the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, H.R. 9910, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The pending question at that time will be the amendment which was called up a few minutes ago by the distinguished assistant Republican leader, an amendment by Mr. BROCK and Mr. BUCKLEY.

I ask unanimous consent that the time on the amendment not start running until tomorrow.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, under the agreement, time on any amendment to the bill is limited to 2 hours. Time on any amendment to an amendment is limited to 30 minutes. Time on any motion or appeal, with the exception of a motion to lay on the table, is limited to 30 minutes.

Rollcall votes will be held tomorrow.

The distinguished majority leader indicated a few minutes ago that the Senate will work late tomorrow and, if necessary, on Friday, in order to complete action on the bill, without having a Saturday session.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 28, 1971, at 10 a.m.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate October 27, 1971:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

George A. Smathers, of Florida, to be a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Peter G. Peterson, resigned, which was sent to the Senate on September 30, 1971.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, October 27, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He that would love life and see good days, let him turn away from evil and do right, let him seek peace and pursue it.—I Peter 3: 10, 11.

Almighty and merciful God, who hast called us into the service of our country, open our eyes to see Thy wonderful works about us and stimulate our minds to proclaim Thy laws of justice and good will to our people and to all the nations of the world.

Help us as a Republic to learn to live together according to the Golden Rule and to make our contribution to life and liberty on our planet.

Bless Thou our prisoners of war, our veterans, and all who work for our country. Hasten the time when wars shall cease and peace shall reign in the hearts of all.

In the spirit of Him who brings peace to men 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to extend the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969.

DOWN WITH THE U.N.? HOW ABOUT NATO?

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, does the China voting at the United Nations put in question the value of that organization? If so, it puts in question at least equally the value of NATO, for only three of our NATO allies—Greece, Portugal, and Luxembourg—voted with us, four of our allies abstained, and the remaining six including our closest friends—Canada, France, and the United Kingdom—opposed us.

Does this not say something, Mr. Speaker, about the viability of the "two Chinas" position the administration tried so hard to sell?

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT OUR ALLIES

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) recounted just a moment ago the fact that six of our NATO allies deserted us on the crucial China vote in the U.N. and four others abstained, which under such circumstances is about the same thing. He said he wondered if this did not raise some questions about the validity of our policy.

I wonder if it does not raise some questions about our allies to whom we have been contributing so generously of our resources and our manpower for so many years. When we really needed them, where were they?

THE UNITED NATIONS VOTE AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, no one ever suggested that U.S. foreign aid was supposed to buy friendship, but surely many of us have hoped that allocations would indirectly at least be an investment in good will.

Mr. Speaker, the vote in the United Nations earlier this week to expel our friend Taiwan and seat Communist Red China is a reflection of how little we gain from the foreign aid program.

Here is a list of the recipients of U.S. foreign assistance in 1970 who voted against the U.S. two-China proposal:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Britain, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Ecuador.

Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Kenya.

Laos, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, South Yemen, Republic of the Congo.

Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan.

Syria, Tanzania, Togo, Trinidad and Tobaga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Earlier this year the bill to extend foreign assistance passed the House by a narrow margin of only eight votes of which one was mine. Today the bill, on the basis of the record of the United Nations' vote, could easily be defeated. Perhaps the United States should not punish its enemies, but I do not see the logic in rewarding them.

SHALL WE CONTINUE TO SUBSIDIZE "DEADBEAT DEMOCRACY"?

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk about being realistic regarding the United Nations and its action in ousting Formosa from membership. I believe fully that this is, indeed, a time for realism. It is time for this Congress to take a realistic look at just what the U.N. is, what it does, and what our role has been and should be.

Is it realistic that the Maldive Islands with 96,000 people or Qatar with 60,000 have the same vote in determining the status of world nations that we do with 200 million people? Yet many of those who preach one-man, one-vote in the United States are supporting this lopsided voting system in the U.N. It is significant that Taiwan, which was let out, has a larger population at 14 million than more than half of the U.N. member countries. There are 41 African "states" which in reality are little more than aggrandized principalities, all carrying full voting rights in the U.N.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Is it realistic that the United States pay one-third of the cost of the U.N. while 129 other countries only pay a pittance each—and 76 of them are getting a partly free ride by refusing to pay their dues and assessments? Is it realistic for us to continue subsidizing "deadbeat democracy"? I think not.

BUSING OF SCHOOLCHILDREN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the caucus room of the Cannon Building a group of citizens assembled to talk to some of their Congressmen about one of the most pressing issues in America today, the issue of schoolbusing which involves the busing of schoolchildren out of their neighborhoods and into other areas because sociologists believe this is the best way to educate.

It is apparent to me this is not an issue that is going to die, because while I was listening to some of the mothers, they made it very clear that where their children are concerned, they are willing to go to whatever lengths are necessary in order to insure that they may have their children attend the neighborhood schools, that they themselves may participate in the local PTA's, and not have their children bused across town.

I certainly applaud the efforts of these people. Members of Congress will be hearing from them throughout the day. They are courteous but forceful, and they want the Members to know they do mean business. I am certain the Members of Congress will show these visitors every courtesy.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 319]

Abourezk	Eckhardt	Meeds
Alexander	Edmondson	Mills, Ark.
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Ala.	Mitchell
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Morgan
Archer	Evins, Tenn.	Patman
Arends	Foley	Pepper
Baring	Gallagher	Pike
Barrett	Grasso	Reid, N.Y.
Blackburn	Gray	Roberts
Blanton	Gubser	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Gude	Rosenthal
Burton	Halpern	Sandman
Caffery	Hamilton	Scheuer
Chisholm	Hébert	Shipley
Clark	Hicks, Mass.	Steiger, Wis.
Clay	Holifield	Stephens
Crane	Howard	Stokes
Culver	Jarman	Ullman
Derwinski	Jones, Tenn.	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Keith	Wilson, Charles H.
Downing	Kuykendall	Zwach
Dwyer	Landrum	
	Long, La.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11418) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate not exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11418, with Mr. ADAMS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I particularly want to begin this statement by an expression of appreciation to the members of the Subcommittee on Military Construction and to the staff. As chairman I have been particularly blessed by the caliber and cooperation of the people with whom I have worked. I think we have brought a good bill to the floor, and it is to their strong help credit is due for this fact.

Mr. Chairman, the budget estimates for military construction as submitted to the Congress for fiscal 1972 totaled $2,313,375,000. Of this amount, $183,570,000 must be deducted because of lack of authorization for Safeguard construction and family housing, leaving a new budget figure of $2,129,805,000. Recommended for appropriation in the bill before you is $2,012,446,000. The reduction includes both authorization and appropriation cuts.

It will be noted in your report that major emphasis is placed on family housing. We propose $249 million for new housing construction. However, this is only 12 percent of the total. It will finance 9,432 new units. An additional 430 units are requested for Safeguard sites that are not funded in this bill because of lack of authorization. They will be considered in connection with the defense appropriation bill.

It is significant that the Committee and the Department of Defense agree that a minimum satisfactory level of 12,500 units is required for annual on-base construction. We have never achieved that level of construction and it is estimated that the actual deficit in housing for all military families is nearly one-half million units. For years, insufficient budget requests, reductions by Congress, and deferments by DOD have not allowed needed family housing construction to proceed. This has contributed to morale problems in the military services and added to the difficulty of retaining qualified personnel. When the families are unhappy, the man in uniform is unhappy. They look for better living conditions elsewhere in other careers. We believe that adequate family housing is critical to the maintenance of effective military services in today's world and essential to any hope for an all-volunteer service.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I noted before the gentleman indicated funds for Safeguard were deleted from this appropriations bill. Are there not funds for the five construction sites in this bill?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct, and I intend to discuss that within a very few minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there also is the pressing need to undertake a sizable program of improvements and modernization to family quarters. It is estimated that the deficit here is one-half billion dollars, but only about 10 percent of that amount, or $49 million, is available in this year's bill for that purpose. And to get this amount, the committee had to add $15 million above the budget. Nevertheless, the fact remains that we are doing better for family housing in this bill than ever before.

The committee takes particular pride in the fact that an important breakthrough is being made in housing as a result of an amendment sponsored by committee members to the housing bill of last year. It provides low-income military families priority of occupation in certain new section 236 projects and eligibility for assistance under rental assistance programs. This directly affects a category of critical need in that it benefits the lower enlisted grades who are ineligible for on-base family housing. These young people are going to fall in love, get married and have babies just as other young people do and many of them have an extremely hard time financially. Heretofore they have suffered considerable disadvantage in obtaining section 236 housing due to long waiting lists and frequent reassignment. These difficulties are overcome under the new law and a substantial building program is underway near many military bases to help this group. It is not enough, but it helps.

