,276.12
Braxton	4,400	2,067	6,467	75.61	488,969.87
Brooke	7,212	581	7,793	75.61	589,228.73
Cabell	24,102	3,775	27,877	75.61	2,107,779.97
Calhoun	2,292	1,106	3,398	75.61	256,922.78
Clay	3,947	1,873	5,820	75.61	440,050.20
Doddridge	1,759	444	2,203	75.61	166,568.83
Fayette	18,752	5,949	24,701	75.61	1,867,642.61
Gilmer	2,063	933	2,996	75.61	226,527.56
Grant	2,298	808	3,106	75.61	234,844.66
Greenbrier	9,384	3,064	12,448	75.61	941,193.28
Hampshire	3,052	956	4,008	75.61	303,044.88
Hancock	9,721	514	10,235	75.61	773,868.35
Hardy	2,545	846	3,391	75.61	256,393.51
Harrison	18,624	3,113	21,737	75.61	1,643,534.57
Jackson	4,893	1,097	5,990	75.61	452,903.90
Jefferson	4,699	876	5,575	75.61	421,525.75
Kanawha	66,460	10,778	77,238	75.61	5,839,965.18
Lewis	4,067	1,160	5,227	75.61	395,213.47
Lincoln	6,517	3,588	10,105	75.61	764,039.05
Logan	20,620	5,959	26,579	75.61	2,009,638.19
McDowell	23,921	9,080	33,001	75.61	2,495,205.61
Marion	15,287	2,417	17,704	75.61	1,338,599.44
Marshall	8,658	936	9,594	75.61	725,402.34
Mason	6,373	1,626	7,999	75.61	604,804.39
Mercer	17,976	4,955	22,931	75.61	1,733,812.91
Mineral	5,714	1,207	6,921	75.61	523,296.81
Mingo	13,575	6,021	19,596	75.61	1,481,653.56
Monongalia	12,613	2,141	14,754	75.61	1,115,549.94
Monroe	3,149	1,474	4,623	75.61	349,545.03
Morgan	2,233	497	2,730	75.61	206,415.30
Nicholas	7,900	2,355	10,255	75.61	775,380.55
Ohio	14,690	1,823	16,513	75.61	1,248,547.93
Pendleton	2,111	693	2,804	75.61	212,464.10
Pleasants	3,993	393	4,386	75.61	328,141.98
Pocahontas	2,593	781	3,374	75.61	255,108.14
Preston	7,643	2,084	9,727	75.61	735,458.47
Putnam	6,811	1,348	8,159	75.61	616,901.99
Raleigh	23,879	7,129	31,008	75.61	2,344,514.88
Randolph	6,923	1,963	8,886	75.61	671,870.46
Ritchie	2,613	803	3,416	75.61	258,283.76
Roane	4,011	1,371	5,382	75.61	406,933.02
Summers					

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FORMULA—FISCAL YEAR 1972—Continued

State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement	State and county	Total children age 5 to 17	Title I children	Total children affected	Federal grant per pupil	Total entitlement
WISCONSIN—Con.						WISCONSIN—Con.					
Iron	1,928	103	2,031	\$81.81	\$166,156.11	Waukesha	42,791	1,764	44,555	\$81.81	\$3,645,044.55
Jackson	4,034	878	4,912	81.81	401,850.72	Waupaca	8,672	896	9,568	81.81	782,758.08
Jefferson	12,084	947	13,031	81.81	1,066,066.11	Waushara	3,149	539	3,688	81.81	301,715.28
Juneau	4,660	666	5,326	81.81	435,720.06	Winnebago	26,297	1,263	27,560	81.81	2,254,683.60
Kewaunee	24,878	1,733	26,611	81.81	2,160,683.91	Wood	15,959	978	16,937	81.81	1,385,613.97
Koshong	5,161	374	5,535	81.81	452,818.35	Menominee	703	332	1,035	81.81	84,673.35
La Crosse	17,679	1,521	19,200	81.81	1,570,752.00	State total	970,933	91,088	1,062,021	81.81	86,883,938.01
Lafayette	4,706	752	5,458	81.81	446,518.98	WYOMING					
Langlade	5,548	747	6,295	81.81	514,993.95	Albany	4,551	296	4,847	82.06	397,744.82
Lincoln	5,374	551	5,925	81.81	484,724.25	Big Horn	3,471	348	3,819	82.06	313,387.14
Manitowoc	19,418	1,156	20,574	81.81	1,683,158.94	Campbell	1,464	77	1,541	82.06	126,454.46
Marathon	23,906	2,088	25,994	81.81	2,126,569.14	Carbon	3,822	368	4,190	82.06	343,831.40
Marquette	9,202	1,108	10,310	81.81	843,461.10	Converse	1,736	153	1,889	82.06	155,011.34
Marquette	2,054	274	2,328	81.81	190,453.68	Crook	1,265	174	1,439	82.06	118,084.34
Milwaukee	227,747	23,164	250,911	81.81	20,527,028.91	Fremont	7,016	927	7,943	82.06	651,802.58
Monroe	8,474	956	9,430	81.81	771,468.30	Goshen	3,134	366	3,500	82.06	287,210.00
Oconto	6,911	948	7,859	81.81	641,944.79	Hot Springs	1,631	89	1,720	82.06	141,143.20
Oneida	5,820	473	6,293	81.81	514,830.33	Johnson	1,384	141	1,525	82.06	125,141.50
Outagamie	27,927	1,508	29,435	81.81	2,408,077.35	Laramie	14,751	1,043	15,794	82.06	1,296,055.64
Ozaukee	10,547	398	10,945	81.81	895,410.45	Lincoln	2,805	292	3,097	82.06	254,139.82
Pepin	1,965	278	2,243	81.81	183,499.83	Natrona	13,035	973	14,008	82.06	1,149,496.48
Pierce	5,675	454	6,129	81.81	501,413.49	Niobrara	915	77	992	82.06	81,403.52
Polk	6,482	894	7,376	81.81	603,430.56	Park	4,883	335	5,218	82.06	428,139.08
Portage	9,517	1,143	10,660	81.81	872,094.60	Platte	1,939	237	2,176	82.06	178,562.56
Price	3,775	574	4,349	81.81	355,791.69	Sheridan	4,510	368	4,878	82.06	400,288.68
Racine	34,850	3,165	38,015	81.81	3,110,007.15	Sublette	950	41	991	82.06	81,321.46
Richland	4,732	872	5,604	81.81	458,483.24	Sweetwater	4,721	248	4,969	82.06	407,756.14
Rock	27,849	2,087	29,946	81.81	2,449,882.26	Teton	745	99	844	82.06	69,258.64
Rusk	4,280	715	4,995	81.81	408,640.95	Uinta	1,980	154	2,134	82.06	175,116.04
St. Croix	7,824	818	8,642	81.81	707,002.02	Washakie	2,459	266	2,725	82.06	223,613.50
Sauk	9,630	1,162	10,792	81.81	882,893.52	Weston	2,204	107	2,311	82.06	189,640.66
Sawyer	2,403	596	2,999	81.81	245,348.19	Yellowstone National Park	96	-----	96	82.06	7,877.76
Shawano	8,592	1,145	9,737	81.81	796,583.97	State total	85,467	7,179	92,646	82.06	7,602,530.76
Sheboygan	20,616	1,235	21,851	81.81	1,787,630.31	National total	43,117,555	7,414,291	50,531,846	-----	3,680,782,206.98
Taylor	5,194	820	6,014	81.81	492,005.34						
Trempealeau	5,870	946	6,816	81.81	557,616.96						
Vernon	6,670	1,313	7,983	81.81	653,089.23						
Vilas	2,271	284	2,555	81.81	209,024.55						
Walworth	12,653	1,010	13,663	81.81	1,117,770.03						
Washburn	2,717	453	3,170	81.81	259,337.70						
Washington	12,191	636	12,827	81.81	1,049,376.87						

THE GEOGRAPHICAL EXPRESSION OF MAINLAND CHINA: THE LARGEST CAPTIVE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is plainly evident that from numerous sources, covering the full gamut from the naive to the political warfarist, a campaign is underway to appease Red China, pave the way for her admission to the United Nations, and even, in time, establish direct diplomatic relations with her. The ping-pong table is about the most ludicrous point of departure in accommodating Peiping's desire to extricate the mainland from both a self-imposed isolation and that so strenuously sought by Moscow. Objectively speaking, from a propaganda point of view, Mao pinged and scored while our innocent sheep poned and were slaughtered according to form. Peiping's next ping is Mao's willingness to receive our President in the capital of a junior imperial state devoted to militarism, totalitarianism, and "peoples' wars" in the countryside of the globe.

PING, NOT PONG

The realistic and sane point of departure begins with a careful assessment of Red China's pitiful condition, the significance of the Russian threat, and, most important, the impact of our moves throughout all of free Asia. Our national honor, integrity, and principles are at stake in the entire free Asian sphere, and not only in the sturdy ally of the Republic of China. On the global scale, there is no need whatsoever to be pinged into the directions cited unless Moscow concretely

threatens to apply the Brezhnev doctrine to Red China, and at that there are alternative and more salutary courses of action toward the freedom of some 700 million Chinese mainlanders.

Lest we forget, the U.S.S.R. has been in the United Nations from the start and its peace-disrupting operations in Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, the Mideast, Africa, Latin America—indeed, on all continents, including ours—are scarcely what we would want to compound with the easy inclusion of Red China in the U.N. We are at the crossroads of ping rather than ponging, and substantial bargaining points are in our favor if we really seek a free understanding, a genuine concourse between peoples, and a secure and peaceful free Asia, rid of not only the threat of Red Chinese imperialism but also of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism.

THE THREAT IS PROPAGANDISTIC, NOT PHYSICAL

For those of us who are enamored by the physical expression of Red China, chiefly its formidable population, I recommend their careful reading of a paper delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University at the first Sino-American conference on mainland China, held last December in the Republic of China. The paper, titled "The Geographical Expression of Mainland China," emphasizes in scholarly form the basic military/industrial weakness of Red China and suggests that Peiping's only main forte—yes, even cognizant of its nuclear development—is propaganda and political warfare that has already been shown in our so-called antiwar demonstrations, with the photos of the mass killer Mao Tse-tung. I wonder how many of our Members and our people, after reading this paper, would settle for the shallow

cliches raised in behalf of another tyrannical regime. This would be the measure of loss in our moral conscience.

Our annual Captive Nations Week—this year July 18-24—is time to bestir and renew our conscience, particularly now when our thoughts and actions are directed toward the largest captive nation of them all, the 700 million Chinese mainlanders.

The paper referred to follows:

THE GEOGRAPHICAL EXPRESSION OF MAINLAND CHINA (By Lev E. Dobriansky)

At a time when there is an evident, calculated political onrush to extend diplomatic recognition to the totalitarian Red regime on mainland China and to pressure its admission into the United Nations, the need for a holistic, institutionalist analysis of mainland China becomes more urgent than ever before. This type of analysis concentrates on the organic, the integrative forces in a given object, the overall movements in total process, going beyond the welter of particulars and even interrelated aggregates of socio-economic character. Its objective is a rational and dispassionate endeavor to understand the object as a whole, in its diverse but dominant totality, so as to perceive its meaning, prime directions, and significance for good or ill in varying contexts of systematic investigation. In short, the mode of analysis pursued here is that developed and furthered by the peculiarly American school of institutional economics.

With this introductory statement on the nature and objective of this paper, it should be evident at the start that the discourse is not one of an informational and data-gathering activity in any particularist sphere of mainland China. Such an empirical activity is, of course, indispensable to all scientific inquiries, and any exposition of worth necessarily presupposes and is based on the disclosures of this primary activity, but it, in and by itself, can never enable us to attain to the level of holistic analysis and meaning-

ful interpretation, even with its results of empirical generalizations. Nor is the discourse here founded on a sole treatment of aggregate data, whether they be GNP's, total employment, investment totalities, Communist Party, armed services and other aggregates. Naturally, here, too, such aggregate data, in so far as they are attainable, are also indispensable for our knowledge of a societal object, but, whether interrelated or no, they, too, do not exhaust the precincts or possibilities of social scientific analysis. There still remains the most difficult level of social scientific thinking where, guided by both particularist and aggregate data and generalization, the painstaking endeavor is to penetrate the object under analysis in terms of its integrative being, process of becoming, predominant characteristics and features, and its super-aggregative possibilities.

Succinctly, these outlines of the methodology that had to be defined at the outset are basically conformable with Aristotle's perceptive understanding of a "political economy," inhabited and worked in by humans who by nature are political animals. The holistic scientific analysis is thoroughly and fully attuned to this true and oft-substantiated conception of man, and without doubt events and developments on mainland China, in the Soviet Union, and elsewhere in the Red domain of the world are best comprehended through this mode of analysis. Even in the United States, where, ironically enough, this type of analysis was first initiated and developed, but least understood and applied, there is a growing recognition of the necessary politico-economic fabric of any society, including an advanced one with proliferative, mechanical patterns of market intercourse and organization. Thus, in the mould of our technologically-economic civilization, this analysis may properly be called "cultural economic," unavoidably concerned with both particularist and aggregate social scientific data, but also necessarily stressing the genetical, the historical, the politico-economic, the irrational and illusory, as well as the accidental, in a movement of unfolding process rather than just one of higher degrees of scale and equilibrium in a non-existent statical context.