One instance of the need for family housing is shown in a nonbudgeted item for Camp Drum at Plattsburgh, N.Y. This year, for the first time, a committee was apprised of the seriousness of the family housing problem there. This information did not come from military

sources, but through the distinguished Congressman from that district. Subsequently one of our committee members, the gentleman from Michigan, studied the problem and found a deplorable situation which obviously requires correction. It will be accomplished in this bill.

The committee also has given particular consideration to the needs for bachelor housing, both officer and enlisted. This is another of the principal items in the 1972 bill. The amount more than doubles that for the previous year. The Army and the Navy particularly have suffered from inadequate bachelor housing. The Air Force has been more aggressive in seeking to meet its needs in this area and the Air Force's deficiency in troop housing is not as serious as those of other services.

The committee is particularly concerned about the need for improvements to troop housing overseas. Apparently, this is most critical in Germany where committee personnel report that barracks space in some of the old German kasernes occupied by the U.S. Army personnel is deplorable and below all reasonable standards. Some of the Army's problems with troops in Germany are attributed directly to poor living conditions. The Army is attempting to improve these problems and the program which was undertaken in 1968 is proceeding on schedule. It is estimated the cost of renovation is $229,000,000 but thus far, only $62,000,000 has been set aside for this purpose. We have a long way to go and this is a program which may be given additional emphasis.

Both family and troop housing have suffered during the buildup in Southeast Asia. There has also been some uncertainty about postwar force levels in base utilization. These problems now are clearing up and the committee is glad to have an opportunity as a result of larger budget requests and through justifiable additions beyond the budget level to take more appropriate steps to meet the needs in these areas.

Please note the Walter Reed Army Medical Center appropriation of $101,670,000. This is the second step in the construction of a new and more modern Walter Reed Medical Center on the site of the present antiquated facility. It will provide a 1,280-bed general hospital with the most modern medical facilities now available. The building is designed to have the flexibility to allow new equipment to be installed as it is developed. It will be one of the foremost medical centers in the world. It will also be one of the most costly. The committee recognizes the need for fully modern and complete medical facilities for military personnel and their dependents, but the Army is cautioned to exercise greatest care to keep costs at acceptable levels.

Another significant increase recommended is for facilities to control pollution, particularly air and water pollution, at military bases. This year the amount recommended is $131,300,000 compared to $74,000,000 last year. The Department of Defense has been a leader in this vital area and with the present schedule, the majority of the work can be completed by the end of fiscal 1973.

There are pollution problems which have not been solved—particularly pollution caused by aircraft engines and shipboard waste. These present unusual difficulties which are costly of solution. Additional effort is needed and has been urged by the committee to attempt the development of less costly devices to deal with these particular pollution problems. Present estimates are unbelievably high.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I note the Congresswoman who interrupted the distinguished gentleman a while ago is not on the floor to hear his explanation after having made a certain query. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present so that she might hear this lucid explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-nine members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 320]

Alexander	Eckhardt	Morgan
Anderson, Ill.	Edmondson	Nedzi
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Patman
Archer	Esch	Powell
Arends	Evans, Colo.	Roberts
Ashley	Evins, Tenn.	Rooney, N.Y.
Baring	Foley	Rosenthal
Barrett	Fraser	Sandman
Blackburn	Frey	Scheuer
Blanton	Gray	Schmitz
Blatnik	Gude	Schneebeli
Brinkley	Halpern	Seiberling
Brotzman	Hastings	Shipley
Buchanan	Hawkins	Smith, Calif.
Burton	Hébert	Stanton, James V.
Byron	Hicks, Mass.	Stokes
Caffery	Holifield	Symington
Chisholm	Howard	Teague, Calif.
Clark	Jarman	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Jones, Tenn.	Thompson, N.J.
Crane	Keith	Ullman
Culver	Landrum	Van Deerlin
Derwinski	Link	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Long, La.	Wilson, Charles H.
Dingell	Madden	
Dwyer	Meeds	
	Mills, Ark.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAMS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11418, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 352 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the Committee rose the gentleman from Florida, had consumed 12 minutes. At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if I may now have the attention of the gentlewoman from New York, under the watchful eye of the gentleman from Missouri, I would like to call attention to the fact that the Committee has recommended funding only for that portion of the military construction budget request for Safeguard for which there is permanent authorization. I am reading from the Committee report on page 7:

> The Committee has recommended funding of that portion of the military construction budget request for Safeguard for which there is permanent authorization available. This amounts to $15,300,000 for planning authorized under 31 U.S.C. 723 and $5,200,000 for access roads authorized under 23 U.S.C. 210. It has been necessary to defer appropriations for the remainder of the Safeguard request until authorization is provided. Accordingly, the Committee has not acted upon $172,500,000 which is requested for Safeguard construction and $11,070,000 requested for family housing at Safeguard sites.

There is no construction money for Safeguard facilities in this bill. Does that answer the gentlewoman's question?

Mrs. ABZUG. Yes. Thank you. In other words, there is money for planning the Safeguard missile but not for construction?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. There are no funds for construction of Safeguard facilities.

Mrs. ABZUG. May I ask the gentleman one other question? Will the gentleman yield for one other question the answer to which I will be very happy to seek while I am on the floor?

Mr. SIKES. Of course.

Mrs. ABZUG. That is how much is allocated in this bill for construction of bases abroad, for military construction for NATO structures?

Mr. SIKES. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Utah to answer that question.

Mr. McKAY. The figures are located on page 35 of the report. They amount to $110 million for the regular construction program. In addition there are minor amounts for pollution abatement and family housing at a few permanent overseas locations.

Mr. SIKES. And the details are carried in the report. Incidentally, none of that is for Southeast Asia. I think the gentlewoman will be interested in that, also.

Now, if I may proceed, there is, of course, interest in Safeguard. The committee has recommended funding of $15,300,000 for planning and $5,200,000 for access roads. There is a permanent authorization for these items. Authorization action on the remainder of the Safeguard request, $172,500,000 plus $11,700,000 for family housing, has not been completed and these funds are not included in this bill. They will be considered in connection with the defense appropriation bill. The funds which are included will continue planning to the National Command Authority site near Washington, and Warren Air Base, and provide access roads at Warren. These first steps are necessary in order to prepare for an orderly construction program at these sites. They do not constitute deployment at these sites. The remainder of the planning funds requested are for planning support for construction at Grand Forks, Malmstrom, and Whiteman as well as overall standard design work, engineering and design support for construction, and planning in support of logistics and maintenance systems.

It will be noted that the committee has approved the addition of $11-plus million for a new materials laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The laboratory is to conduct tests on materials in the Air Force inventory, largely as a follow-on to verify similar tests conducted by private industry and university laboratories. There has been a question

of duplication of programs in the private sector and there has been criticism of lack of effort to modernize and properly maintain present permanent type brick laboratory buildings. Nevertheless, the committee is impressed with the strong case made for the project by Air Force officials and by our own colleagues who are familiar with the project.

However, the committee points to the fact that since 1955 there have been appropriations of $75 million for laboratory construction at Wright-Patterson. Before other expensive new space is requested, the committee feels strongly that a more realistic effort be made to find better ways to utilize and modernize existing space. It is possible that the funds herein provided can be used more properly to promote other high priority laboratory needs and not solely for materials research. In any event, the committee feels that a thorough review of research facilities is required and that there must be an updating of requirements and available resources before additional projects of this nature are submitted to Congress.

We have again placed strong stress on the need for stronger representation by our representatives to obtain a larger percentage of funding by NATO countries for facilities which are required for NATO. Possibly our allies know that we are impatient people and that we quite likely will fund a project when we see it is needed rather than accept the delays necessary to get NATO approval and joint funding. We do run a risk by delays in availability on these projects. We don't want our own forces left unprotected in an emergency. The only answer is stronger efforts by our team for joint action on timely construction. This will be noted on page 8 in your report.

This concern is emphasized by statements from Defense Secretary Laird who has attended NATO meetings in Europe and who has expressed dissatisfaction over the failure of our NATO partners to carry out improvements they have pledged to make in their own armed forces. As in most everything else we do, the United States carries the lion's share of the burden. The American taxpayer is becoming increasingly unhappy about this situation.

There are, of course, a great many military installations, and despite our best efforts we cannot be fully apprised of conditions at all of them. A very good example is the Naval Home at Philadelphia. For the first time in my memory, a request was made for funds for rehabilitation of this structure. Inquiries revealed that the Naval Home is not funded in the same manner in which the Soldiers' Home at Washington is funded. It depends upon actual appropriations. The Soldiers' Home is maintained by small deductions from each soldier's pay each month. Consequently the latter has plenty of funds to maintain a fully adequate and reasonably modern facility. In contrast, an act of 1934 abolished the Naval pension fund which had supported the Naval Home, transferred $14,800,000 belonging to the Naval Home to the Treasury. Since 1935, the Naval Home has been dependent upon appropriations, but less than $1½ million has been spent on improvements. A visit by committee staff showed that the Naval Home is in deplorable condition and must be moved or rebuilt. We are providing funds that are actually essential for a continued operation of the facility during the current fiscal year, and we are asking that proper studies be undertaken toward providing a modern plant for the Naval Home at a proper location.

The committee has reviewed the General Accounting Office report—B–159451—entitled, "A Case History Showing Need for Improvements in the Management of Overseas Military Construction Contracts." Further, the comments of the Department of Defense, those of the Air Force, and other pertinent information have been carefully considered on the Tuy Hoa Air Base in Vietnam.

The outstanding job of the Air Force in managing the construction of Tuy Hoa Airbase is acknowledged by the committee. It is pleasing to note, that under the pressure of military urgency and extreme adverse conditions, such a major project was not only completed ahead of schedule but at a cost less than any other similar base built in Vietnam.

The committee is encouraged by such a demonstration of outstanding technical, operational, and managerial capability. Where cost overruns occurred on other construction projects within Vietnam, it is significant that this project was completed within the cost originally estimated in spite of adverse weather conditions, hostile environment, long supply lines, uncertain labor force, and unusual inflationary and balance-of-payment considerations.

It is quite obvious that the Air Force possesses the technical and managerial capability to accomplish such major construction projects in a most effective and efficient manner. The committee feels that it would be highly desirable for the Department of Defense to make full use of such expertise in the future.

Your committee calls attention to a growing problem of providing adequate school facilities for military dependents in the vicinity of military installations in the United States. In more and more localities, the local school systems cannot provide safe, decent facilities. There is growing pressure on both Federal and local funds for school construction and the budget requests for construction under the impacted area program are woefully insufficient to cover the applications. In a few areas, schools are built and operated on military bases by HUD, but in some States this is actually prohibited by local law. There is no money in this bill, but the committee calls attention to the gravity of the problem and asks that a full review on the entire subject of school construction funding be undertaken, including the Department of Defense.

Specific reductions and additions are spelled out in the report before you. For the Army, the authorizations are reduced by $19,102,000 and this committee recommends an additional reduction of $13,324,000. This is carried on pages 11 and 12 of your report. The total appropriation recommended for the Army is $437,274,000.

For the Navy, the authorizing committees made reductions totaling $30,569,000. We recommend additional reductions in appropriations totaling $31,165,000. However, a very substantial part of this—$16,200,000—is for phase I of a $150,000,000 Defense office building at Bolling/Anacostia. The amortization schedules on this building do not make it an attractive expenditure, and in addition, the committee is concerned with lack of effort to bring about decentralization of military activities in the Washington area. For years we have heard that there will be a reduction of military activities in the Washington area, but the trend has to some extent been just the opposite. It occurs to me that one very good way for revenue sharing would be to distribute some of the tremendous concentration of military activity now in Washington to other cities throughout the Nation. It would also make Washington a less inviting defense target. It is well to call to your attention that this building is only one part of a $1.6 billion construction plan for the District of Columbia. Nevertheless the committee insists that the valuable area be retained for defense needs.

Details on Navy construction are carried on pages 13 to 15. The total recommended appropriation is $343,766,000.

The Air Force has the smallest budget request. The authorizing legislation makes a net reduction of $30,173,000 and this committee recommends additional reductions of $13,396,000. Details are spelled out on pages 16 through 18. The total recommended for the Air Force is $273,031,000.

The committee feels that the current construction program with its strong emphasis on family and troop housing represents the most significant forward step in military construction in years. Reductions that we have made in other programs are not large, nor is there justification for large cuts. Military construction budgets always have been small in relation to need, and this bill, like other recent bills was heavily cut before it came to Congress. Other cuts were made in the authorizing process. We feel that our recommendations are sound and we trust we will have support of the committee's actions.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as usual, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) has outlined in great detail the items that are of concern in this matter of the military construction appropriation bill. I do not want to go over the same items and the same ground as the gentleman has covered, and therefore my remarks are going to be very brief.

The gentleman from Florida has indicated that in this legislation we are moving with great strides in the housing area not only for family housing, but the barracks that our men are going to use on our military installations as well.

I would like to indicate for those from the Defense Department who will be reading this RECORD—and I am sure that

they will be reading it—that they should take another look at the bedroom mixture we have in our family housing, and get to more three-bedroom and four-bedroom housing than we have now, because there is an excess of two-bedroom housing, and if they have any question about it I would be glad to visit with them in my office because I believe this is a subject we ought to be concerned about.

We are, I believe, in this legislation upgrading the facilities that need to be upgraded.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, serving under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is a real pleasure, as is serving with all of the members of that subcommittee, and I would state that we have only one purpose in mind, and that is to provide for the military service those things that are needed to make it function properly, and make it attractive for our men who serve in our military services. We have always considered this to be an essential part of the defense of our country.

We have worked hard and long in trying to bring forth this bill. The hearings are quite extensive, and to those of you who may have any questions about some of the details I would refer you to those hearings. We have a very well-written report.

I do want to make one brief comment on the new Defense office building that the gentleman from Florida alluded to. I personally have some differences of opinion in this area. I am concerned about the fact that we did not build this about 6 years ago when we had an opportunity to build it at a greatly reduced cost. If you will look at the hearings you will find that we have at the present time in the Defense Department a tremendous amount of leased space in the metropolitan area of Washington. The number of square feet that are proposed in the new Defense office building are really less than we have now in substandard Government-owned and substandard leased space for our Defense people.

The Defense Department, under our former colleague, Secretary Laird, has agreed that they are going to try to reduce the number of units that we have here in Washington. But we had better understand that even with this reduction we can look forward—as this space becomes even more substandard to our requirements—to going out and leasing more space in some of the large office centers such as Crystal City and Rosslyn. Most of these places are now occupied by lease from the Defense Department.

I wish that we had really listened to the Committee on Armed Services and appropriated this money a long time ago when the late chairman of the committee, Mr. Rivers, was concerned about it.

I do want to say this, however, and to put it in the RECORD that we have a concern about the importance of keeping that property in the Department of Defense.

Now I know as a result of our tearing this down that there are going to be many who are going to want to use this property for some other purpose. One of the things that the Department of Defense can be criticised for, is that sometimes they go out and have to buy property at a high price—they do not look far enough down the road as to their planning for future requirements. If that property is lost to the Department of Defense, we can blame no one but ourselves if they have to go out and locate new property.

We are looking down the road to the requirements of new Defense Intelligence Agency space. It is essential that this Agency locate here. I think we should consider this as a potential site for the Defense Intelligence Agency office building.

In this bill we are going to proceed with the construction of the new Walter Reed Hospital, a large medical facility out at the old Walter Reed site. Many of you have been out there. As you realize, it has been there for many, many years and it is getting in a very deteriorated condition. So there is $101 million for that in this bill—which is only one-half the cost, if that, to complete this kind of complete medical facility.

I think the Committee on Armed Services did turn out a piece of legislation that we have not considered yet, but I believe it has to do with the possibility of a new defense medical center. If that defense medical center is going to turn out 300 physicians a year for the military, then this is going to be a sizable construction item which is probably going to be here in the District of Columbia because of the close availability of Walter Reed and the Bethesda Medical Center, medical facilities which it is so essential to have in an adequate medical center.

When you consider that the present medical centers usually turn out about 80 doctors a year, you can get some idea of the size of the program that we are anticipating will probably be in this area.

I do not want to take any further time because, as I said, the distinguished gentleman from Florida has covered the details of the bill very well. If there are any questions, I am sure we have people here who will try to answer them for you.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this bill. I want to pay tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) who has presided over this committee with distinction.

I confine my remarks to one aspect, the problem of housing, because we all know there is a tremendous housing backlog for the armed services. It is unlikely—as valiantly as we have tried over the years—that we will be able to clear up the backlog because the necessary money is not available.

It is important, therefore, to call attention to the fact that the military does not make the best use of its existing housing.

To give you an actual case before our committee—a year or so ago the Army proposed to move the intelligence functions located at Fort Holabird in the Baltimore area to Fort Huachuca in Arizona.