In applying all this to mainland China, striking similarities in developmental experience can be drawn from the longer history of the USSR, and no adequate analysis of this type can ignore experimental precedents in the order of totalitarian rule and imperialist ambition. Theorizing on the basis of additional experience and growing evidence for a different scene has its productive role, but it is scarcely sufficient unless it is subjected to qualification and correction by cumulative human experience, as in the case of the USSR. For example, if reference can be made again to the issue of recognizing Peiping in whatever form, it is striking, indeed, how old illusions on "reality," "prospective trade" and "peace" nurtured forty years ago with regard to the USSR are muddling minds today in relation to mainland China.³ Then, the horrible fact of five to fifteen million humans decimated in a costly man-made famine and social experimentation moved few of these minds, as it appears today that a similar phenomenon makes little imprint on similar minds. As a former correspondent in China and the editor of the *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung* has put it with only some quantitative inaccuracy: "Mao Tse-tung, in his betrayal of the Chinese people, has already slaughtered, exiled and imprisoned more than the total number of people killed and mutilated by Stalin and Hitler combined."² If the force of perennial power struggle is borne in mind, his additional observation is portentous: "And under Mao's chosen successor, Lin Biao, by Lin's own testimony, the worst is yet to come." Needless to say, for those in

the field of action and decision-making it hardly speaks well to shun such prominent facts even if politico-moral principles are not upheld.³ A full institutionalist analysis insures the permanence of such critical and reflective data.

A GEOGRAPHICAL EXPRESSION

Doubtlessly, those who currently employ supportive "reality" in their argumentation for extended recognition will be astounded by my characterization of mainland China as basically a geographical expression. In the obvious sense, mainland China is of course a geographical expression, with demarcated borders, typography, rivers, populational densities and the normal like. However, in the real sense of a broad politico-economic entity, under the guise of the People's Republic of China, it still remains largely a geographical expression, buttressed by the force of armed rule and virtual, self-imposed isolation. The political symbolism of the PRC is by all evidence defied by the absence of any people's democratic will and the hollowness of any republic. Worse still, the periodic successions of turmoil, chaos and confusion on the mainland—far exceeding in comparable spans of time anything seen in the evolution of the Soviet Union—indicate the brutal fact that there is no politico-economic entity and all the attributes of societal stability, normal operations and relative cohesion that this fundamental concept suggests.

Supporting this apt characterization of mainland China as "a geographical expression" is a special and appropriate concept of capital. What mainland China suffers from most is a deficiency and lack of this basic type of capital. Capital not in the standard economics meaning of the term, as real investment or fluid savings, but rather in the peculiar, and in this case most appropriate, Lassallean meaning. It has frequently been reported that Mao is by far more attracted to what Marx dubbed as the utopian socialists than to Marx himself. This one can readily believe since the origins, development and nature of what is euphemistically called Chinese Communism bear as much relevance to Marxism as they do to Thomism. Were Mao a careful student of Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864), the Louis Blanc of German socialism, and acquainted with his theory of Konjunktur, he would come to comprehend the significance of mainland China as a persistent negation of capital in the useful Lassallean sense. Capital, in this fundamental sense, means a necessary long-run convergence of political, economic, social and juristic conditions and circumstances providing an environmental state of relative tranquility and order for socio-economic progress and balanced development, whatever may be the scale of priorities.

This socio-economic concept of capital has more determinative meaning for our times than does the standard textbook one. Without its pervasive presence and accumulation, real investment, fluid savings and other forms of generated, subsidiary capital would be prevented, impeded or destroyed. Capital in this broad but fundamental sense is as important to the Soviet Union or the United States as it is to mainland China. As reflected in much higher degrees of societal institutionalization, the former enjoy it—and indirectly show it—by far more than does mainland China, where it is grossly deficient. Indeed, there is a direct ratio and thus escalating sensitivity between socio-economic capital and the subsidiary forms of capital in the more advanced countries and states than in the less advanced ones that aspire to realize goals of technico-economic progress—again, whatever may be the priorities. Obviously, as a case in point, enforced romantic notions of social organization, human nature and the like serve to undermine the expansion of socio-economic capital and thus restrict and detour the accumulation of the necessary subsidiary forms.

Briefly, then, this guiding concept of capital enables us to furnish a synthetic, essentialist picture of mainland China these past two decades and to justify its basic character as a geographical expression. Contrary to the current arguments of recognitionists, more than adequate information exists as to this grave capital deficiency. The prudent use of this concept affords insights into the disintegrative fabric of the PRC and its convulsive properties, sustained in the last analysis by rigid totalitarian methods, military control in the diverse regions of the mainland, and its fragmented expansiveness and engendered immobilities. Any ensuing analysis under the guidance of this concept cannot but point to several real possibilities severely altering the human situation of Asia and beyond. It is fraught with immense danger as well as promise, depending on the actions taken and ultimately on the underlying interpretations and judgments assigned to the available evidence.

THE UNCULTURAL REVOLUTION

The excessive and incredible upheavals caused by the Great Leap Forward and the anti-intellectualist, so-called Cultural Revolution may seem sufficient to determine the grave lack of societal capital on the mainland. But the bases of analysis extend beyond these two spectacular and, from the viewpoint of cumulative human experience, irrational phenomena. They necessarily involve human nature, the Chinese character and tradition, inevitable social differentiation, and the romantic inanities of forced, egalitarian proletarianism. A complete social scientific investigation of the mainland must necessarily deal with these and other ultimate factors in order to explicate the phenomenal imbalances, discontinuities, wild fluctuations and truly chaotic conditions that have featured the brief socio-economic history of the so-called People's Republic of China.

Within the span of this paper, these salient points will be covered under (1) the uncultural revolution (2) the great leap backward (3) protracted backwardness and (4) the military and imperialist drives. As mentioned, our guiding, overall concept is capital in the Lassallean sense. Our theme is the striking deficiency of this fundamental capital in mainland China, thereby justifying the apt characterization of this area as a "geographical expression." The disbalancing phenomena, as seen in agriculture, industry, transportation, foreign trade, the whole sphere of social relations, and the political apparatus, not to overlook the treatment of other national entities on the mainland, both underwrite and measure the acute shortage of societal capital in this vital and explosive area of our world. From this compact analysis, then, one can draw the logical conclusions of decision-making import and policy action as to whether the geographical expression is fit for admission into the U.N., is worthy of direct diplomatic recognition, is a prospective market for prosperous trade, is a contributor toward world peace, and a host of other important considerations.

Concentrating on the dominant forces contributing to and sustaining the geographical expression, it is convenient for us to begin with the most recent convulsive episode of the mainland's tortuous development. The so-called Cultural Revolution, spanning from late '65 through '68 and being in essence an uncultural revolution, if stand-ards of civilized existence and growth are observed, crystallized several of these forces. They can be efficiently categorized as follows: romantic utopianism, Mao cultism, power consolidation, and psychological revolutionism. With some prominent similarities to past experiences in the evolution of the USSR, these forces often are intermixed and operate concurrently and inter-relatedly. Though heavy documentation can be offered for each, a concise pattern can be presented here, based on several salient points of evidence.

Footnotes at end of article.

Clearly, it would not be too great an oversimplification to identify Maoism as Red Chinese Stalinism, with its cultism, spurious hero worship, extreme totalitarianism, and power consciousness. The spirit, words and deeds of Maoism conform thoroughly with this overriding Stalinist animus: "We must destroy and cast aside the rotten theory that with every advance we make, the class struggle of necessity will die down more and more . . . On the contrary, the further forward we advance . . . the greater will be the fury of the remnants of the broken exploiting classes."⁴ Time and time again, in different words but with identical meaning, the same animus is expressed by Mao, who has a peculiar bent for putting it in terms of "enemies with guns" and even those without guns: "After the enemies with guns have been wiped out, there still will be enemies without guns; they are bound to struggle desperately against us, and we must never regard these enemies lightly."⁵ Ironically enough, the former head of the PRC, Liu Shao-chi, who was eliminated by this doctrine of permanent revolution, in 1959 advanced a refined expression of it in his theory of undulating struggle whereby the struggle will persist at varying levels of intensity and will finally disappear "only when . . . bourgeois political and ideological influences are finally wiped out."⁶ Throughout the 60's, this same animus is given vent to in connection with a variety of pretexts. Thus, for example, Lenin's warnings are invoked as to the overthrown enemies of socialism that would "multiply their efforts tenfold and their hatred a hundred times in the obstinate fight to restore capitalism."⁷

This revolutionary animus, which reached a high point in the so-called Cultural Revolution, cannot but remind one of its identical use by Stalin in the 30's, tied in with his forced collectivization program, extensive purges in the Party and the armed forces, and established acts of genocide and mass deportations. Similarly, the manipulation of the animus served multiple purposes for Stalin as it has for Mao, among them being the purge of feared opponents in the ever-present power struggle, the constant fear of a freedom revolutionary outbreak, interminable manifestations of resistance to totalitarian planning, and the residual product of "revolutionary consciousness" for export on the part of a presumed wave of the future. Powerfully mixed with the animus was the personality cult under Stalin as it has been with Mao. If, as Khrushchev says, "It was during the war that Stalin started to be not quite right in the head," there are grounds to believe that Mao began to lose his bearings with the Great Leap Forward, only to be accentuated in the uncultural revolution.⁸

To be sure, in many respects the mainland situation differs from that in the Soviet Union, involving culture, traditional bonds, the democratic and moral magnetism of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, individualist farming, the very existence of a Free China and others. But when one soberly considers these differences, the magnitude of the unstabilizing impact of Maoist revolutionary proletarianism becomes all the more evident and, in the light of USSR's experience, all the more destined to failure and disaster. "Revisionist" though it has been, in the Soviet Union a reconciliation had to be pragmatically made with certain traits of human nature, such as self-interest, the better life, national and professional identity, increased mobility, apathy toward permanent revolutionary fervor, and adjustments to technological determinants. This in no way has lessened its posture as the prime enemy of the Free World; on the contrary, with enhanced productivity and channeled investments, it has magnified it. In the case of the mainland, as exemplified by the multi-faceted commune, the revolu-

tionary animus went far beyond the Stalinist mould with its philosophical socialist utopianism, feeding on theories pre-dating Marx.⁹

Aside from its practical political uses, primarily purgative, it is this suffusive animus, put in terms of a proletarian cultural revolution, that dominates the scene of the mainland and in varying degrees influences, shapes, distorts, disbalances, rocks and shocks almost all spheres of so-called Chinese mainland society. Red guards were used by Stalin in the man-made famine of the early 30's in Ukraine, northern Caucasus and southern Russia, but by no means were they unleashed with the reckless and tragicomic abandon witnessed on the mainland, disrupting parts of the economy, decimating scarce professional resources, closing down the universities and schools and, of all things, virtually wrecking the structure and operational apparatus of the Communist Party. The last outcome demonstrates in itself the proximate, heavy dependence of Mao on the armed forces and security network, not to mention the significance of his heir-designate Lin Biao. Utopian, un-Marxist exhibitions in Soviet Russia during the short teens, in the form of communes, abolished money system, labor-time cards, free "love," sartorial as well as occupational egalitarianism, cultural divorce from the past and a host of other heralded but specious changes in human nature were left far and long behind when Stalin massively applied the permanent struggle doctrine. In Mao's case, an unbridled utopianism is combined with the doctrine for periodic cleansing of broad sections of the mainland populace.

Thus, far more in line with utopian socialists and associationists of the early 19th century than with Marxism, Maoism with its totalitarian power seeks to remake human nature through enforced proletarianization, entailing the elimination of social stratification, an economic levelization, and a developing egalitarianism that would abolish motives of profit, incentive, and individual material gain. Not unlike Tito who initially sought to out-collectivize the USSR in a shorter time period and with superior socialist results, Mao gives all evidence of attempting to out-communize the USSR and the rest of the Red Empire through this un-Marxian utopianism executed in a predominantly agrarian environment. This is no Red Chinese mystery; it is an oasis of ideologic madness, for even substantial technologic development alone, which the mainland conspicuously lacks for its size and needs, will predetermine differentiations, rewards and other inevitable socio-economic distinctions. If this is the bourgeoisification that Mao fears, such as has occurred long ago in the Soviet Union and later in other parts of Eastern Europe, the machine in its more sophisticated and advanced form predetermines it, regardless of all the verbal romanticism stacked against it.

What therefore has been propagandized as something new is plainly old and at that reactionary. In substance, for a brief period the Russians, too, had their propaganda against the "four olds": old ideas, old culture, old customs and old habits. They soon learned about human nature. Theoretically, the "new ideas" are at the least over 100 years old. In parts of the Free World, those who have declared themselves Maoist-oriented, invariably furnish the finest tribute to the "profundities of Mao's thoughts" by their overt philosophical illiteracy. However, taking all this into account, we cannot overlook the practical consequences of Mao's philosophical aberrations, over and above those mentioned.

The first Stalinist consequence is the strengthening of the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, which in de-Aesopianized language means eliminating all who refused to accept Mao's leadership without qualification. An Aesopian version puts it as such:

"Support should be given to those in power who are proletarians, precisely for the purpose of overthrowing those in power who are taking the capitalist road."¹⁰ Like Stalin's purges, the list is long with numerous outstanding leaders in the party, government, and the military, such as Lo Jul-ching, Army Chief of Staff; Sun Yeh-fang, China's Liberman and former director of the Economic Research Institute in the Academy of Sciences; P'eng chen, head of the Peking Party Committee and Politburo member and, of course, Liu Shao-chi, former head of state.

A second consequence is the perpetuation of "revolutionary consciousness" to appease further the regime's ever-present fear of bourgeoisification and democratic anti-communist resistance, to surpass propagandistically the Moscow regime in the phantasmal drive toward undefined communism, and thus leadership in the international communist movement, and to inspire various breeds in the Free World as instruments for the operations of Peiping's global political warfare. "People of the world," blurted Mao on May 20, 1970, "unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!" In the meantime, within the confines of his menagerie arrests of anticommunists are being made periodically, as in the area of the Maoist Army Garrison in Canton, apprehending leaders of an organization called the International Freedom Party.¹¹ A third consequence is that with the Communist Party virtually in the vest pocket of the People's Liberation Army grounds have been formed for a protracted internal struggle.

This unending internal struggle, which will validate further the geographical expression, depress the basic capital to still lower levels, produce additional socio-economic dislocations, cause the mainland Chinese to fall further behind those in other underdeveloped areas, and will make plain mockery of the naive push for Peiping's recognition, is well in evidence. Concerning the so-called Cultural Revolution, as one source put it in 1967, "There will inevitably be many more in the future."¹² On this theme, as a joint editorial phrased it in 1969, "criticize all erroneous tendencies and erroneous ideologies within the Party and among the revolutionary ranks which violate Mao Tse-tung's proletarian line and policy."¹³ Plainly put, too, are these words: "The brilliant course of the Chinese revolution shows that the Chinese people won political power through fighting with guns under the leadership of Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party, and it is likewise with guns that they defend political power."¹⁴ So now, in this gigantic tragi-comedy, the new struggle is propagandistically graced with a transfer from the Little Red Book to a booklet of five philosophical articles by Mao to improve the thinking of everyone on this higher plane, and if Mao's instructions cannot be understood, Vice Chairman Lin will explain them—"then they are easy to understand, and one understands them more deeply," according to a navy party committee.

THE GREAT LEAP BACKWARD

The basic and determinative process of internal struggle extends back, of course, well beyond the uncultural revolution episode, in fact back to 1949 and in potentiality for totalitarian rule back to the early 20's. Within the context of mainland China and its multifarious peculiarities, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that it is this process of permanent and unpredictable revolution, generated and accelerated by the ideologic and political forces mentioned, that has created and dominates this geographical expression. Not to see this is not to see the situation as a whole, despite the multiplicity of its diverse parts. Thus the so-called Great Leap Forward, a prime case for economic psychiatry, is in the light of our analysis a Great Leap Backward and only buttresses further the general thesis of this paper. For

Footnotes at end of article.

in the entire evolution of the Red Empire since 1917, no case can be compared with Mao's dominance as concerns the crude mangling of economics in a totalitarian mould by philosophical romanticism and callous power politics, enforced strongly within but being patently weak without.

If one wades through the mass of fragmented but nevertheless meaningful information and data regarding the mainland since 1949 and maintains the holistic bent underscored here, he cannot but logically arrive at the same ruling generalizations. Within the limits of this presentation, it is, of course, not my intention to recite these socio-economic data accumulated since 1949, for the organized sources are available for such scrutiny.¹⁵ Instead, those essentials are selected to gain further insights into the convulsive properties of the geographical expression.

After seizing power in October 1949, the Mao regime typically embarked on a program of land collectivization and rapid industrialization, executed in stages and, despite certain quantitative gains down to 1958, performed at incalculable real costs of lives, time and resources. In all of the Red economies, physical aggregate figures for industrial and agricultural outputs can never measure the real and opportunity costs incurred for such advances—and these costs run incalculably and disproportionately high—nor can these figures, taken alone, ever be impressive from the viewpoint of total social efficiency, including those of presumably the most advanced Red economy, the USSR. Where, as in the case of the mainland, figures of physical magnitudes have decreased or spell virtual standstills, the condition of excessive costs become even more compounded.

In the primary agricultural sector of the land ostensibly liberated by "agrarian reformers," the reforms to 1952 involved far more than land redistribution. They were aimed at the elimination of so-called "ruling, rural classes" (so to speak, the Chinese kulaks) and subordinating the vast agricultural area as an instrument of economic totalitarianism at the disposal of the regime. In the process, over 10 million households were initially liquidated, and eventually about 116 million acres were confiscated and, in the standard initial Red stratagem, redistributed among 300 million peasants. It wasn't long that the stratagem became evident to the most ignorant peasant with the collectivization phase from '52 on, executed in three consecutive moves: mutual aid teams of 6 to 8 households each with common equipment; from '53, elementary co-operatives with land pools under single management; and from '55 on, the Chinese kolkhoz with collective ownership of land and means of production, except for the proverbial escape valve, the peasant's plot. In essence, the Soviet experience was repeated here, and by the end of '57, 120 million households were forcibly organized into 752,000 kolkhozi. Then the fantastic and tragicomical Great Leap Forward in the predominant agricultural realm, which the Russian themselves viewed with horror.

Launched in April 1958, this mad institutional leap was accomplished with such romantic and harsh fervor that by October, 90 per cent of peasant households were merged into 24,000 huge, unmanageable communes, with the small plots now non-existent, tight central control, and peasants eating in public mess halls while the children played in communal nurseries. By the summer of '59, the grand retreat ensued and, by virtue of the incredible damage done, continued well into 1963: in short, reverting the whole system back to ante-'58. Great Leap Forward figures were admitted to be fabrications, and from 1960 to the present official statistics have been scarce, with the old Rus-

sian technique of percentage data being used. However, reasonable estimates point to a slow agricultural improvement from '61 to '64, with grain output rising from a low of 155 million tons in '60 to 165 million in '61 and 182 million in '62, but still behind the ante-'58 level. By '64 some restoration to this level seemed to be achieved, though the situation was marked by heavy imports of wheat from Canada and Australia, 6 million tons in '61, 4.5 million in '62, and 5 million in '63.

On the eve of the uncultural revolution plots were again forced into collective cultivation and state control was extended over the limited free agricultural markets. A stubborn problem seen in the USSR and elsewhere in the Red Empire, the promotion of peasants' incentives was lost upon the regime. Also, with the prospect of a population of 1 billion in 1980, the necessity of agricultural progress seemed to be overshadowed by Mao's utopianism. The salient point of all of this is the marked irrationality of the Great Leap Forward as measured without doubt in concrete performance. Totalitarian impositions of romantic notions do not guarantee efficient performance and maximum output, as the experiences of the USSR and other sectors in the Red Empire have well demonstrated. In sharp contrast to the United States, the Republic of China and many other areas in the Free World, it is a striking phenomenon that virtually all Red economies are beset by a persistent problem of adequately feeding their populations in bulk terms, not to speak in qualitative veins. Comparisons of adequacy and per capita output between the Republic of China and the mainland make the latter look dismally sick.

Substantially, the industrial picture during this period also shows up the clash between totalitarian romanticism and the stubborn requirements of technologic progress, which I maintain is the crowning mark of any civilized community today. From '49 on, as in agriculture, socialization of industry on the mainland advanced rapidly, with private enterprise in any way connected with the Nationalist Government being immediately confiscated and by 1952 almost all foreign enterprises were seized. By '58, some 70,000 private industrial enterprises were reorganized under joint state-private management, nearly 2 million commercial establishments were converted into state-private or cooperative stores, and the banking system was basically socialized. All this was standard Red "socialist" procedure and, as a matter of fact, executed at a slower tempo than one finds in comparable periods in the so-called communist states of Eastern Europe, which includes the USSR.

Significantly, the first two 5 year Plans followed the USSR model. As expected, the first plan of 1953-57 placed emphasis on rapid, heavy industrialization, aiming to double gross industrial production by the end of the Second Five Year Plan in '62, whereas, typically, agricultural production was to rise about 1/4 in the first plan and in the second, with the investment ratio between industry and agriculture maintained at 7.5 to 1. As it turned out, during the first planned period and on the low scale of mainland industry the results were somewhat impressive. The average annual growth of industrial output was about 19 per cent and, typically, in agriculture reportedly only 4.5 per cent; in some physical terms, pig iron production tripled to 5.9 million tons, steel quadrupled to 5.4 million tons, and coal doubled to 130 million tons. Again, I emphasize, as in the cases of all the Red economies, such physical terms, perhaps impressive in themselves, are not really meaningful in the holistic framework of total social efficiency, balanced development, and viable strength.

Also according to standard Red patterns, light industry lagged behind the heavy and

agriculture lagged behind both, with food grain increasing in the five year period actually by only 14 per cent to over 175 million tons at an annual growth rate of food production as low as 2.6 per cent, barely more than the natural increase in rate of population, reported at 2.2 per cent per annum by mid-'56 the socialization of the low-scaled mainland economy was almost completed, and its industrialization was based on the development of heavy industry. For what it is worth, the mainland GNP is estimated for 1950 at about 55 billion yuan, valued at constant '52 market prices, and by '57 it rose to 102 billion, or an increase of 86 per cent at an average yearly increment of about 8 per cent.¹⁶ Then the Great Leap Forward in '58—a further conclusive indication of the economic immaturity of Mao's romantic madness with a method.

In this real Great Leap Backward production targets for '58 were raised double those of '57. The leap proved to be catastrophic. The regime first confirmed its success and then admitted falsifying published figures. It had a disastrous effect on agricultural production as some 60 million rural workers were transferred to participate in a backyard furnace campaign producing low-grade steel. The agricultural setback in turn slowed down industrial production and also offset the economic gains of the ante-'58 period. Aggravating the situation, Moscow sensibly suspended its economic assistance in the summer of '60, which constituted a most important support of the first Five Year Plan. Its 156 major projects provided the backbone of the plan. In the '50-'59 period, Moscow supplied more than 10,000 technicians and specialists, more than 21,000 sets of scientific and technical documents, including over 1400 blueprints for large enterprises, and trade between the two imperialist areas increased noticeably, reaching a turnover of \$2 billion in '59. By '62, the turnover was 1/2 of '59, the lowest since '50. One can be sure that Moscow won't have its fingers burnt again in this fiery geographical expression without full guarantees in applying the Brezhnev Doctrine.

As in agriculture, the industrial retreat was on in '60. The industrial tempo decelerated markedly to afford a concentration of resources on agricultural recovery. In the finest tradition of primitive economics, a "whole country support agriculture" program was pushed as 20 million laborers, city dwellers, bureaucrats and students were mobilized for work on the agricultural front. Resembling the USSR's New Economic Policy forty years before, peasants' initiative was appealed to, private land plots were returned, choice of sowing was allowed, and produce was marketed freely. In the '61-'64 period, on the eve of another upheaval, industry was virtually stagnant, foreign trade decreased sharply, annual plans, not to speak of five year plans, failed to materialize (the Third Five Year Plan was to have begun in '63 and then was scheduled to run '66-'70) and an acute capital shortage ensued. Steel output, for example, declined from 13.3 million tons in '59 to 10 million in '62. Foreign trade in '58 was at \$5.5 billion and by '62 at \$2.3 billion. To meet the investment level of the Second Five Year Plan, some \$7 billion was necessary annually, but what was available was diverted into the heavy costs of nuclear development, which led to the first atomic explosion in October, 1964 and the third by '66, a 2.6 million army and a huge militia of men and women which guard the geographical expression.

PROTRACTED BACKWARDNESS

For those who would dignify the regime on the mainland with recognition in the U.N. or directly, and for whatever specious reason, this incredible record of protracted backwardness should be played over and over again. Bearing in mind some of the apparent

Footnotes at end of article.

parallels and similarities with the development of Soviet Russia and then the Soviet Union, we cannot but note the patent irregularities, distortions and inadequacy of statistical data that form one among many indicators of the general condition of the mainland. Punctuated by overall confusion, administrative vagaries, ideological obtuseness, recurring shortages and spasms of starvation, agricultural performance is another powerful indicator of pervasive deficiency in societal capital. In the sphere of largely underdeveloped industry, where integration is at a premium and mismanagement the general rule, similar conditions and characteristics prevail. Innovation, modernization, and stable progress are attributes in virtual non-existence. Major resultant disruptions can be seen in cognate economic sectors, such as transportation, foreign trade and final consumption, through the uncultural revolution to the present.

The prominent aspects of this amorphous reality in its dismal state of protracted backwardness are numerous and startling, so much so that doubtlessly few people are aware of them, whether on official or private levels. Transferred to the field of political action, in the course of '71 these and other facts should be publicly discussed before this geographical expression is again pressured into the U.N. One need only ask himself "How far have we insured peace in the world with Moscow in the League of Nations and then the United Nations?" The internal Russian record in the imperial state of the USSR is bad enough; the unbelievable Maoist record in this geographical expression is plainly monstrous.

With the paroxysms of the Great Leap Backward and the Uncultural Revolution, what planning organization there was, has been severely impaired as officials such as the Minister of Finance Li Hsien-nien, Minister of Agriculture Liao Lu-yen, and chairman Po Yi-po were pilloried with abuses in this vein: "We don't need brains! Our heads are armed with the ideas of Mao Tse-tung." Hardly a pitch for long-term development with millions of anti-intellectualist drop-outs or to satisfy the desperate need for modernization in an expression of 18th century environment with early 19th century ruling utopian thoughts. The statistical dearth itself reflects the reality of this expression. Occasional references are made to the Third Five Year Plan, yet no growth rate for industry is published. In the First Five Year Plan the average national income yearly increase was 8.81 per cent; it is perhaps safe to estimate for '58-'68 one of only 0.34 per cent, giving on an unreliable fixed exchange rate an average per capita income of about \$76. Even the population figure of 750 million mainland Chinese is suspect and, as one source puts it, "all efforts to estimate the size and rate of growth of China's population are fraught with considerable uncertainty." Since the 1953 census there is no evidence that basic population statistics have been kept, and in this numbers game, so reminiscent of most of the Russian experience, your guess is good between 700 and the U.N. estimate of 759.6 million for 1970.

However, despite the guesstimal variances in all these figures, whatever the pick still furnishes a pointed indication of the dismal character of this fragmented "reality." In '69 its gross product was in the range of \$70-\$80 billion, or about 1/3 of Japan's GNP, and its per capita output ranged from \$90-\$100, about only 1/4 of the Republic of China. Those who suffer nightmares over the gigantism and threat of Mao's domain on the world scale should reflect on these and other estimates. Over 700 million people, with 90 per cent jammed on 12 per cent of land which is arable, and deep division existing among the 21 provinces, 5 autonomous regions and 3 centrally governed municipalities, make the mainland more of a cinder-box to the regime

than any serious threat to our Free Asian allies.

The food-population problem is undoubtedly one of the major long-term problems. In '69 grain production totaled 188 million tons and in '70 this will be exceeded. With the 4.5 million tons purchased from Canada and Australia, a level of adequacy in food consumption is attainable. The output, however, is still below the 200 million tons of '65. In '67, there was an extensive slaughtering of cattle, pigs and poultry by the peasants. The forced migration of some 25 million city dwellers into the countryside during '68-'69, while not exactly a means of enhancing agricultural productivity, contributed to output recovery. Generally, farm life continues to be one of hard toll from dawn to dusk, with wooden plows and hand sickles much in evidence, and the entire family involved. Modernization is the basic need and this calls for heavy investments in land reclamation, mechanization, irrigation projects, rural electrification, and fertilizer plants (fertilizers are still only 40 per cent of minimum requirement). In this predominantly agrarian economy, it also calls for an institutionalization of private plots, freer markets, peasant incentives, and a surcease of romantic actions against economism. On record, it is doubtful that the last would be allowed.