At that time the chairman, the head of the subcommittee staff, and I visited Fort Huachuca. We looked at the housing situation and pointed out that the housing in the Huachuca area was inadequate to care for this tremendous move. About 40 percent of the people in the nearby town were living in trailers. We could not see where the people transferred from Holabird would be housed.

The Army came before us and blandly said, "There will be plenty of housing, we assure you. The total cost of this will be a couple of million dollars."

We estimated the cost of the move would be approximately $60 million.

Well, the Army transferred these activities to Huachuca, despite the warnings. Then we began to hear the complaints of the people who moved out there. People were driving up and down the streets for hours hunting for a place to stay. We learned that there absolutely was not a place to live anywhere around.

We called the Army's attention to this. The Army denied it. I called up the colonel in charge out there. He said, "I am not allowed to say anything about this," and hung up.

Then we began to call the real estate agencies. We called one real estate agency after another and heard the same story from every one. Despite what the Army had said, the real estate firms said, 'There is no housing out here. This is the blackest situation you ever heard of."

A short time after that the Army finally issued a communique to its personnel saying, "There is no housing in Huachuca. Don't move your families out there. Don't even move your furniture out there because there is no place to store furniture within 200 miles." So we asked General Yates to come before our committee. We presented him with this communique, and he said, "I am embarrassed."

So I would like to read the official comments in the committee report:

COMMENTS

Last year, the Committee directed the Army to further review its plans to move intelligence functions from Fort Holabird, Maryland to Fort Huachuca, Arizona because it felt the Army had inadequately considered the total facilities implications of the move.

Following the Army's review and final decision to move the intelligence functions to Fort Huachuca, the Committee learned that the Army, on its own admission, had erred badly in presenting the Fort Huachuca housing situation to the Committee. The initial housing report, presented in April, 1971, said nearly 600 houses and apartments were available for rent. However, "available" housing did not coincide with vacancies.

What they meant by "available" heaven only knows, because you could not possibly have moved into one of them. The report continues—

A second report, presented in June, admitted a deficit of more than 1000 units, and concluded with the statement that: "Should the community be unable to meet our needs within a reasonable period of time, we will consider on-post construction for military families at Fort Huachuca." This statement indicates that the Army may come to the Congress to request a large sum for housing,

in addition to the $29 million in long term construction costs that are anticipated in connection with the move.

The Committee does not regard the management of this base realignment as a model for future projects.

I think that we in Congress should realize when the Army—the military—comes to us with these problems, that the Holabird-Huachuca move is one example of how vast sums of money are being wasted on useless, unnecessary, unwarranted moves.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS).

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I will take only a few minutes. This bill has been discussed thoroughly and explained in detail by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida. It has been discussed also by my colleague from Michigan. So I do not think it is necessary to go into another detailed explanation of the bill.

I would like to point out, however, a few of the highlights only for the purpose of emphasis, because I know these figures already appear in the RECORD.

The budget requested a total of $2,313,375,000 in new obligational authority. The committee reduced these requests by $300,929,000 and recommends $2,012,446,000 in new obligational authority.

This is a decrease of $25,628,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1971; but as the gentleman from Florida explained, these figures do not reveal the entire picture, because all amounts related to Safeguard construction which require annual authorizations have been omitted from the bill. If the Safeguard items had been included, the bill would be $308,372,000 above last year's appropriation and $117,359,000 below the 1972 budget request.

The committee has filed a 47-page report explaining and detailing the line items in the bill on a State-by-State basis, and there is a table in the back of the report on page 44, which lists on a State-by-State basis the 9,432 new housing units funded in this bill. I recommend that all who are interested in the details of this bill that they study this report. They will find answers to any of the questions they may have with respect to military installations in their own districts in that report.

The bill presently under consideration deals with two basic areas of concern—military construction and family housing. A table on page 2 of the committee report depicts, in summary form, appropriations for last year, budget requests for the present year, and the committee's recommended action on the budget requests.

Let us look first at the military construction items. This bill provides military construction funds totaling $1,068,872,000 for regular forces and $90,581,000 for reserve forces. When added to funds remaining unobligated from prior appropriations, the Department of Defense will have a total of $2,210,989,333 available for obligation in fiscal year 1972 for the regular forces and $135,457,938 available for the reserve forces. When added to military construction funds previously appropriated but not yet spent, the present bill will provide $3,442,424,829 available for expenditure in fiscal year 1972 for the Regular Forces and $173,904,489 for Reserve Forces. Funds available for obligation and funds available for expenditure are shown in charts on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report.

The net reduction in outlays from the budget request, resulting from both the authorization and appropriation process, is estimated to be $24 milllion. This does not, of course, include the Safeguard requests that will, as I have previously indicated, be considered in another bill.

The amount recommended for military construction provides substantial increases over last year for new bachelor officers and enlisted housing, for medical facilities, and for pollution control.

This year's program will increase the emphasis on provision of adequate numbers of bachelor quarters and on replacement or improvement of inadequate quarters both at home and overseas. The largest deficiency in any category of defense facilities is for troop housing, approximately $3.1 billion. Even at the increased rate recommended in the bill, this deficiency will not be met for years. These accommodations are an absolute must, and an accelerated effort to provide them is long overdue. The Department of Defense has taken the necessary first step with this year's budget request. The request for bachelor housing for this year more than doubles the amount requested for last year. In fact, of the amount recommended for military construction in this year's bill, over one-quarter of the Army's funds and approximately one-third of the Navy's funds are for troop housing. Though troop housing comprises roughly 15 percent of the recommended Air Force funds, the Air Force over the years has provided a higher level of troop housing than the other two services and therefore has less of a deficiency.

The committee has made clear to the Defense Department that though the build up in Southeast Asia in past years may have understandably contributed to neglect in other areas, there is certainly no longer any excuse for delay in correcting troop housing deficiencies. Members should understand that present troop housing in many overseas areas is substantially below acceptable standards. Many of the substantial problems the Army is experiencing with troops in Germany are directly attributable to substandard living conditions. The committee has therefore provided the full sums requested in the Army's budget for improvement to overseas troop housing. In addition, since 1968 the Army has been taking money from operation and maintenance funds to renovate the worst of the existing facilities. It is estimated that it will cost $229 million to renovate 120 of 165 Army Kasernes. Thus far, the Army has obtained or requested $62 million for this purpose. The committee urges the acceleration of this program.

The largest increase in funds for medical facilities results from the recommended $101,670,000 to fund the next step in the construction of a new and modern Walter Reed Medical Center. Initial funding for interim facilities, demolition, and site preparation were approved last year. This year's funding will be a major step toward providing a 1,280-bed general hospital with the most modern facilities available.

Another significant increase recommended is for facilities to control pollution, particularly air and water pollution, at military bases. In fiscal year 1971 a total of $74 million was provided for pollution control, and this year's bill appropriates $131.3 million. Of continuing concern, however, is the failure to develop satisfactory controls of pollution caused by aircraft engines and shipboard waste. It is hoped that a concerted effort in these areas will be continued by the Department of Defense.

As for Safeguard, the committee has recommended funding of that portion of the military construction request for Safeguard for which there is already authorization. This amounts to $15,300,000 for planning authorized under 31 U.S.C. 723 and $5,200,000 for access roads authorized under 23 U.S.C. 210. The committee has not acted upon $172,500,000 which is requested for Safeguard construction and $11,070,000 requested for family housing. We feel that it is appropriate to provide funding for that part of the budget request for Safeguard which is already authorized, particularly in view of the previous action of the House in authorizing the amounts and the program requested for Safeguard for fiscal year 1972. The recommended funds include money for planning at the National Command authorities, and the Warren Air Force Base sites and for access roads at the Warren Air Force Base site. This will allow the administration to proceed with such first steps as are necessary in order to prepare for an orderly construction program at these sites.

The committee was disappointed with the failure of the Department of Defense to obtain additional NATO slice funding of operational and training projects in Europe. NATO slice funding is the means of funding the NATO infrastructure program. The purpose of the infrastructure program is to provide the support facilities for NATO forces which are intended for common use or have a high degree of common interest. The funding for this program is approved in annual increments or slices.

In the past there have been numerous projects included in the Department of Defense normal budget request that would have more appropriately been included in the joint NATO slice funding. The end result is that this country funds numerous projects that should have been funded jointly. Projects which are not included in NATO slice programs must be prefinanced with funds from the military construction program. The United States pays the whole cost of the project at time of construction, and then supposedly is reimbursed when the project's paperwork is processed and approved through NATO channels. In reality, reimbursements have been delayed substantially in the past. As of December 31, 1970, the difference in reimbursements

and costs to the United States was approximately $210 million. Consequently, this year the committee adopted the policy of not funding projects that it believes could have been included in the NATO slice programs. The projects were not specifically disapproved. But if the services feel they have sufficient priority, they will have to come up with corresponding reductions for items at other locations, and then seek committee approval prior to proceeding. This will be the future committee policy on projects it feels should have been in the NATO slice programs.