Industrially, both the Leap and the Cul-Rev cost the mainland a full decade of industrial growth. In '66, crude steel output was only 12.2 million tons, coal at 250, crude oil at 10, electric power at 40 billion kw hours. Fighting and sabotage during the Cul-Rev led to declines, as witness the admission of Peiping's Maoist chief Hsieh Fu-chih as to a 7 per cent decrease in the capital's industrial production.¹⁸ With agriculture concentrating on food products, consumer goods industries will still lag behind the '58 peak; and heavy industry continues to be hampered in growth capacity by the regime's intensive weaponry program. With only about 3 per cent of the labor force employed in modern industry and a steel output of about 12.5 million a year, as compared to the 130 million of the U.S., the mainland's industrial economy can be viewed as an expression of scale.

The overall picture is not any brighter or too promising in transport, foreign trade, final consumption, education, and even economic planning. The travel mania of hundreds of thousands of Red Guards during the Cul-Rev to exchange "revolutionary experiences" was not without effect on the transport system, leading to goods' pileups, bottlenecks, and wasted resources. In mid-'67, the Central Committee had to call for a restoration of order.¹⁹ Heavy amounts of capital investment are required for any modern transport system, and it will be some time before the mainland could begin to develop one in an area now featured by immobility, where 8 out of every 10 Chinese who can get anywhere is on foot. Most have no access at all to telephones, radios or newspapers. A striking underdevelopment is punctuated by 23,000 miles of railway, mostly single track, only 350,000 miles of highways, largely soft surfaced, and an acute shortage of buses and trucks. Such poor infrastructure accounts in large measure for the geographical expression of the mainland.

For those naive recognitionists who advance the argument of unlimited trade with the mainland—incidentally, an experience repeated over and over again with the Russians—the record and content of the mainland's foreign trade is sufficient to underscore the speciousness of their argument. After all, in the lost fashion of elementary economics, foreign trade is a coefficient of given domestic economies, and from what we see of the mainland's, its prospects are

bleak, indeed. To be even more elementary, trade is a two-way street, and the geographical expression within the fantastic Maoist mould has little to offer in return. So, on with the statistics and basic essentials. Similar to any Red foreign trade, the mainland's foreign trade functions are imports of the latest Free World technology, shoring up the pitfalls of domestic production and planning, and pretending in a Chinese Potemkin-like mode to exert through this medium and influence, usually among pygmy states, of the great "reality," in geography only. Peaked in '59 at \$4.3 billion, the mainland's foreign trade declined to \$2.7 billion in '63, recovered to about \$3.7 billion in '65 and an estimated \$4.7 billion in '69 for hardly any progress in ten years.

Even more important are these salient facts: (1) prior to '60, about 2/3 of its trade was intra-Red Empire; since, about 70 per cent is with Free World countries which, in a way, contributed to Mao's socio-economic fantasia (2) the commodity composition has changed from imported machineries to imported foodstuffs and (3) short on hard foreign currency, it is exchanging high-value food products, such as rice, meats, vegetables, for cheaper items like wheat. Alongside this "sophisticated" foreign trade, the Peiping Potemkinists offer wheat to Egypt and Sudan, developmental aid to Iraq and Jordan, with generous interest-free terms over a 10 year repayment period—and with a 10 year grace period to boot!—for exceeding their Russian competitors, but all for conversion purposes to Mao's thoughts and even votes for U.N. admission. Recently, Mao has called for a crash program in the construction of large naval and merchant fleets to exceed the "several 10,000 ton ocean-going freighters, a few 15,000 ton oil tankers, and an icebreaker" and by the verbal theme "Let the great Red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought wave high on the shipbuilding front forever."²⁰

Great Leap propaganda formed the illusion that three years of hard work and suffering would gain the Chinese worker 1,000 years of happiness. The gross fatuity of such typical propaganda is belied by the squalorous and desperate conditions of the exploited Chinese worker. A per capita income of less than \$100 a year places him as one of the lowest in the world. Earnings by some are less than \$15 a month. A diet of rice is what all but few Chinese have; meat, fish and even tea are luxury items. Food and clothing are strictly rationed. In the early '50's and also '60's industrial pay was mostly by piecework, and this encouraged maximum production. The Leap and Cul-Rev substituted Maoist "incentives" of the "common good" and togetherness, and production lapsed. Now the stress is on utilizing machines to the maximum, leading to an epidemic of industrial accidents. Soviet-type unions were virtually eliminated by the Cul-Rev, and the worker finds himself completely defenseless today. Refrigerators, TV sets, of which there are a few thousand on the mainland, sewing machines, cars and other mechanical conveniences are restricted to the minority elite. Public health care remains primitive as "native medicine" with its herbs and locally made ointments still prevails. Movies are drenched in propaganda and Maoist "messages," and coerced attendance at political meetings, revived after the Cul-Rev, is obligatory for one member of every household. In short, omnipresent drabness punctuates the daily existence of the exploited mainland Chinese worker and peasant.

Considering the dominant, overall trends and developments depicted here, what other effects and outcomes could one logically expect? For long-term, secular development the worst damage caused by Mao's methodical madness has been in education. Practically every government in the less developed areas of the world understands and values the basic capital represented by time-

Footnotes at end of article.

consuming education for the long-term growth and progress of its country and people. But in this geographical expression, where skilled human resources have chronically been in short supply, this unalterable truth has been recklessly negated by the Cul-Rev and Mao's "proletarian educational system," which the Russians played with over 40 years ago. Education was set back by at least 10 years by Mao's uncultural carnival, during which most universities were closed down. Today's political theatrics of dispatching worker and army propaganda teams to campuses to conduct "revolutionary mass criticism," "reeducate the intellectuals," purge nonleftists, and groom classroom platforms with farmers, workers and soldiers will undoubtedly accentuate the mainland's educational incapacity to meet the needs of the Chinese people by the civilized standards of our century. If the experiences of others, particularly the Russians and their "proletarian education," nursing schools, molding the "socialist" or "Soviet" man, etc., don't serve as a constructive lesson, hard objective determinants of technology and economics will inevitably underwrite the painful cost of these political theatrics.

Finally, to speak of economic organization as a going, integrated concern in this massive expression is to speak of an illusion. Prior to '58, economic planning was attempted on a Soviet model, a single-track system of centralized planning for the benefit of centrally controlled state enterprises. In the Great Leap a shift was made to a double-track system, where local authorities in a planning unit of a geographical and hopefully self-sufficient area attempted to coordinate enterprises in their area, paralleling somewhat Khrushchev's *sovnarkozi* in the USSR.²¹ This resulted in mass disruption of supplies between areas and regions. The debacle of the Third Five Year Plan is evidence enough of the extensive disorganization that has prevailed these past five years. Under the semblance of a Fourth Five Year Plan, ostensibly begun in January '70, it appears that "decentralization," a euphemism at best, is stressed, encouraging the construction of small factories, irrigation projects and other enterprises in so-called "people's communes." Motives behind it seem to be a reduced vulnerability of cities to attack, an improved capability of local sectors to defend themselves, relief of population congestion in cities, elimination of undisciplined Red Guards from the cities, and a reduction in urban unemployment. Priorities are directed at agriculture and light industry with the aim of accumulating in a self-reliant spirit surpluses for investment in heavy industry, supplemented in some degree by foreign loans and assistance. In short, the basic question of what type of economic organization is being sought remains moot, as the forces of Maoist utopianism, bureaucratic pragmatism, revived "capitalism," black marketeering and corruption vie with each other.

THE MILITARY AND IMPERIALIST DRIVES

In the light of this totalistic socio-economic pattern of expression on the mainland, it is submitted that concentrated nuclear development in this maze proves in itself the dominance of a militarized configuration that, with a more or less enforced isolation, permits the continuation of a semblance in politico-economic organization known as the People's Republic of China. So long as extensive military control in conjunction with Communist Party totalitarianism persists, this concentrated development will continue unabated and relatively unaffected by sectoral convulsions. Moreover, external forces, such as Moscow's play for influence and power on the mainland, the threat of the Brezhnev doctrine, and ambivalent American interest, will fortify further this top-priority development for emphasized security.

By all evidence, the essence sustaining the geographical expression with a semblance of

organized effort and pulsation is military. As in the case of all Red states, and the USSR in particular, an excessive, disproportionate amount of the annual gross product is allocated to the military, which in the last, ideal analysis is by nature a form of economic parasitism. Aside from the heavy costs of military nuclear development, about 20 per cent of the mainland's gross product is absorbed by the armed forces—the 2.5 million in the PLA and 7 million in militia and security forces. The military nuclear program has been undertaken with significant continuity and, as a sharp contrast to all other spheres of the expression, is somewhat of a vehicle for Red Chinese potemkinism, a badge of Peiping's ostensible super-power status concealing vast impoverishment and underdevelopment. Despite reported anti-Maoist incidents in '67 in Sinkiang province, a site of Peiping's nuclear industry, the program was pushed ahead, with a hydrogen bomb tested in June of that year and all indications that top-priority sectors of the economy connected with the military escaped the ravages of the Cul-Rev. It is expected that by 1975 a modest force of strategic nuclear missiles will be deployed.

This development, as well as the launching of a 381 pound satellite in '70, has more meaning for Peking's potemkinist tactics and imagery, not to mention potentialities for blackmail, than it has for military capability on a global scale. It is greatly out-powered by the USSR and even more so by the U.S. With the largest armed force in Asia, it nevertheless poses a continuing threat to free Asian nations. However, American presence in Asia, in one form or another, reduces this threat considerably.

If the advance reports are correct, it would be in complete conformity with the thesis developed here that the new draft constitution, supplanting the present one promulgated in 1954, will make Mao supreme commander of the armed forces and Lin Piao deputy commander; and also that instead of "a people's democratic state" reference will be made to "a proletarian dictatorship," in which "Mao Tse-tung thought is the guiding principle for all work of the people of the whole country." The prime sustaining forces of the geographical expression—the military, the political totalitarianism, and the cultist—find constitutional accommodation, to be stamped by the National People's Congress. More, despite ambassadorial exchanges and the like, the new constitution looms as a new propaganda issue between Peiping and Moscow. For example, Moscow's Radio Peace and Progress beamed to Inner Mongolia stressed on September 27 that the "Peking leaders intend to strengthen their aggressive extermination policy of force against the non-Han people by legal means—the new national Constitution."²² All of which points to another dominant feature of the expression, namely its imperial character and the imperialist drive of the Peiping regime.

The subjects of Peiping's "nationalities problem," similar to that of Moscow, and its political warfare aspirations on a global scale, also similar to Moscow's, can be described at length. It is sufficient here to mention certain essentials that would complete the dimensions of our thesis and also point to aspects of the two subjects which are deserving of far more attention in Free World scholarship than they have been receiving. For years now Peiping has been condemning Moscow for what it calls "social" or "socialist imperialism" and has directed its political warfare efforts toward the numerous non-Russian nations in the USSR. It has viewed the "new Tsars" as being even more covetous than the "old Tsars" who occupied more than 1.5 million square kilometers of land now claimed by Peiping.

Now, the fact is that we are dealing with the two last remaining and important imperial complexes in the modern world. Although with obvious differences of scale (e.g. more distinctive nations in the USSR than

in the PRC, greater non-Russian population in the former than non-Chinese in the latter, etc.) in substance the PRC is as imperial in character and possessed with imperialist drives as is the R.S.F.S.R. in the USSR. Emphasized by both sides in the Sino-Russian rift, this mutual character has been portrayed at length by both these past few years. Referring to the Chuangs (over 8.5 million) Uighurs (5 m.) Dungsans (4.5 m.) Yis (3.5 m.) Tibetans (3 m.) Miao (2.5 m.) Manchurians (2.5 m.) and others, totaling over 45 million, one typical source stresses that "the national regions of the PRC have a colonial nature."²³ Another states, "the national culture of the less populous nationalities of China has been subjected to forced Sinization."²⁴ As so eloquently exposed by both sides to mutual discredit, a range of exploitation by Peiping extends beyond the mainland Chinese per se, and this parallel problem built into the imperial complexes of both, with critical potentialities for the future, must be honestly and objectively faced and discussed in the Free World.

Finally, under a colossal pretense, supported superficially by the huge population, area expanse, a large but largely unmodernized army, and space and nuclear badges of super-power status, in this awesome imagery Peiping has sought to influence, and perhaps even to dominate by remote control, in many regions of the less developed world, "the countryside of the globe." It is unnecessary here to recount in detail the scope and depth of this essentially political warfare operation, greased by arms shipments, diplomatic intrigue, financial support, low-grade aid, and Maoist revolutionary emotionalism. Here, too, substantially Peiping is following the path that Moscow has pursued since 1917, but the resources now at the former's disposal can scarcely be compared with those of the latter. Yet, support involvement in Indo-China, penetrations in the Mid-East,²⁵ railroad building in Tanzania, and political warfare activities on all continents, measure a disposal of resources that incurs a far greater marginal cost of sacrifice and deprivation to the peoples of the mainland than is the case of Moscow and its underlying populaces.

To conclude, the ideological fantasies of Maoism will protract the deficiency of societal capital on the mainland. Current gestures of pragmatism, "peaceful coexistence," diplomatic concourse, reduced self-isolation, Chou En-lai visitations, international air service and the like are only part of the play for the next act in out-competing Moscow in global revolutionary activity. With the death of Mao, a whole new range of possibilities will emerge, including that of Soviet Russian penetration, surcease of ideologic fanaticism, and the growth of societal capital. Whether this possibility may be realized to the distinct disadvantage of the Free World, will depend on the analytical outlook of Free World powers toward what has been depicted here as a geographical expression and also on the course of action they choose to pursue. The ultimate question is "Should societal capital be encouraged to grow in the realm of this geographical expression?" Applied to the mainland, as Mao has written, "a single spark can start a prairie fire." But also applied to the geographical expression, "We cannot comprehend a whole without seeing its parts, but we can see the parts without comprehending the whole." It is in terms of the whole that the ever-present possibility of the spark exists.

FOOTNOTES

¹ E.g. Hon. Stephen M. Young, "Canada Leads The Way," *Congressional Record*, November 18, 1970, p. S18410.

² Bruno Shaw, "A Warning Against Mao," *The New York Times*, November 13, 1970.

³ David Lawrence, "Why U.S. Silence on Seating Peking?" *Syndicated Column*, November 23, 1970.

⁴ Joseph Stalin, *Mastering Bolshevism*, New York, 1946, pp. 21-22.

⁶ Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Vol. 5, New York, p. 364.

⁷ *Current Background (Hong Kong)*, U.S. Consulate General, No. 595, October 5, 1959, p. 11.

⁸ *Hung Chi*, No. 21, 1963, Joint Publication Research Service, Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963, p. 6.

⁹ "Khrushchev Remembers," *Life*, New York, November 27, 1970, p. 64.

¹⁰ See George Lichtheim, *The Origins of Socialism*, New York, 1969.

¹¹ *Hung Chi* Editorial, No. 12, 1966.

¹² *Tin Tin Yat Po*, Hong Kong, September 17, 1970.

¹³ *Peking Review*, May 26, 1967, p. 47.

¹⁴ "Firmly Grasping Revolutionary Great Criticism," *People's Daily, Liberation Army Daily, Red Flag*, August 25, 1969.

¹⁵ Huang Yung-sheng, Chief of General Staff, PLA 43rd Anniversary, August 1, 1970.

¹⁶ E.g. *An Economic Profile of Mainland China*, Vol. 1-2, Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C., 1967.

¹⁷ William W. Hollister, *China's Gross National Product and Social Accounts, 1950-1957*, Illinois, 1958, pp. 1-7.

¹⁸ *An Economic Profile of Mainland China*, Washington, D.C., Vol. 2, p. 343.

¹⁹ *Quarterly Economic Review*, London, July 1967, p. 6.

²⁰ "The Economic Cost," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, Hong Kong, July 27, 1967.

²¹ *Peking Radio*, Summary of People's Daily, June 4, 1970.

²² Andray Donnithorne, *China's Economic System*, New York, 1967, pp. 457-470.

²³ Christian Duevel, "Towards Early Adoption of New Soviet Constitution?", *Radio Liberty*, New York, October 28, 1970.

²⁴ T. Rakhimov, "The National Tragedy of the Peoples of China," *Radyanska Ukraina*, Kiev, April 12, 1970.

²⁵ "National Oppression of the Peoples of China," *Soviet Turkmenistany*, Ashkabad, April 29, 1970.

²⁶ E.g. Joseph S. Roucek, "Communist China's Penetration of the Middle East," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, New York, Summer, 1970.

CHAPTER VII—CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROGRAMS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh in a series of articles on children and youth and maternal and infant care programs. Support for H.R. 7657 as amended is increasing. The bill which would extend for an additional 5 years the children and youth and maternal and infant care programs which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 69 House cosponsors, and 16 cosponsors in the Senate.

There are at present 59 regional children and youth programs with additional satellites and 56 maternal and infant care programs in existence delivering comprehensive health care to almost half a million children and youth of lower socioeconomic levels in central cities and rural areas. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

I have received from the directors of these programs descriptions of the programs in their community and what it would mean if their particular program were terminated. To give our colleagues an insight into these programs, I am

placing in the RECORD descriptions of six children and youth programs.

The material follows:

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 603A—MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Children and Youth Project #603A, a sub-project of the Minneapolis Health Department's C & Y 603, which is administered through the University of Minnesota, serves a catchment area with the greatest concentration of urban American Indians in the country. (There are greater total numbers of Indians living in cities like Los Angeles, but they are more widely scattered). As a small project serving approximately 2,500 children, we are making an intensive effort to provide continuing comprehensive health services to this population, which is known to be responsible for an undue proportion of morbidity and mortality statistics. The only other services readily available to the Indian group are from the county general hospital, which is at some distance, and a Model Cities program nearby which has a 150 family capacity plus episodic services available.

During its four and one-half years of operation, Project 603A has placed heavy emphasis on preventive care and has geared a large part of its program to serving children in the preschool years. Well over a third of the children under age are of American Indian heritage. Another 6% are Negro, a small percentage are Oriental and Mexican American with the remainder of the population consisting of low income Caucasian residents.

Our staff of 30, augmented by students from often as many as a dozen different University Departments, delivers a wide variety of health services including medicine, dentistry, nursing, nutrition and social work services, speech screening, hearing screening, and psychological screening and mental health services.

We provide a car for teen age Indian girls in a residential home whose innovative program is aimed at reducing the delinquency rate among these young people, as well as services to other agencies in the community, including schools, welfare agencies and many others. We try to fill needs that are otherwise not being met and do our best to avoid duplication of services.

It would be fair to say, I believe, that the University of Minnesota is becoming increasingly interested in the Community University Health Care Center as a possible vehicle for exploring and innovating in the area of health care delivery systems and this Children and Youth Project provides the University an opportunity to serve the community while offering unique educational and research possibilities. The University's continuing support, in terms of hard, matching dollars, as well as services, is evidence of its commitment to such a program.

Very little is now known about the health needs and health behaviour of the native American in the urban setting. A baseline study was done in the fall of 1970 by Dr. Vernon E. Wechworth's staff at Minnesota Systems Research in Minneapolis. We are now embarking upon a study which will help us to better understand what behavioural expectations the Indians bring to their encounters with our staff, what behaviour the Indian community sees as desirable in such encounters and the community's perceptions of the fit between their problems and the scope and organization of services provided at our center. We would like to find out more health needs of the community. While the past decade has answered these and related questions for the Black and Chicano minorities, almost no such information is available for the urban Indian. We believe that Project 603A has a unique opportunity to make a contribution in this important area.

The community we serve has recently provided us with gratifying evidence of its sup-

port also. In less than one weeks time, members of the Advisory Committee obtained 700 signatures from residents in the area testifying to the fact that "CUHCC is more than just a building and a staff," as far as they are concerned and that we do indeed provide a service upon which they depend. We hope we can continue to provide comprehensive health care services for them in the future. Even better, we would like to find some way to fund a program which would extend care to the parents of our children, building some sort of HMO type program on the basic Children and Youth Project framework which has already proved so eminently successful.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 606-A—BALTIMORE, Md.

After a careful planning period, during which a definitive census of the health needs of the target population was performed, the C&Y Project 606A opened its doors to ten thousand children (0 through 18 years) living in nine census tracts of inner-city Baltimore. The choice of these census tracts was based on the fact that they contained large numbers of families suffering from socioeconomic deprivation, who had never had access to quality health care. Although the University of Maryland Hospital had attempted to serve the needs of these people for decades, the familiar patterns of inadequate, "dispensary" type service prevailed in the general area.

The C&Y Project brought with it several new and dynamic thrusts in the delivery of health care:

1. This new kind of care would center on the production and assurance of health rather than episodic care of illnesses;
2. If the people could not or would not come to a center for health care, it would be taken to them;
3. Outreach programs would extend into the school, the home, and other community institutions;
4. The multiple disciplines necessary to deliver comprehensive health care would be contained under a single roof and act in a coordinated fashion;
5. Because the overall plan of C&Y held that a specific sum of money would be applied to the health needs of a specific geographic population, responsibility and accountability for the delivery of health care would be required for the first time in the history of American medicine.

Every one of these new ideas for the delivery of comprehensive care to inner-city children has been achieved, at least in part, at the C&Y Project 606A.

The activities of this C&Y Project are totally prevention-oriented. The first priority is to absolutely prevent all diseases in this population which are amenable to existing technology, within our means. The second priority is to detect all disease, in early stages when treatment is more satisfactory, also within the confines of existing technology. The third priority is to prevent the complications of manifest disease with prompt, sensitive, and specific illness care. Once a child enters the medical care system, he is fully evaluated, his urgent needs are taken care of, his early stage diseases are detected, he is given all reasonable preventive measures, and his health is thereafter maintained at as high a level as possible.

Lack of transportation and inconvenience of clinic hours have long been the problem of people forced to seek their health care at outpatient clinics. The C&Y Project maintains a micro-bus which is used primarily for transportation of patients with urgent needs, large families, or those who live at inconvenient distances from the Center. The bus is also useful for transferring large groups of children during special projects, to or from their neighborhoods or schools.

It was found early by Center personnel that programs for school-age children are

better carried out physically in the school. Multiphasic technical screening of school children, immunization programs, consumer education programs, drug programs, and various other categorical programs have been carried into the school whenever technically feasible. In addition to school programs, this C&Y Project maintains a large staff of public health nurses, under our employ and direction, who regularly visit the homes in the census tracts for which they are responsible, and they deal in matters of environmental health, overwhelmed multiproblem families, and problems whose urgency has not been perceived by the family. These nurses also staff clinics at the Center, engage themselves in matters of school health, and they are responsible for the overall continuity of care delivered by the project.

In order to provide such comprehensive care, it has been found necessary to include in the staff physicians, nurses, dentists, psychologists, nutritionists, and social workers. Although far from perfect, we have begun to break down the traditional barriers which separate the health care professionals and are moving rapidly toward a goal-oriented, problem-oriented, multi-disciplinary approach to the health care of inner-city children. No one discipline has been predominant in its delivery of health care; the facilities of the Center, charts and record, and planning is shared by all.

Of the many new aspects of C&Y Projects, the charge to deliver comprehensive care to a specified geographic population is of utmost importance. The project is responsible and accountable for the health of the individuals living in its geographic target area, which means that with relatively fixed income, progress in delivery of health care to a relatively fixed target population is accomplished by new ideas and new methodology, not by new requests for more money and more personnel. This is at the heart of the success of the C&Y idea.

The loss of this facility and those like it to the community would be incalculable. Overnight, ten thousand inner-city children would be deprived of the first sensitive and rewarding experience they have ever had in regard to their health. Immunization levels would drop, posing a threat to the community at large (which is already occurring in more advantaged populations!). High levels of anemia and other nutritional diseases would begin to creep back into the population from record low levels achieved during the past few years. Treatable diseases in early stages would be left to ripen and mature, once more being forced to present themselves for treatment at over-burdened outpatient clinics and emergency rooms. Members of various professional disciplines would disband their cooperative effort and return to their old, familiar ways which have, over the years, produced such division of thought and fragmentation of care. Perhaps most important of all would be the loss of responsibility and accountability for professional activities. All of the new ideas that have only begun to bear fruit, and have yet to reach their full potential, would be lost and forgotten. A health care wasteland would gradually overtake and destroy the bright oasis of comprehensive care.

The professional deliverers of health care would find some way to start again, to preserve some of the better ideas and experiences, because this is their job, and what they are trained to do. The real tragedy would come to the community which, never having had anything resembling comprehensive health care, would find themselves again in morass of social, emotional, and physical destitution surrounded by broken promises by what they have always viewed in the past as self-seeking "establishment" professionals. But then, this is a familiar pattern to them, and they would probably adjust again, somehow.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 654—
PITTSBURGH, PA.

Children's and Youth Project No. 654 was begun in February, 1968 under the auspices of the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh and the University of Pittsburgh in conjunction with the Allegheny County Health Department, the Pittsburgh Housing Authority, and the Graduate School of Public Health. It is located in the Terrace Village Housing Project, a city-sponsored apartment complex of 1,851 units housing a total population of approximately 6,000. The Children's and Youth Project was designed to provide comprehensive health services to those residents of Terrace Village between the ages of birth and sixteen years. There are 1,650 eligible children in this age range.

Over the three years of existence of this project, 82 percent of the eligible population have been enrolled and are under active care. In a further breakdown by age groups, 92 percent of the children under the age of 2 years are receiving comprehensive services at the Health Center. Neighborhood acceptance of the Health Center is excellent as is witnessed by the percentage of the eligible population who are participating and active in ongoing health services.

The pediatric staff of the Children's and Youth Project consist at this point of 2 pediatricians, 3 pediatric nurse practitioners, 1 dentist, one dental hygienist, 5 community health aides and 1 Master's level social worker. Each family registering with the Project receives an initial assessment which consists of a two-generational medical and social history, a complete physical examination, screening tests for hearing, vision, psychometric achievement, hemoglobin level, tuberculin sensitivity, sickle-cell trait or disease, and urinalysis. Periodic reassessments are scheduled depending upon the age of the child. The Well Baby Clinic, as previously mentioned, has enrolled over 92 percent of the eligible infants in the neighborhood. In addition to routine assessments and periodic reassessments the Project provides care for acute and chronic illnesses, counseling in the areas of nutrition and behavioral problems, and referral services to the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, which serves as the backup facility for the neighborhood unit.

In an evaluation of effectiveness of the health program offered by the Terrace Village Health Center, a cohort of 110 infants who were followed in Our Well Baby Clinic were compared with a similar cohort from an excellent private pediatric practice in urban Pittsburgh. In the private pediatric practice 90 percent of the patients had complied with stated objectives of the pediatrician in terms of the number of visits desired in the first year. Seventy-four percent of the families in the Terrace Village Health Center Community likewise had compared with the stated objectives of the Center. In both the private and the low-income cohorts, the degree of immunizations for DPT, polio and measles, succeeded 95 percent. Ninety-eight percent of infants in each group had had tuberculin skin tests. The mean hemoglobin levels of the infants from the Terrace Village population was exactly equal to that of the infants from the upper income group. We feel, therefore, that the quality of infant health supervision offered to the residents of the Terrace Village is comparable to that in any private practice setting.