A breakdown of the recommended military construction appropriations for each individual service is contained on pages 11–19 of the committee report. In addition, the State lists and tables at the end of the report reflect a breakdown of action on individual line items. I particularly commend these tables to members who have military installations in their districts. On the whole, I find the military construction funding for this year encouraging because for the first time we have succeeded in reporting a bill which places real emphasis on troops, housing, and services. Though it is only a beginning, it is a notable one.

This brings me to the other major concern of this bill, and that is the section dealing with family housing. For several years now the committee has been urging the Department of Defense to give a higher priority to family housing. We have met with only partial success. Family housing is the only area in which the committee has provided an increase over the budget request. This is in line with our firm belief that military housing, troop as well as family, is absolutely crucial to improving military morale and retraining military personnel. The inadequacy of housing is not just a problem in Germany; we have woefully inadequate housing right here in the United States.

The bill before you appropriates $845,418,000 for family housing. This is $129,232,000 above the amount appropriated for last year, and $19,018,000 above this year's budget request. It should be noted that this does not include $11,070,000 requested in the budget at Safeguard sites. This request is also being deferred until consideration of a later appropriations bill.

The total appropriation for family housing breaks down to: $305,026,000 for construction; $474,295,000 for operation and maintenance; and $158,917,000 for debt payment, of which $92,820,000 is applied to debt reduction. The figure for new construction is an increase of $87,198,000 over last year's appropriation. The amount recommended by the committee will provide a total of 9,432 new on-base housing units. Though this is an increase over the 4,670 new units funded in 1970, and the 7,749 funded last year, it is still far short of the 12,500 units per year the committee considers necessary to keep up with the minimum requirements. Obviously, this is not even enough to begin catching up with the present deficit in on-post family housing, which was 490,672 units for all military families as of December 31, 1970. This is not, of course, a new problem. As many of you probably remember, we have previously pointed out these concerns. For added emphasis, however, it should be pointed out that even if one takes the minimum projected force figures of an austere cutback, and include all conceivable new units anticipated by the Department of Defense, in 1976 the family housing deficit would still be 51,988 units for eligible personnel and 34,263 units for ineligible personnel.

Further, the figure for ineligible personnel calls attention to the plight of married, lower ranking enlisted personnel in the rank of E4 and below. As we pointed out last year, most of these personnel are not eligible for either on-post housing or off-post housing allotments. The Department of Defense has recently broadened the definition of eligible to include all personnel with a career commitment. This is only a partial solution, however, and the committee has recommended a vigorous effort to come up with other forms of assistance.

There is also a compelling need for a greater effort in the area of minor construction and improvements to existing family quarters. The Department of Defense estimates that there is presently more than $200 million backlog in essential maintenance of existing family housing. There is a similar backlog of minor construction. The committee bill provides an increase of $49,925,000 over last year's appropriation for these items, but the total figure contains only about $35 million to apply toward the deficit. Much remains to be done.

There has been some noticeable progress in the area of off-base housing. One important development has been a recent HUD/Department of Defense agreement. This provides low-income military families priority of occupancy in certain new 236 projects and makes them eligible for rental assistance programs. Up to 4,600 of these 236 units are planned under last year's program, and 10,000 units are expected for this year's progarm. This is potentially a major breakthrough. I personally would like to see the Department of Defense extend this type of coordination with HUD into numerous other areas that could benefit military personnel. For instance, HUD is presently experimenting with and studying several types of innovative low-cost housing that could produce approaches transferable to military housing programs. Also, as the committee report points out, support which military families receive from programs sponsored by HUD should be increased.

One other item in the proposed bill should be noted. The committee approved a $7,575,000 request for the homeowners assistance program. The program was originally created to assist military and civilian employees in reducing losses incurred by having to dispose of their homes as a result of base closures. The law was recently amended, however, to provide this same assistance when the scope of operations at a military installation is reduced. In view of the overall defense cutback, the broadening of the eligibility criteria will probably result in future increases in the funds requested.

I do not think this is a perfect bill. Nor do I think it is an extravagant bill. In fact, I think that the appropriations recommended are the minimum required. I have pointed out that I think the Department of Defense could and should be doing more in the area of troop and family housing. I have also noted, however, that progress is being made. Approximately 40 percent of the total appropriation is for family housing, and increased portions of the military construction requests are for troop housing. I think we are making a good start toward a balanced military construction and family housing program.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY).

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill.

As a freshman in the Congress I would like just to pay tribute at this time to the committee and to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), who has given the subcommittee members every opportunity to participate. There has never been a time when I wanted to ask a question or to search for something when I was not given that opportunity. In fact, I was sent out on occasion to do a little searching, for which broad experience I am grateful. I can assure the Members the committee is operated in an open manner so that we were able to proceed to get at the facts.

There are two or three things I would like to mention and emphasize. One is that the committee took a very hard look at the concentration of the Military Establishment in the Washington, D.C., area. There has been reference to the Defense office building in Anacostia. I think it has been pretty well brought out and documented that at this point it is not profitable to proceed with that facility, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), very well indicated. The Department of Defense wanted the building, but did not know who was going to be put in it until after they got the building. Witnesses talked about moving various agencies of the Department out of the area but did not know which ones. They wanted this building on the basis of efficiency but could not indicate where that efficiency would take place or what savings would result. They indicated they would reduce the number of locations they presently have, from 88 to 25, and give up a considerable amount of good space in the process, so the new facility would not really accommodate all they need. Also the amortization factor on the new building was not any better than the rent. In fact, excluding adjustments for parking fees, et cetera, it could not be amortized in 60 years.

We were concerned about the impaction in this area, and the military were put on notice that they should take another look at transferring some of the operations of the military out of the area rather than further consolidating it.

That was further illustrated in the discussion about Walter Reed Hospital. Not only is there the fact of impaction, but also there is the fact that costs are increasing at such an alarming rate. We have already started on the Walter Reed Hospital project. Ground has been

broken and things have been opened up, but to make a point of illustration, I was on a board of directors of a hospital in my State where we had just completed a brand new 438 bed hospital with all out patient and modern facilities. The cost of that unit was $35 per square foot.

The projected cost of the new Walter Reed Hospital is something like $95 per square foot.

There is a multiple of factors which play on this.

One factor, of course, is the fact that we have so much building going on here that it automatically raises the cost.

Another factor, of course, is that they plan to put in a research facility in connection with it. But then that is far too wide a difference.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. In that connection, I remember a statement made on the floor last year, which I have been unable to verify, but it was made by a Member who is a responsible Member of this body, and I am sure he had the facts or would not have stated it. I believe I referred to this in some of the hearings, and some of the military construction people verified it. There is so much building going on in Washington, D.C. right now that they have to import construction workers into the District of Columbia from as far away as 200 miles.

In view of that, I really cannot understand why there is such a high incidence of unemployment in the District of Columbia, but that is right in point with what the gentleman from Utah has been saying about the heavy construction load which now exists in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I had further evidence of that from a neighbor of mine who works in the construction business out in Virginia, who tells me that anyone who comes along and says he can use a hammer he will hire, and they can quit at noon or whenever they want to. He is that much in need of help for those who are willing to work in the construction industry, which only points up further to the problem we face.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, to further illustrate the depth to which the committee went in its work to try to come up with a practical solution to the problems the military face, we asked some very searching questions in some areas, and I believe the military needs to take cognizance of this in some type of planning. They do some of it, but perhaps they need to do a little bit more.

Part of their problem in facing this systems planning is the fact that there are rising and falling factors, with wars and so on. We recognize that. Beyond that, they need to do some thinking.

I shall give only one illustration here. A laboratory at Vandenberg Air Force Base was built for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory several years ago. The program was washed out and that building has not been used.

We need to think also in terms, for example, of a materials lab, which was asked for, and on which we had some disagreement in the full committee. It is not that we do not need the materials lab, but we need to examine the question. Do we need to put the work in house, or do we need to contract it, or both?

I believe they need to come up with directions in which this thing needs to go, rather than just spend money, because some researcher wants a little pyramid under him to build another research center. Perhaps we can still reach the needs of the military within the contract field of our private or State universities and industry.

There are many other examples which could be given. We searchingly went into this thing.

I believe the military needs to take a serious look at which direction they will go, rather than just to build because they want to build.