In addition to the Children's and Youth Project which has served as a nucleus for the Health Center, arrangements have been made with Magee Women's Hospital to provide pre and postnatal care for mothers in the Housing Projects. The opportunity is thereby given to the pediatric staff to work with expectant mothers prior to the delivery of their infants. In addition, the Center has now added a cadre of persons providing comprehensive health care for adults in the Terrace Village Housing Project; so that the Terrace

Village Health Center now provides comprehensive health services across the total age range of the population.

The Health Center is dedicated to the concept of provision of Health in its broadest sense. The staff, therefore, has been active and instrumental in the creation of recreational opportunities for children and older people in the neighborhood. A program of cognitive stimulation for infants is underway and currently involves 57 infants in their first year of life. A small group of indigenous mothers from the community have been trained to work with other mothers in the stimulation of the learning processes of their infants. This program is in its first year of operation and will be evaluated in terms of its results at the end of its first and second years. Plans are being developed to provide day care services for infants in the Terrace Village Community, but funding has not yet been available for such an undertaking.

The Community itself has been intimately involved in the evolution and development of the Terrace Village Health Center. The Health Center has an Advisory Board composed of representatives from the sponsoring institutions listed above and an equal number of representatives from the Community itself. Decisions on program are made by the Advisory Board. The relationship of the staff to the Advisory Board and to the Community in general has been a harmonious one from the beginning.

It is felt that the provision of comprehensive health services in the Terrace Village Center meets a vital need of the Community. Prior to the initiation of the Center, the health services available to residents of the project were fragmentary and were almost completely crisis oriented. It is hoped that the comprehensive health care system providing personalization and continuity of care to a given population might be continued.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 610—
ARVERNE, QUEENS, N.Y.

To understand the Children & Youth project in the Rockaways, one has to understand the geography of the peninsula. The Rockaway Peninsula is part of New York City located south of Brooklyn and Queens, separated from them by Jamaica Bay. It is connected to the rest of New York City only with two bridges. This geographic isolation reflects on its health services.

The population of the Peninsula is about 100,000 people, 30,000 of them low income, 35% to 40% of this population are children under 18 years of age. Before Project Pryme was funded, the 10 to 12 thousand low-income children had very little medical care. Two Health Department Well-Baby Clinics provided some preventive services, but all illnesses they had to turn to Queens General Hospital located 16 miles away and more than one hour by public transportation.

The funding of Project Pryme in 1966 changed the situation. Now many of the low-income children have health services available within walking distance from their homes. Project Pryme provides Pediatric care, Dental care, Public Health Nursing services, Social Services, and Psychiatric services to its patients. It helps them to solve the housing problems and other problems in the family. A dedicated staff of 60 health professionals and supporting staff provides high quality comprehensive care with easy access in a dignified manner. Over 5000 children take advantage now of those services, and with adequate funding this could be extended to all the 10,000 children who need the services.

In 1970, 33,000 patient visits were made to Pryme for health services. Since October, 1969, in cooperation with the N. Y. C. Department of Health, Pryme has initiated and coordinated a lead poisoning detection,

treatment and follow-up program among Rockaway youngsters up to six years of age. Over 2000 children have been tested, 87 have been hospitalized, in addition to an almost equal number who have elevated blood lead levels and who are being closely monitored. All Negro Pryme patients are screened for sickle cell trait or sickle cell disease. Follow-up and/or counseling is provided for those with a positive test.

In addition to providing on-site preventive, diagnostic and treatment services to local indigent children, Pryme arranges for, and makes it feasible for them to receive further medical services free of charge at Queens General Hospital both in specialty clinics and as in-patients. Rapid, free, and frequent transportation is provided by Pryme for children and their parents between Rockaway and the hospital.

What would happen if funding for Pryme were to be disconnected? Over 5000 children would again have to resort to attending emergency rooms at two small local voluntary hospitals or travel on their own to Queens General Hospital. Children in need of social and psychiatric services would have few if any facilities available to them within the Rockaway Peninsula in case of need. Treatment for acute illnesses and preventive services would virtually disappear for most low-income children, (except for immunizations given at the local well-child Health Department clinic). Rockaway's isolation would revert back to pre-1966 levels.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 647— DALLAS, TEX.

Our Children and Youth Project provides comprehensive health care for infants and children from low income families in West Dallas.

West Dallas is a land area of 30 square miles. 50,000 people live in this section of Dallas. 24,000 of these people are under 18 years of age. Approximately 74% are black, 20% Latin-American, 5% white and 1% Indian. The average family income is less than \$3500 per year. The nearest public clinic is from 2 to 12 miles from the homes of families living in this area. Public transportation is not available to most of these families. The cost of "free" health care as a percent of annual gross income in terms of lost wages for parents, public transportation or parking costs and child care or luncheon costs (long waiting periods in public clinics) is exorbitant.

In order to overcome these barriers to health care, our project has established three Neighborhood Health Clinics near major schools in the area. The clinics are staffed by teams of health professionals which include a pediatrician, 2 nurses, 2 social workers, 1 nutritionist, 1 clinical psychologist, 1 dental hygienist and 1 nurse aide. Acute illnesses are cared for promptly, reducing the need for more costly hospitalization. Rehabilitation programs are developed for children with chronic diseases and multiple handicaps, permitting them to function more independently. Health maintenance programs contribute to the prevention of health problems, thereby permitting more children to receive health care with the resources available to us. Each Neighborhood Health Clinic can provide such health care for approximately 5,000 children.

Our Neighborhood Health Clinics are currently making the following contributions to the communities which they serve:

- (1) Reduce infant mortality care;
- (2) Reduce unnecessary hospitalizations;
- (3) Reduce preventable health problems;
- (4) Reduce school absences caused by health problems; and
- (5) Reduce work days lost by parents, thereby increasing family income.

If our Children and Youth Project is not adequately funded these Neighborhood Health Clinics will have to be phased out.

We would expect the loss of these clinics to have the following impact in West Dallas:

- (1) Infant mortality rate would rise because of lack of adequate health supervision for the newborn.
- (2) Hospitalizations would increase because of lack of available facilities for prompt treatment of acute illnesses.
- (3) Preventable health problems would increase because of the absence of health maintenance programs.
- (4) School absences would increase because of lack of available facilities for prompt treatment and rehabilitation and the absence of health maintenance programs.
- (5) Loss of family income caused by work days lost by parents who use public clinics would increase.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 615— AUGUSTA, GA.

History and Purpose of the C & Y Clinic: Amendment to Social Security Act in 1965 provided funds for establishing a certain number of C & Y Clinics throughout the 50 states. Georgia has one. The purpose was to explore means of providing comprehensive health care to the low-income population. Due to limited funds a limited number of low-income people in each area would receive the services.

The Medical College of Georgia received the Federal grant and provides the required matching funds. Project 615—our C & Y Clinic—began operation September 1966.

Target Areas: Sunset Homes, Gilbert Manor, Allen Homes.

Number of Families: Approximately 650— all Black with 2,000 children 0-18 years of age—85% are in health supervision.

Most Common Medical Problems:

1. Infections—Respiratory, Skin, Urinary Tract Infection, Venereal Disease, Gastro Intestinal.
2. Injuries—Orthopedic—most common problems:

1. Disorganized family structure—cause or effect?

Social Adjustment Problems, High Drop-Out Rate, Teenage Pregnancy, Educational Deficits, Delinquency, Recent Trends Toward Racism, and Drugs.

Methods of Solution of Problems:

Overlying the most minor medical problems, at times, are the cultural and socioeconomic ills of a Black ghetto population. To achieve any measure of success in going beyond crisis and episodic medical (and dental) care, the focus of attention must be on the family and the community. We use a multidisciplinary (Team) approach in all complex cases. The person in the clinic with whom the family has rapport is the Team member responsible for getting and putting together, in a meaningful way, information and help from C & Y or outside agency personnel. Every effort is made to make the parent a member of the Team. This discourages dependence and allows growth of the parent as a responsible member of the community.

Other Activities:

The C & Y Clinic provides clinical experience for medical and dental, nursing and social work students—under close supervision. Dental Hygiene students also spend part of their time with C & Y patients.

REMARKS OF REINTRODUCTION OF ADEQUATE NUTRITION ACT OF 1971—H.R. 8883

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing the Adequate Nutri-

tion Act of 1971—H.R. 8883—together with the following cosponsors: Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. KOCH.

We are strongly committed to this legislation. We believe that providing food stamps at the rate of \$80 for \$134 worth of stamps for a family of four—the level deemed nutritionally adequate by the Department of Agriculture—as well as simplifying the certification and distribution process, can be a significant means of helping to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in America.

It is well known that millions of poor people in this Nation are subsisting on grossly inadequate diets. Nowhere is this situation more pronounced than in the ghettos of our major cities. No single group of Americans suffers more because of this state of affairs than do children. Undernourished in their most formative years, they go on to permanently warped, stunted lives as the result of such deprivation. Our society dare not plead ignorance of this situation, for it exists everywhere, including many areas within a few blocks of where we meet today.

Implementation of the Department of Agriculture's new food stamp regulations in their present form will cause 350,000 poor persons to lose their eligibility for stamps; in addition, for some 1,750,000 individuals—primarily the blind, the aged, and the disabled—food stamps will now cost more and yield less.

H.R. 1, as passed by the House, would exclude welfare recipients from the food stamp program, but we have no indication that the Senate will not change this; furthermore, even if the House version becomes law, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that 1 million poor people will still be eligible for stamps.

We must not allow the poor to become the victims of the uncertainties of our legislative process or the bunglings of our bureaucrats. The time has come to resolve the paradox of hunger and malnutrition in a nation which has the resources to feed all of its people.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9596

A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Adequate Nutrition Act of 1971".

Sec. 2. The Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2011-2025), is amended as follows:

Definitions

(1) Section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new definitions: "(n) The term 'operating agency' means any State agency, the Secretary, or any public agency or private nonprofit organization administering any program pursuant to section 10(g) of this Act.

"(o) The term 'political subdivision' means any county, city, township, or other unit of general local government responsible for administering public assistance programs within a State."

Eligible households

(2) Section 5 is amended by striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The Secretary shall require every individual who is a member of a household that is participating in the food stamp program, other than an individual described by clause (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) of subsection (d) of this section, to register for employment with the local public employment office or, when impractical, at such other appropriate office as shall be designated in regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor. If the Secretary finds that any such individual has failed to register for employment without good cause, the continued eligibility of the household (of which such individual is a member) to participate in the food stamp program shall not be affected, but the value of the coupon allotment, determined under section 7 (a) of this Act, authorized to be issued to such household shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined by subtracting from that authorized allotment the amount charged therefor pursuant to section 7(b) of this Act as the number of such unregistered individuals in such household bears to the total number of individuals in such household. Before any such reduction is made, the individual concerned shall be afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a fair hearing held in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as a hearing under section 10(e) (4) of this Act. A reduction in the food stamp allotment of any household under this subsection shall continue so long as such individual fails or refuses to register for employment as provided herein.

"(d) An individual shall not be required to register pursuant to subsection (c) of this section if such individual is—

"(1) ill, incapacitated, disabled, or over sixty years of age;

"(2) a mother or other relative of an individual under the age of eighteen who is caring for such individual;

"(3) an individual under the age of eighteen;

"(4) an individual eighteen years old or over who is a student regularly attending a school, college, or university, or the equivalent thereof, or regularly attending a course of vocational or technical training designed to prepare him for gainful employment;

"(5) an individual whose presence in the home on a substantially continuous basis is required because of the illness or incapacity of another member of the household; or

"(6) an individual eighteen years old or over and is employed at least thirty hours per week or earns at least \$48 per week.

"(e) If the Secretary of Labor finds that any individual registered under subsection (c) of this section has refused, without good cause, to accept suitable employment in which such individual is able to engage and that such employment was offered through the public employment offices of the State, or was otherwise offered by an employer and the offer of such employer was a bona fide offer of employment, the eligibility of the household (of which such individual is a member) to participate in the food stamp program shall not be affected, but the value of the coupon allotment authorized to be issued to such household shall be reduced in accordance with the method set forth in subsection (c) above. Before any such reduction is made, the individual concerned shall be afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a fair hearing held in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as a hearing under section 10(e) (4) of this Act. A reduction in the food stamp allotment of any household under this subsection

shall continue so long as such individual fails or refuses to accept employment as provided by this section.

"(f) (1) In determining whether any employment is suitable for an individual for purposes of subsection (e) of this section, the Secretary of Labor shall consider the degree of risk to such individual's health and safety, his physical fitness for the work, his prior training and experience, the length of his unemployment, his realistic prospects for obtaining work based on his potential, and the distance of the available work from his residence.

"(2) In no event shall any employment be considered suitable for an individual if any one of the following conditions applies—

"(A) the position offered is vacant as a direct result of a strike, lockout, or other labor dispute;

"(B) the wages for such job are payable at a rate less than the highest of the following:

"(i) the State or local minimum wage;

"(ii) \$1.60 per hour or the minimum hourly rate which is or would be applicable to the job under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6(a)(1) of such Act, as amended, applied to the job, whichever is higher; or

"(iii) the prevailing rate of pay in the same labor market area for persons employed in similar work in the locality; or

"(C) the hours and other terms and conditions of the work offered are contrary to or less favorable than those prescribed by Federal, State, or local law or are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality."

Value of the Coupon Allotment and Charges To Be Made

(3) (A) Subsection (a) of section 7 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In determining the amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household, the Secretary shall take into consideration such relevant factors as he deems appropriate but may not consider the availability or expected availability of appropriations to carry out this Act. In no event shall the amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household be less than the amount which the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture determines to be necessary to permit a household of comparable size to purchase the kinds and amounts of food specified in the low-cost food plan described by such Service and published in the 'Family Economics Review.'"