We have cut out of the request, over and above what the authorization had cut, another $65 million.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. While we are talking about where to build all of these new facilities, and so forth, I wonder if there is perhaps an error in the report.

There are 10 pages of construction projects, including some 35 bases in California, and on Iceland, and on a number of little islands and in several nations which voted against us in the United Nations the other day, but there is no mention at all of a project in Iowa. Iowa has always been a loyal State of the Union. We pay our taxes and support the Nation. The committee surely would not leave out Iowa on purpose. Is that an error in the report?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKAY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Things are so peaceful and pleasant in Iowa we did not think they wanted to be bothered with military considerations.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Sometime when we are going to have new labs, I would say Iowa is a pretty good place to put them.

Mr. McKAY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

To emphasize the facts further that there is need for greater planning effort I think we need to take a more critical look at coordination not only within a given service such as the Air Force or the Army but between services, for the use of those facilities where we have expended hard-earned tax dollars. There ought to be some way for us to get to the point where you can use that which has been produced or built without leaving it vacant or leaving it for non-use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McKAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

We have taken a critical look at many things here. This bill, of course, is not perfect because you have human beings working on it and I have not met the perfect one yet. But with this hard look we have been taking we have also worked very hard to arrive at possible solutions, particularly in the area of housing. There is a compliment which is due to the chairman and the ranking minority member of this committee and the committee as a whole. Before I arrived here, in looking to the housing needs that were evident, they helped to start what I consider a farsighted program. Now, to achieve an all-volunteer Army, which the chairman alluded to earlier with a great deal of frequency, we have a great many problems which we have to solve. I would like to commend the chairman and the other members for the fact that not only did they get into family housing and into the BOQ's and other matters such as that, but they have gotten into the 236 housing, in cooperation with the Department of HUD.

Medical services are upgraded in the bill because some of the medical facilities we now have are temporary facilities provided in World War II and they are not adequate now.

The modernization of depots should provide considerable savings. In one instance they estimate about $9,445,000 for a project and by modernization of it they will save $4,930,000 annually and $1,092,000—one time savings.

With those kinds of savings we can do a lot. So things are moving in the right direction.

There is great emphasis on pollution control and problems of sewage. We have urged cooperative efforts not only of the military but of the military with various counties, cities, and States. There are a number of areas where money is provided in order to meet standards and criteria with regard to pollution problems.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to serve with this committee and recommend that this body accept the bill as presented as a good effort for the betterment of our military service and its needs.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT).

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), the able and knowledgeable ranking member of our subcommittee, have, as usual, explained the details of this bill quite lucidly. I support the bill and urge its enactment.

Some aspects require reiteration and emphasis.

This is one of the few appropriation bills reported in a sum less than the budget. We are probably as wrong to report this bill under the budget as the other 10 which were reported over the budget. If there is any place where proper facility and property management indicates a need for the expenditure of more money, it is in our military construction, operation and management pro-

gram. We have a facilities investment of billions of dollars. We are not yet spending enough to properly rehabilitate, modernize, repair and maintain these important facilities and buildings.

Any comparison with other nonmilitary Federal facilities, or State-owned buildings and facilities or private buildings will quickly and dramatically show that we are not keeping pace in the care and maintenance of our military physical plant. Deterioration is outdistancing our program for repair, maintenance and modernization.

This continuing deterioration is especially alarming because so much more deterioration was permitted during the years of the enormous buildup in South Vietnam. Too much of our resources were diverted from the necessary requirements for ordinary repair and maintenance to the urgent demands of the war in Southeast Asia. We are not yet catching up—yet we must.

It does us little good to have large, diverse and dispersed military facilities if they are not kept in a good condition of repair and readiness.

Furthermore, at a time when we are trying desperately to develop an all-volunteer service, it is even more important to provide modern facilities for the serviceman's work and tolerable accommodations for his family's living. Outmoded work facilities and rundown housing can dampen morale and reduce retention as much as inadequate pay and uncertain career advancement.

It is not only good facilities and plant management, but essential personnel management to keep pace with a maintenance and modernization program.

Some of our modernization and maintenance problems and costs could be ameliorated by progressing more quickly with the review of our overall base structure and locations. Many military bases, which grew up like Topsey, under the duress of emergency wartime conditions, should be closed, moved or consolidated. Decisive decisions should be made and implemented to make better use of our military, naval and air force bases, to reduce the costs of maintaining useless bases.

The situation at the Sailor's home in Philadelphia is disgraceful. The home ought to be moved to a place where living conditions are more pleasant and less expensive year round. The financing and management arrangements should be similar in all services. An Airman's home should be considered in the same vein. This will require study and legislation which is beyond the jurisdiction of our committee, but the responsibility of the Congress cannot be shirked.

The location and management of defense facilities in the Capital region requires urgent and thorough consideration. Conditions are not now satisfactory. The plans of the Defense Department are not clear or concise. But decisions must be made soon. Most Defense administrative and intelligence facilities must, of necessity, be located near Washington, but considerable dispersal could, and should be accomplished—for the best interests of military personnel and the Capital itself. Concentration of military, as well as other Federal agencies, in the Capital area contributes to making life and work here more inconvenient and less productive for everyone.

The Defense Department leases too much property, in widely separated buildings, which are not properly suited for the military mission. This is expensive and inefficient in many instances. The Defense Department occupies many square feet of totally unsatisfactory administrative space that requires rehabilitation or razing. These conditions have existed for some time—but there will be no better time to plan and begin the implementation of an orderly development of the defense facilities in the Capital area.

For years the Defense Intelligence Agency, which ought to be in the Capital area, has needed a new building and facilities. Delay in providing the DIA with adequate facilities will increase the cost and impair the accomplishment of its important mission.

The Bolling Air Force Base property should be reserved for Defense Department use. If all defense facilities in the capital area were consolidated and the leased properties were relinquished, there would not be adequate space including Bolling. It would be unwise to dispose of this strategically located property and then, quite certainly be required to purchase property of less utility at greater cost some time in the future.

But the Defense Department must furnish better plans and specifications for the use of Bolling. Any effort by the Defense Department to move permanently to Bolling simply to save the property from the covetous eyes and designs of every other governmental agency, would be equally unwise.

The location and use of Defense facilities in the Capital area demands early resolution. This early resolution of Defense Department needs for facilities and space must be coordinated with the other governmental agencies. Decentralization, dispersal, and removal from Washington should be the objective whenever practicable and possible.

Family housing needs more emphasis. Housing is high on any service family's needs. Adequate housing is absolutely essential if we are to attract and retain a competent, satisfied professional army. We are far behind in providing tolerable housing for a minimum peacetime force. We are short on housing units; the housing units in our inventory are short of space; our housing inventory is in dire need of repair and maintenance.

Family housing developments need to be planned to include community facilities. Parks and playgrounds, churches and shopping centers are just as important to military families as to civilian families.

The school facilities on military bases are far from adequate in too many places. Next to sheer survival, the education of one's children may be the most urgent objective of parents. We want to encourage responsible families who care about their children to remain in the service. We cannot retain responsible families if we cannot assure their children of a first-rate education.

We cannot expect single men to live in slums on military bases here or abroad during peacetime. Housing for families and troops must be improved for the peacetime volunteer forces.

All of these needs will cost much more than is contained in this bill. Perhaps with all the other demands on the Federal Treasury, no more can be devoted to military construction needs this year. But, we should all know and understand that more is needed if we intend to maintain an adequate professional volunteer service.

We have made many important advances in the last few years. Family and troop housing is improving. Wives and families are better pleased. Fewer two-bedroom houses, and more four-bedroom houses are being constructed. Troop housing is more spacious and allows more privacy. More advances can be made when our troop forces, particularly in NATO countries, are more precisely determined.

We must keep our military physical plant, facilities, housing, and community services modern and in good repair and maintenance if we expect to provide the national security and readiness our citizens expect, and deserve.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DENHOLM).

Mr. DENHOLM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to a point of inquiry.

I understand the housing construction portion of the bill may contain a provision for the building of motels. I wonder if that is so provided whether or not such motels will be located on post or off post.

Mr. SIKES. I think the distinguished gentleman's question, if he will yield, is pertinent and timely, and I am glad to have an opportunity to answer it, because there has been publicity which would indicate that motel-type housing facilities are being built on military bases. For the benefit of the Members, let me state that there are facilities for temporary housing of military families which are being built with nonappropriated funds. Nonappropriated funds are not under the control of this committee but are generated through activities such as officers clubs, PX's, et cetera. That money is used in ways which are intended to benefit morale, improve recreational facilities, et cetera, for the services.