(B) Subsection (b) of section 7 is amended by striking all after "Provided further," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a household may, if it so elects, purchase any amount of coupons less than the full coupon allotment it is entitled to purchase. The amount charged any household for any portion of a coupon allotment less than the full coupon allotment shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would have been charged such household for the full coupon allotment as such portion of the full coupon allotment bears the full coupon allotment such household was entitled to purchase. The Secretary shall prescribe general guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance services to be provided by State agencies to eligible households, including, but not limited to, matters relating to the places, times, and frequency of coupon issuance services in political subdivisions approved for participation in the food stamp program. Such general guidelines and minimum requirements shall include at least the following provisions: (1) that the issuance of coupons shall take place no less often than once per week, and (11) that any household may purchase its entire

month coupon allotment at any time of issuance for that month or may elect to purchase any portion of its monthly allotment having a face value of three-quarters, one-half, or one-quarter at any time of issuance for that month and thereafter may purchase the proportionate remainder of that allotment which has not previously been purchased for that month."

Administration

(4) (A) Subsection (b) and (c) of section 10 are amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to the following conditions, the operating agency shall assume responsibility for the certification of applicant households and for the issuances of coupons. Applicant households shall be certified for eligibility solely on the basis of a simplified statement, conforming to standards prescribed by the Secretary, and such statement shall be acted upon and eligibility certified within seven days following the date upon which the statement is initially filed. The Secretary shall, however, provide for adequate and effective methods of verification of the eligibility of recipients subsequent to certification through the use of sampling and other scientific techniques. If a household, certified as eligible in any political subdivision to participate in the food stamp program or a program of distribution of federally donated foods moves to another political subdivision in which either program is operating, the household shall remain eligible to participate in such program in such other political subdivision for a period of sixty days from the date of such move without regard to compliance with any requirement of the new political subdivision.

"(c) In the certification of applicant households for either the food stamp program or a program of distribution of federally donated foods there shall be no discrimination against any household by reason of race, religious creed, national origin, or political beliefs."

(B) Subsection (e) of section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The State agency of each State shall submit for approval a plan of operation specifying the manner in which such State intends to conduct such program. Such plan of operation shall provide, among such other provisions as may be required by regulation, the following: (1) for the use of the eligibility standards promulgated by the Secretary under section 5 of this Act and the certification procedures specified in subsection (b) of this section; (2) safeguards which restrict the use of disclosure of information obtained from applicant households to persons directly connected with the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act; (3) that the State agency shall undertake effective action to inform low-income households concerning the availability and benefits of the food stamp program and encourage the participation of all eligible households; (4) for the granting of a fair hearing and a prompt determination thereafter to any household aggrieved by the action of a State agency under any provision of its plan of operation as it affects the participation of such household in the food stamp program; and (5) for the submission of such reports and other information as may from time to time be required. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the State agency shall, in conjunction with procedures under which any household participating in the food stamp program shall be entitled, if it so elects, to have the charges, if any, for its coupon allotment deducted from any grant or payment such household may be entitled to receive under the Social Security Act and have its coupon allotment distributed to it with such grant or payment. The State agency shall arrange for the issuance of coupons to eligible households and for the collection of sums required from

eligible households as payment therefor through the facilities of United States post offices directly or by mail, or in such other manner convenient to participating households as shall best insure their participation."

(C) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 10 are amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) By April 1, 1972, if a food stamp program is not being operated by the State agency in every political subdivision of any State, the Governor of the State shall have the right directly to administer the food stamp program in any such subdivision in which the program is not being operated. If the Governor should fail so to act by May 1, 1972, the Secretary shall directly administer the food stamp program in any such subdivision through any appropriate Federal, State, or county agency or through any public agency or private nonprofit organization approved by the Secretary, and such program shall be in operation by no later than June 30, 1972.

"(2) If, one hundred and eighty days after a food stamp program has begun to operate in a political subdivision in any State, a three-month period should occur in the course of which the number of persons participating in that program is less than 50 per centum of the number of persons in that subdivision who are from households whose annual income is below the poverty level as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (which number shall be determined annually on the basis of the most recent available data from the Secretary of Commerce, the Governor of the State in which such subdivision is located shall have the right directly to administer the food stamp program in such subdivision. If the Governor refuses to exercise his right or fails to do so within thirty days of being notified of said right by the Secretary, the Secretary shall directly administer such program in such subdivision or administer such program through any appropriate Federal, State, or county agency or through any public agency or private nonprofit organization approved by the Secretary. When the Secretary administers a food stamp program through a public agency or private nonprofit organization, he shall require the public agency or private nonprofit organization to observe all the appropriate provisions of this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto.

"(h) Members of an eligible household who are sixty years or over or an elderly person and his spouse may use coupons issued to them to purchase meals prepared for and served to them in any location other than a resident institution or boarding house by a political subdivision or a private nonprofit organization which is operated in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act and is recognized as a tax-exempt organization by the Internal Revenue Service. Meals served pursuant to this subsection shall be deemed 'food' for the purpose of this Act."

Cooperation With State Agencies

(5) Subsection (b) of section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay to each State agency an amount equal to 75 per centum of the sum of: (1) the direct salary, travel, and travel-related cost (including such fringe benefits as are normally paid) of personnel including the immediate supervisors of such personnel, for such times as they are employed in taking the action required

under the provisions of subsections 10(a) and 10(c) (3) and (4) of this Act and in making certification determination for households other than those which consist solely of recipients of public assistance. In addition, the Secretary shall pay an operating agency in a State 50 per centum of the cost of issuing coupons to eligible households and of collecting the sums required from eligible households as payment therefor and shall pay 100 per centum of such costs if the number of persons participating in the food stamp program administered by such agency is equivalent to or greater than 66 per centum of the number of persons in the political subdivision covered by that program who are from households whose annual income is below the poverty level as established by the Secretary pursuant to section 10(g) (2) of this Act. In the event that a public agency or private nonprofit organization is authorized to administer the food stamp program in any area in accordance with the provisions of section 10(g) of this Act or that such an agency or organization undertakes activities pursuant to section 10(a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to reimburse such agency or organization for all of the costs it incurs in carrying out such program or activities."

Appropriations

(6) Section 16 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 16. To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and not in excess of \$3,500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974. Sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this Act until expended. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotment shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. If the Secretary determines that any of the funds in such account are no longer required to carry out the provisions of this Act, such portion of such funds shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. With funds appropriated under this section, the Secretary is authorized to conduct, or contract with public agencies or private nonprofit organizations to conduct research, demonstration, or evaluation projects designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods to achieve the purposes of this Act."

SHORTER PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with the recent announcement by the Democratic Party of a nominating convention date, the electorate is condemned to suffer through yet another marathon presidential campaign. The Democrats will hold their convention during the week of July 9, 1972—some 4 months before election day.

As I have said numerous times before, such lengthy campaigns are unnecessary and actually counterproductive in our age of quick travel and mass media. Voters and candidates can communicate effectively in a concentrated month or two. Campaigns which extend beyond that point are expensive, exhaust the candi-

dates, and by boring the electorate reduce voter turnout.

I had been hopeful that the major parties would schedule their conventions at later dates. Many of our campaign excesses could be automatically reduced and possibly eliminated by voluntary action by the parties. Unfortunately, the parties, at least for 1972, will not do this. In fact, the recent announcement by the Democratic Party more than ever points out the need for the legislation which I have introduced to shorten the length of presidential campaigns.

My bill, H.R. 8606, would make impossible the nomination of candidates for President more than 60 days prior to election. There is no special significance to the number 60, and perhaps even a shorter time would prove desirable. Sixty days is simply a reasonable period for candidates and issues to develop. By eliminating the unnecessary hoopla of elections, our national campaigns could easily be conducted within this time limitation.

Last week, I reintroduced this legislation with seven cosponsors. I am hopeful that other Members will now join me in pushing for shorter campaigns.

I have today communicated with Chairman Lawrence O'Brien of the Democratic National Committee to express my disappointment that the Democratic National Convention has been scheduled for July 9, 1972 nearly 4 full months before the November 7 elections. I include the text of my letter to Chairman O'Brien:

JULY 6, 1971.

HON. LAWRENCE O'BRIEN,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: It was disappointing to learn that the Democratic National Committee has moved to hold the National Convention beginning July 9, 1972—nearly four full months before the election of November 7.

As you know, I have re-introduced legislation with seven co-sponsors (H.R. 8606) limiting the campaign period for a presidential election to 60 days. We strongly feel that 60 days is a sufficient and reasonable period for candidates to develop their issues and participate in a dynamic campaign. We also feel that a campaign of longer duration is counter-productive, expensive and leads to confusion rather than clarity to both issues and candidates.

In our age of quick travel and mass media, the ordeal of a four month campaign is unnecessary and excessive. Voters and candidates can communicate effectively in a concentrated month or two.

Although the Republican Party has not set an official date for its convention, it is apparent it will also be held several months before the election date. It is unfortunate that the Democratic Party has not taken the lead in establishing a shorter, more sensible campaign period. Such self-regulation would be preferable to legislative action.

I sincerely hope that in the future the Democratic National Committee will give more serious consideration to the advantages of a shorter campaign period.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO KNOW—ASNE CODE

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, from a strong personal conviction, I have been an ardent advocate of the right of the people to know. As a Member of this distinguished legislative body, I have openly supported responsible reporting on the part of the newspapers and have challenged with equal vigor journalistic endeavors which do not meet established professional standards.

The recent conflict between the executive department and certain newspapers has now been settled by the Supreme Court but there remain many knotty problems to be resolved by all three branches of Government and the fourth estate.

At this time in our Nation's life when the role of the press in the coverage of public affairs is under close scrutiny, I think it is useful to examine journalism's own standards of behavior. For that reason I ask that the ASNE Code be inserted in the RECORD for every Member's perusal:

CODE OF ETHICS OR CANONS OF JOURNALISM—AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

The primary function of newspapers is to communicate to the human race what its members do, feel and think. Journalism, therefore, demands of its practitioners the widest range of intelligence, or knowledge, and of experience, as well as natural and trained powers of observation and reasoning. To its opportunities as a chronicle are indissolubly linked its obligations as teacher and interpreter.

To the end of finding some means of codifying sound practice and just aspirations of American journalism, these canons are set forth:

I.

RESPONSIBILITY—The right of a newspaper to attract and hold readers is restricted by nothing but considerations of public welfare. The use a newspaper makes of the share of public attention it gains serves to determine its sense of responsibility, which it shares with every member of its staff. A journalist who uses his power for any selfish or otherwise unworthy purpose is faithless to a high trust.

II.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—Freedom of the press is to be guarded as a vital right of mankind. It is the unquestionable right to discuss whatever is not explicitly forbidden by law, including the wisdom of any restrictive statute.

III.

INDEPENDENCE—Freedom from all obligations except that of fidelity to the public interest is vital.

1. Promotion of any private interest contrary to the general welfare, for whatever reason, is not compatible with honest journalism. So-called news communications from private sources should not be published without public notice of their source or else substantiation of their claims to value as news, both in form and substance.

2. Partisanship, in editorial comment which knowingly departs from the truth, does violence to the best spirit of American journalism; in the news columns it is subversive of a fundamental principle of the profession.

IV.

SINCERITY, TRUTHFULNESS, ACCURACY—Good faith with the reader is the foundation of all journalism worthy of the name.

1. By every consideration of good faith a newspaper is constrained to be truthful. It is not to be excused for lack of thoroughness

or accuracy within its control, or failure to obtain command of these essential qualities.

2. Headlines should be fully warranted by the contents of the articles which they surmount.

V.

IMPARTIALITY—Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free from opinion or bias of any kind.

1. This rule does not apply to so-called special articles unmistakably devoted to advocacy or characterized by a signature authorizing the writer's own conclusions and interpretation.

VI.

FAIR PLAY—A newspaper should not publish unofficial charges affecting reputation or moral character without opportunity given to the accused to be heard; right practice demands the giving of such opportunity in all cases of serious accusation outside judicial proceedings.

1. A newspaper should not invade private rights or feeling without sure warrant of public right as distinguished from public curiosity.

2. It is the privilege, as it is the duty, of a newspaper to make prompt and complete correction of its own serious mistakes of fact or opinion, whatever their origin.

DECENCY—A newspaper cannot escape conviction of insincerity if while professing high moral purpose it supplies incentives to base conduct, such as are to be found in details of crime and vice, publication of which is not demonstrably for the general good. Lacking authority to enforce its canons the journalism here represented can but express the hope that deliberate pandering to vicious instincts will encounter effective public disapproval or yield to the influence of a preponderant professional condemnation.

WILD HORSES—LIFE OR DEATH?

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of Time magazine dated July 12, but already on the newsstand, there appears a spread of color photographs of great beauty—and great ugliness.

The photographs are of wild horses. The beautiful photographs show them running wild a symbol of the freedom and spirit of the great American West.

The ugly photographs show men bent on these horses' destruction. I am sorry the photographs cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but two of the captions may give my colleagues an idea of their content. They read: "Hunters closing in to lasso panic-stricken horses from a truck speeding over salt flats in Nevada" and "A lassoed horse drags a heavy rubber tire until he is exhausted and entangled in rope. Next stop: a dog-food plant."

On the first day of this Congress, I introduced legislation to halt this slaughter. The Senate recently passed similar legislation. I hope that we in the House will soon have an opportunity to act, too. The House Interior Subcommittee on Public Lands has carefully studied the issue and related issues involving the use of the grasslands for grazing. It is good news that they have refined the legislation and, a few weeks ago, reported it to the full Interior Committee. I hope it will be approved by the committee Wednesday. Thousands of children, who have writ-

ten letters and carried petitions throughout this land, are waiting for our approval of this legislation.

Thousands of children and thousands of adults are waiting to see if this Congress has the interest and the reverence for life that will lead to a solution to this problem.

Such diverse publications as the Christian Science Monitor and the Wall Street Journal and the children's Weekly Reader have devoted front page attention to this problem. I commend to my colleagues, as further evidence of the continuing interest of the American people in these animals, the article in Time:

THE FIGHT TO SAVE WILD HORSES

Rocky, a dark bay with an insignificant little head, a tiny, battle-scarred chest, concave flanks and protruding ribs, was caught on Easter Sunday and has been confined ever since on the outskirts of Reno in a small pen with heavy timbered fences eight feet high. At the approach of humans, Rocky races down to the other end of the pen, perks his ears, then lays them back and gallops in mad circles. Only the pen is too small, the turning angle too sharp, and Rocky keeps falling on his side. "Ain't he sorry?" laughs Mustanger Bill Victor. "He ain't hardly a horse at all."