Each of the military services has established a program of constructing temporary lodging units, built with nonappropriated funds. They are primarily to assist military personnel who are suffering financial hardship due to the high cost of temporary housing at duty stations to which they are newly assigned.

Rather than have them try to make the necessary arrangements to go to an expensive hotel or other expensive facilities, they are provided for a short time—for a few weeks—with housing in these faciilties.

The initial program includes the following numbers of units which are under construction or completed:

Army: 582 units at eight locations.
Navy: 900 units at 13 locations.
Air Force: 1,020 units at 24 bases.

In addition, follow-on programs, generally of a smaller scope, are planned.

In general, the services have tried to ascertain the availability of commercial facilities in an area before proceeding with this new construction. In some instances, they may have made mistakes. I am informed that they are now aware of these problems and are taking steps to tighten up their procedures in this area.

In addition, there have been complaints that these quarters are not going to be used for transients, but for official guests, and so forth. I have reviewed some of the services' regulations in this area and, if followed with reasonable discretion, they should result in proper use of these for families who need them because they are being transferred.

Again, these are nonappropriated funds not under the control of this committee, although we do insist upon reports as to the manner in which the funds are spent. We are trying to see that a proper job is being done. We do not feel that this is something that is getting out of hand.

Mr. DENHOLM. I have one other question, Mr. Chairman. Is there anything in the bill that would limit or restrict military housing construction to the continental United States?

Mr. SIKES. No; but there is only a limited amount being built overseas which is funded directly from military construction. The majority of the family housing overseas is provided by rental guarantee, leasing or other programs. In this year's bill there is housing funded in Australia, Puerto Rico, and in the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. DENHOLM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN).

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time, and I shall be very brief.

I should like to say to the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), and the members of the subcommittee, that I deeply appreciate the interest which they took in a particular housing situation at Camp Drum, to which the chairman of the subcommittee referred in his remarks. I want to express my particular appreciation, Mr. Chairman, to you for having had the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) view firsthand the defects in family housing at Camp Drum.

The 88 units that are provided for in this bill are desperately needed to replace totally inadequate, obsolete housing that has long since passed its period of usefulness or adequacy for housing our military and their dependents.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), and to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) as well as the members of the subcommittee for what they did for Camp Drum's family housing.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and wish to compliment the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations for working out this bill.

Included in the Military Construction bill this year is one item for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base which I believe has become a crucial requirement for the maintenance of American defense preparedness in the years ahead. American political realities now require that more stress be placed on our defense research and development efforts and less on the maintenance of forces in readiness.

As our national spending priorities have changed to provide a larger proportion of our Federal budget for domestic needs in contrast to defense requirements the U.S. military R. & D. effort will be the critical factor in maintaining American military superiority. In the past, we have relied on the size of our nuclear stockpile and the readiness of men and weapons for massive conventional response. It is obvious that in the future we will be maintaining smaller defense forces and fewer weapons, so the available hardware will have to have maximum capabilities and be well ahead of the competition.

Much of the testing for the Air Force R. & D. program is carried out by the Air Force Systems Command at Wright-Patterson AFB. The importance of materials research and development and sound materials application engineering which is done at the materials testing laboratory there cannot be overstated. In terms of meeting current and future mission needs of the Air Force plane and weapons systems, a materials problem often as not is the fundamental technical issue that determines the timing of the development of a new system.

Two current examples of structural materials problems are the F–111 and the C–5A. The materials testing laboratory called upon to provide direct technical support and leadership in the resolution of this challenge of strength to weight and stress.

But at the present time the inadequate housing of the laboratory is a primary limitation to the capability and effectiveness of the mission of the materials laboratory. Five of the eight buildings in which the facility is currently housed predate 1928, and those five buildings represent almost 90 percent of the space now occupied by the laboratory. Over 400 people, three-fourths of whom are scientists and engineers are housed in these pre-1928 buildings. During the next 5 years an annual budget of between $45 and $50 million in research operations is to be done by them. Hopefully that work will be done in facilities which do not adversely affect the workers or the work itself.

The present structures do not provide for adequate space for critical new research, are not adaptable to setting up new research equipment and experiments, and most important, they lack the capabilities in which to provide a proper research environment in terms of controlling temperature, humidity and dust. These conditions have seriously jeopardized the laboratory's ability to validate specifications set by the Air Force which are necessary to check compliance of contractor performance and outside testing work done for the Air Force by other laboratories on a contract basis.

The buildings have been rehabilitated on a piecemeal and patchwork basis for more than 40 years. They are now beyond further modification when faced with the critical mission the facility is called upon to perform. It is high time to replace them. Otherwise we face a rapid deterioration of performance at the materials testing laboratory. We cannot permit that if our national security interests are to be maintained.

I want to point out here that in this need for the laboratory to maintain its ability to properly evaluate outside work, such work is currently being conducted at 155 private companies and at 39 universities around the Nation, although the materials laboratory at Wright-Patterson does a great deal of in-house research and development and evaluation for the Air Force and has produced results that have been recognized worldwide in certain fields such as ceramics. But the in-house work done at Wright-Patterson now comprises only 16 percent of its total research responsibility. A study of Federal laboratories conducted 8 years ago by the National Science Foundation called for a minimum in-house work capability of 20 percent, with the optimum at between 30–35 percent of all research projects being managed so that the Federal laboratories would have a sound basis of their own technical data on which to properly evaluate and manage the outside contracted R. & D. services.

This means that the in-house role of the materials testing laboratory at Wright-Patterson must increase in the future if it is to be as effective as it will have to be.

The request for a new facility is not new this year. The Air Force first asked for congressional approval of a new facility in fiscal year 1966. It was then authorized by the Congress at a cost of $6.7 million—but not appropriated. Again in fiscal year 1970, the project was budgeted by the Air Force and authorized by the Senate, but not by the House. This year, once more, the project was asked for, and has been authorized by both the House and Senate, and approved by the Committee on Appropriations. I want to emphasize that although during the 7-year programing period, the scope of the proposal has remained unchanged. The original projected cost has risen by $4.6 million from $6.7 million in fiscal year 1966 to $11.3 million for the current fiscal year.

Failure to appropriate funds for the laboratory this year would mean another increase in its projected cost. Even so, that is not as critcial as the further deterioration in capabilities that would also accrue. I therefore urge that the highest priority be given to this project and that the Congress approve the funds for its construction. The Committee of Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations have both pre-

viously concluded, following hearings, that the facility is needed, and it has been authorized previously by the full House and the full Senate, as well.

The suggestion has been made that the materials laboratory at Wright-Patterson and facilities at other Air Force bases are redundant and that the Air Force has not been systematic in considering its requirements either in time or in location or with an eye to economy and efficiency.

While there is some necessary interrelationship in this effort with other Air Force laboratory facilities at other locations which merges the expertise of such various locations and their own unique capabilities, it is erroneous to contend that widespread and unneeded duplication exists.

The materials laboratory at Wright-Patterson provides unique technical support in materials engineering for both operational systems and equipment for systems under development. Other laboratories are involved in similar efforts for other fields of research and development. In all areas the bulk of the effort is devoted to obtaining out-of-house capabilities from private industry and the universities on a contract basis. At the materials laboratory, as I previously indicated, this amounts to some 85 percent of the Air Force materials program through the Wright-Patterson laboratory. There are also technical and evaluative capabilities which must be provided in-house in the Air Force and which are not duplicated in industry and the universities. Each of the laboratories are required for this in-house capability in their particular area of responsibility. Any duplication of portions of a responsibility of the magnitude the Air Force is called upon to perform in this extremely specialized technical area is an effort to increase capabilities and economies related to time and manpower, not in spite of those goals. I am confident that the Air Force is continuing to make certain that its requirements are considered in this light.

Finally, I want to note that a direct reference has been made to the facility at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California which was built as an assembly plant for components of the canceled Manned Orbiting Laboratory—MOL—program. The inference was made that the facility constituted a laboratory that duplicated other facilities and that with the cancellation of the MOL program now sits empty and idle.

It should be pointed out that the facility did not undertake experimental laboratory testing programs, as indicated, but was used for assembly purposes only. Following the cancellation of the MOL program, instead of sitting idle, as has been stated, the facility is now used as part of the strategic operational missile launch crew training program. Such utilization does indicate the Air Force attempts to maximize the effectiveness of existing facilities.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this important appropriation bill (H.R. 11418) and I am cognizant particularly of the appropriations for the Great Lakes Naval Training Center located in my congressional district.