Rocky's sorry plight typifies the state of the 18,000 wild horses, or mustangs, left in the United States, most of them barely subsisting in arid brush country in ten Western states or, like Rocky, languishing in pens. Descendants for the most part of proud Andalusian horses brought to the New World by Spanish conquistadors 400 years ago, they are the only remnants of herds that as recently as 1900 numbered in the millions. If nothing is done to protect them, conservationists warn, there may be none left by 1980.

THE GREAT HUNT

The mustang, which helped tame the West, is facing extinction for obvious reasons: it long ago became outmoded by trains, automobiles and farm machinery. Not worth preserving as game for hunters because it is too easy to track and kill, and not worth preserving for domestic use because it is too wild, stupid and inbred (according to some ranchers), the mustang has long been rounded up and "rendered"—a euphemism for slaughtered—by various entrepreneurs. At first the horse carcasses were valued only as a source of glue, clothing and violin bowstrings. But by 1945, industry recognized that wild horses were a cheap source of pet food. That was the signal for the beginning of the great hunt.

SUNDAY KILLERS

Between 1900 and 1950, more than a million wild horses were eliminated. Even the Government got into the act. From 1934 to 1963, the Bureau of Land Management and its predecessor agency condoned and even paid for the killing of mustangs. On numerous occasions the U.S. Forest Service held "close-outs" in which it gave ranchers 60 days to round up their own strays on forest service land—and then proceeded to shoot any remaining wild horses. The bureau's rationale: the mustangs chomp up valuable vegetation on Government property.

Far worse is the manner in which wild horses were "captured." They were panicked by planes, then lassoed from speeding vehicles and hobbled by being tied to 100-lb. truck tires (as vividly depicted in John Huston's 1961 film, *The Misfits*). Some were riddled with shotgun pellets and dragged aboard trucks half dead, others had their nostrils tied with baling wire, their legs broken, their eyes gouged out. Foals were left without mothers, who burst their lungs in futile attempts to escape mechanized pursuers. Some ranchers, resentful that wild horses compete with livestock for scarce food and

water in arid regions, dope water holes, or simply ride out into the hills and blow the mustangs' heads off. "Sunday mustangers" use weekends to rope and ride down wild horses often driving them to the point of exhaustion or death.

TIME Correspondent Timothy Tyler last week talked with Chug Utter, a Nevada mustanger who in 20 years has "gathered" 40,000 wild horses, and in whose pen Rocky awaits his fate. Chug remembers flying over wild herds in a light plane and using a "fourteen sawed-off shotgun just to spook 'em. We also used an electric shocking machine, but we didn't harm 'em. That's all poppycock." Anyway, says Chug philosophically, "there's only one end to being a horse, whether he's a champion race horse or a plug: dog food."

The hatred or, at best, brutal indifference that many ranchers feel toward the wild horse could stem from more than their impatience with anything other than livestock on the range. Hope Ryden, in her book *America's Last Wild Horses*, suggests another reason: "Perhaps these living reminders of an almost obliterated Indian culture are despised because they not only continue to enjoy a free-roaming existence in the wilderness, but haunt the American conscience as well."

Wild Horse Annie. The cruel treatment of the mustangs has begun to draw protest from some Americans. The most noted of them is Mrs. Velma Johnston (alias "Wild Horse Annie"), a frail Nevadan who once owned a horse ranch and has been battling 21 years to save mustangs. Under her leadership horse enthusiasts have pushed through a number of state laws designed to protect the animals. The thousands of letters Annie has sent to legislators and other government officials also helped to promote the 1959 federal statute known popularly as the "Wild Horse Annie Law," which prohibits the hunting of wild horses from airplanes or other motorized vehicles on the public domain. In addition, Annie's lobbying helped establish wildhorse sanctuaries in the Pryor Mountains of Montana and Wyoming and at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada.

But there are loopholes. The Wild Horse Annie Law, for instance, leaves enforcement to local communities, where the leading citizens often are ranchers. As a result, the hunting down of wild horses continues. Some brazen mustangers even let their branded horses mix with wild horses, then capture the entire bunch. If investigators discover wild horses in the herd, the mustanger explains that he was only trying to recover his stock.

New Laws. Largely through the efforts of Wild Horse Annie, new and tougher laws are now before Congress. The Senate passed its version last week; the House version is still in committee. Both bills would give full responsibility for protecting and managing wild horses to the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service, and would prohibit the killing of mustangs except by trained Government agents—and then only when the number of horses becomes excessive. Violators would be subject to fines of up to \$2,000, one year in jail, or both. The bills would make wild horses a part of the national heritage, and establish new refuges on public lands.

Ecologists and conservationists are joining forces with those who want to preserve wild horses for humane and aesthetic reasons. While ecological studies are incomplete, they seem to confirm that wild horses do not compete with livestock, because they usually roam mountainous regions inaccessible to cattle, and do not compete with other wildlife, because they are grass eaters while most herbivores eat brush.

Scientists also say that studies show the birth rate of mustangs is low and that their number is kept low by natural enemies like

mountain lions, wolves and disease. Wild Horse Annie is grateful to her new allies but feels that there is a less pragmatic, more important reason for preserving the horses. "To the people of America," she says, "mustangs represent the kind of freedom we were founded on."

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS ENTER THE VOTING BOOTH

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week the 26th amendment to our Constitution, granting 18-year-old Americans the right to vote in all Federal, State, and local elections, was assured of ratification. The Ohio State Legislature became the 38th State to approve of this change in our basic law.

As an active supporter of the 18-year-old vote, I am extremely gratified on this historic occasion. It is indeed a pleasure to welcome an additional 11 million young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21 into the electorate. In addition, I am especially pleased that the Ohio action makes the 26th amendment the swiftest to be adopted by our States, having been ratified in record time only 3 months after Congress approved this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, today's youth are more highly qualified than ever before to assume the responsibility of voter participation. At present, 75 percent of our people graduate from high school. By comparison, 43 percent completed high school 30 years ago in 1940. Over 40 percent of our young people will attend college at some point. In contrast, in 1940 only 16 percent of young people expected to attend college.

It was during the Middle Ages that the age of 21 was selected to signify attaining adulthood. It was at that age that a young knight was considered capable of wearing a full suit of armor, brandishing a sword and wielding a lance. Here in 1971, more than half a millennium later, it is common for young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21 to don flack jackets, carry M-16's and assume all the burdensome responsibilities of modern manhood. Each day young American boys lay down their lives in Vietnam, that quagmire of misery in Southeast Asia. The fact is that about 35 percent of our forces in Vietnam are under 21. More than 20,000, almost half of all our men who have died in action there, had not attained their 21st birthday.

Four States already had a voting age lower than 21. In Georgia and Kentucky, the voting age was 18. In Alaska, the age was 19 and in Hawaii, 20.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this generation of young people is the best ever—that they are healthier, quicker of mind, and better trained than their predecessors. Also, there is a moral energy in this generation that exceeds that of 18-year-old boys and girls of any previous generation. Their interest in public affairs and their potential for public service at home and abroad have been clearly shown in their participation in the Peace Corps, in VISTA, and through the active part that

millions of young Americans have played in the political events of recent years.

At a time when there is so much talk of a generation gap and alienated youth threatening to overthrow the establishment and drop out of society, extending the franchise to 18-year-olds is a sensible countermeasure that will help to keep the majority of our youth politically active in our society, where they have important contributions to make.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that our 18-year-olds will cherish the precious right to vote as we do and will recognize it for what it is—the foundation of our American system of government. I am confident that they will exercise their new franchise intelligently and responsibly.

SOMETHING IS OUT OF COMMISSION

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the time is long past for Congress to curb the extensive proliferation of public advisory commissions. These commissions place an onerous and unwarranted burden on the sagging shoulders of the American taxpayer.

The fact is that there are an estimated 2,600 to 3,200 advisory and interagency commissions and committees currently existing in our Federal Government. Many of these are inactive, meaningless, obsolete or redundant.

Mr. Speaker, these advisory committees currently cost the American people approximately \$75 million a year in operating expenses. This represents an appalling indulgence in bureaucratic wastefulness, especially when so many Americans are caught between the twin pincers of unemployment and inflation, and so many others are living below the poverty level.

Total committee membership encompasses about 20,000 individuals, with an assigned staff of approximately 4,000 persons.

Mr. Speaker, these and other shocking facts detailing the sprawling growth of advisory bodies came to light during hearings held last year before the House Special Studies Subcommittee, then chaired by the distinguished Representative from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

Earlier this year, that distinguished Representative introduced H.R. 4383, "The Federal Advisory Committee Standards Act," to implement the subcommittee's recommendations, aimed at bringing advisory commissions under congressional control. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation and commend the able Representative from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) for his significant contribution in fathoming the murky depths of this confusing subject.

Mr. Speaker, every administration since the days of George Washington has utilized advisory bodies. President Washington himself personally appointed a commission to try to settle the Whiskey Rebellion. It is only during the last quarter of a century, however, that the system of advisory committees has

quietly developed into a fifth branch of our American Government, along with the constitutionally created legislative, executive, and judicial branches and the independent regulatory agencies.

Congress should come to realize that an invitation to advise can also by subtle steps confer both the power to regulate and the power to legislate.

The amounts spent on funding individual advisory panels, coupled with some commissions' subsequent lack of results, merit special attention. For example, the recent Commission on Obscenity and Pornography produced a report at a cost of \$1.8 million to the American people, yet the report was publicly disavowed by President Nixon even prior to its submission. During the last administration, the President chose to ignore the final report of the National Commission on Urban Problems, which he and his staff had activated and sponsored. The cost to the American taxpayer of this report came to \$1.5 million.

Beyond their sheer numbers and cost, advisory commissions suffer from the glaring reality that often committees are established which duplicate the functions of previously existing advisory bodies. For example, there are at least four committees on women's rights: a Citizens' Advisory Committee on the Status of Women; an Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women; the President's Study Group on Careers for Women; and the Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities.

There are even commissions created for the purpose of advising other commissions. The Advisory Committee on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws was established in 1966 to advise and consult with the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. Also, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission has an Advisory Council and five outside study groups. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare's Commission on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health has two subsidiary advisory panels.

Mr. Speaker, another problem with advisory commissions is the fact that because of loose or often nonexistent termination requirements, many advisory panels never die—they just fade away. We often forget that many commissions outlast Presidents and administrations. For example, the Marine Corps Memorial Commission was established in 1947 to consider and formulate plans for the erection of an appropriate memorial on a site in Grant Park, Chicago. The Commission has done little or nothing in 24 years of existence, and there is no indication that a memorial will be erected.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to apply strict birth-control regulation and administrative supervision to insure that currently existing advisory commissions and bodies created for this purpose in the future will be productive and useful. Adoption of the Federal Advisory Committee Standards Act would be an important first step toward creating commissions that will fulfill their destiny. I hope that the proposed reform legislation

on this all-too-little-publicized yet vitally pressing subject will be enacted during the current session.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for today through Thursday, July 8, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee, for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for today through Thursday, July 15, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BEVILL (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. BIESTER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 5 through July 13, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the UCC Revision for Universal and Berne Copyright Convention in Paris.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TERRY.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BADILLO in three instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in three instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in six instances.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 7, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

932. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1971 progress report on the Western United States water plan, pursuant to the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968 Public Law 90-537; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

933. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft or proposed legislation to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

934. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the report on the financial condition of the Penn Central Transportation Co. as of April 30, 1971, pursuant to section 10 of the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

935. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending application and hearing cases in the Commission as of May 31, 1971, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

936. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

937. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

938. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

939. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

940. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in case

No. A-4993823, pursuant to section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

941. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on better cost accounting needed for operation and maintenance of military family housing, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations

942. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in management of motor equipment activities, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

943. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities for improving the southern Monterey rural health project, King City, Calif.; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 9596. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9597. A bill to subject certain nationals or citizens of the United States to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts for their crimes committed outside the United States and to provide for the apprehension, restraint, removal, and delivery of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9598. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide for the awarding of a "Supreme Sacrifice Medal" to relatives of members of the Armed Forces killed in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 9599. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to conduct an election for the purpose of a referendum on the question of statehood for the residents of the present District, election of delegates to a constitutional convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to include certain organizations providing laundry or linen services to hospitals among the cooperative hospital service organizations entitled to tax exemption thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself and Mr. POBELL):

H.R. 9601. A bill to authorize the Office of Management and Budget to establish a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees throughout the Federal Government which are created to advise officers and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOW, Mr. BRAY, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.R. 9602. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to enlarge the mission of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and to assist in enlarging the mission of the State Maritime academies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution: Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.J. Res. 768. A resolution: White House Conference on Environment and International Law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

233. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the creation of a Golden Gate National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

234. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

236. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

237. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

238. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

239. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the protection of the beaches and shoreline of Ventura County; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

96. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres, Albuquerque, N. Mex., relative to the municipal status of certain community land grants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

97. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners, Ottawa County, Mich., relative to amending the Social Security Act to assist the aged in public facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

98. Also, petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Trust Territory of the Pacific, relative to amending the tariff laws to allow entry of Micronesian products into the United States on the same basis as provided for insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Tuesday, July 6, 1971

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

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

Eternal Father, ruler of men and nations, as we return to this Hallowed Hall, we thank Thee for respite from daily duties, and for the annual rituals renewing our national heritage befitting "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In the days before us, guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom has been committed the government of this Nation, and grant them special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength: that upholding what is right, and following what is true, they may obey Thy holy will and fulfill Thy divine pur-

pose, to the honor and glory of Thy name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 30, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 1, 1971, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2133) to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months.

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 31) to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communi-

ties in providing needed public services, and for other purposes.

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 31. An act to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes;

S. 2133. An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months; and

H.R. 9271. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 30, 1971, the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 9271) on July 1, 1971.