Mr. Chairman, in anticipation of an all-volunteer military force, coupled with a determination on the part of this administration and of the Congress to augment the role of the U.S. Navy, I am pleased to note essential appropriations in line with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the funds appropriated for the Navy Hospital Corps School at Great Lakes in the amount of $3,161,000 will provide a much-needed facility for specialists who care for other men in the military service. I have seen the existing facilities at Great Lakes and I am personally aware of the critical need for this improvement. I commend the committee on recommending funds for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I want also to commend the committee on including in this appropriation bill funds totaling $2,386,000 for the construction of enlisted men's quarters at the naval training center.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of $323,000 appropriated for air conditionng the Electronic Supply Office at Great Lakes is a most popular and long-awaited appropriation of funds. The ESO building was originally designed for air-conditioning. However, air conditioning has never been installed in this structure which houses the sophisticated equipment used by the ESO. Those dedicated individuals who serve in the Electronic Supply Office have been most patient and understanding during the long hot summers when this building—without adequate ventilation—and no air conditioning—has caused them discomfort and physical suffering. Mr. Chairman, when I appeared recently at the 25th anniversary of the Electronic Supply Office and announced that the Congress, at long last was appropriating funds for this purpose, there was a general and enthusiastic reception which I wish all in this body could have heard. Let me say that this item, while not one of the largest in this appropriation bill, is one of the most necessary, and one which will be gratefully received by those who labor to make our sophisticated electronic equipment and weapons usable and serviceable at all times.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the facilities at Great Lakes Naval Training Center—including the Naval Electronic Supply Office—and wish to assure this body of the efficient and economic operations which are carried out in the various parts of this great naval base.

Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the officers and men who serve at Great Lakes as well as in behalf of the civilians who are employed there, I want to indicate with satisfaction these important items in the military construction appropriation bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from New York seek recognition?

Mrs. ABZUG. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentlewoman seek recognition?

Mrs. ABZUG. I seek recognition to offer an amendment to title I, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state the paragraph to which her amendment is directed. Will the gentlewoman please use the microphone? The Chair cannot hear the gentlewoman without the use of the microphone.

Mrs. ABZUG. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but that microphone does not work.

I seek recognition to amend on page 2, line 7, after the word "Code," to strike out the sum of $437,274,000 and insert in lieu thereof the sum of $417,274,000.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, and in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, $437,274,000, to remain available until expended.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Clerk had already read from page 2, and was down to the bottom of page 2, and I believe the amendment comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. ABZUG. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I was standing, and was seeking recognition, and the microphone apparently did not work at that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair did not hear the gentlewoman when she made her request at the microphone; but the Chair did observe that the gentlewoman was on her feet and looking at the Chair at that time, when this portion of the bill was read by the Clerk. Therefore the Chair will hold that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) does not come too late and is in order.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk has not read the amendment yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York will send her amendment to the desk, and the Clerk will read the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ABZUG

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ABZUG: On page 2, line 7, after "code", strike out "$437,274,000", and insert "$417,274,000".

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment. At the time that the military construction authorization bill came up on the floor for discussion last week, there were questions raised as to whether the authorization included any money for the Safeguard antiballistic missile program. The response at that time was that it did not. However, a reading of the committee re-

port on this bill—the military construction appropriation bill—shows that it contains a total of $25 million for planning and research and development for the Safeguard program.

There is much question in this country as to whether this kind of appropriation is necessary for our defense. We have had much discussion as to whether Safeguard is sound or necessary in a scientific sense. We have also had much political discussion as to whether this project might interfere with the chances of reaching some kind of an agreement in the SALT talks.

Mr. Chairman, I have opposed the antiballistic missile program in this country, as have many people in this Congress and in this Nation, on the ground that we have not been provided with any satisfactory strategic, political, or scientific explanation of the need for such a defense. Therefore, I will oppose any appropriation of funds for this purpose.

There will be further appropriations for the Safeguard antiballistic missile program in the defense procurement appropriation bill. These too, I will oppose.

I believe that to take and set aside money for planning and sites when there is substantial doubt as to whether we should have these sites at all is totally improper.

Speaking more generally, I have no intention of supporting money for missiles so long as there is no money for adequate housing, schools, day care, health care, and urban transportation. Furthermore, I will vote against this bill and all other defense authorization and appropriation bills until we set a date and withdraw all our troops from Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from New York yield back the balance of her time?

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is necessary to take a great deal of time for a discussion of the proposed amendment. We have fought this battle up and down the Hill for years.

What is in this bill is planning and access road money for the sites that have been requested by the Administration as part of the Safeguard program, and these funds are fully authorized. If we eliminate the funds now, what little there is of the Safeguard program is going to come to a grinding halt. We will lose essential time if we ever are to have any semblance of a Safeguard program. All bargaining power that we may have in the SALT talks would be killed here today in one fell swoop if this amendment should be agreed to. I do not believe the House wants that.

The amendment should be defeated, and I trust it will be defeated. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment and to join my chairman in opposition to the amendment. He has adequately stated that we have been over this ground many, many times before. I would like to remind the committee that all the committees of the Congress, both legislative and appropriation committees, that have that responsibility in this area have agreed that this is a program that should be pursued.

I think we have to rely on the fact that those who have been living closest to the program would be in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) rise?

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS) having assumed the chair, Mr. ADAMS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11418) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 354, nays 32, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—354

Abbitt	Edwards, Ala.	McDade
Abernethy	Eilberg	McDonald, Mich.
Abourezk	Erlenborn	McEwen
Adams	Esch	McFall
Addabbo	Eshleman	McKay
Alexander	Evans, Colo.	McKevitt
Anderson, Calif.	Fascell	McKinney
Andrews, Ala.	Findley	McMillan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fish	Macdonald, Mass.
Annunzio	Fisher	Mahon
Ashbrook	Flood	Mailliard
Ashley	Flowers	Mann
Aspin	Flynt	Martin
Aspinall	Ford, Gerald R.	Mathias, Calif.
Baker	Forsythe	Mathis, Ga.
Baring	Fountain	Matsunaga
Begich	Fraser	Mayne
Belcher	Frelinghuysen	Mazzoli
Bell	Frenzel	Meeds
Bennett	Frey	Melcher
Bergland	Fulton, Tenn.	Metcalfe
Betts	Fuqua	Michel
Bevill	Galifianakis	Mills, Md.
Biaggi	Gallagher	Minish
Biester	Garmatz	Mink
Blackburn	Gaydos	Minshall
Boggs	Gettys	Mizell
Boland	Giaimo	Mollohan
Bolling	Gibbons	Monagan
Bow	Goldwater	Montgomery
Brademas	Gonzalez	Moorhead
Brasco	Goodling	Morse
Bray	Grasso	Mosher
Brinkley	Green, Oreg.	Moss
Brooks	Griffin	Murphy, Ill.
Broomfield	Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.
Brotzman	Gross	Myers
Brown, Mich.	Grover	Natcher
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Nelsen
Broyhill, N.C.	Hagan	Nichols
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Obey
Buchanan	Hall	O'Hara
Burke, Fla.	Hamilton	O'Konski
Burke, Mass.	Hammer-schmidt	O'Neill
Burleson, Tex.	Hanley	Passman
Burlison, Mo.	Hanna	Patman
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Idaho	Patten
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.	Pelly
Byron	Harrington	Pepper
Cabell	Harsha	Perkins
Camp	Harvey	Pettis
Carney	Hastings	Peyser
Carter	Hathaway	Pickle
Casey, Tex.	Hays	Pike
Cederberg	Henderson	Pirnie
Celler	Hicks, Wash.	Poage
Chamberlain	Hillis	Podell
Chappell	Hogan	Poff
Clancy	Holifield	Powell
Clark	Horton	Preyer, N.C.
Clausen, Don H.	Hosmer	Price, Ill.
Clawson, Del	Hull	Price, Tex.
Cleveland	Hungate	Pryor, Ark.
Collier	Hunt	Pucinski
Collins, Tex.	Hutchinson	Purcell
Colmer	Ichord	Quie
Conable	Jacobs	Quillen
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Railsback
Corman	Johnson, Pa.	Randall
Cotter	Jonas	Rarick
Coughlin	Jones, Ala.	Reid, N.Y.
Daniel, Va.	Jones, N.C.	Rhodes
Daniels, N.J.	Karth	Riegle
Danielson	Kazen	Robinson, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Keating	Robison, N.Y.
Davis, S.C.	Kee	Rodino
Davis, Wis.	Keith	Roe
de la Garza	Kemp	Rogers
Delaney	King	Roncalio
Dellenback	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Denholm	Kuykendall	Rostenkowski
Dennis	Kyl	Roush
Dent	Kyros	Rousselot
Devine	Landgrebe	Roy
Dickinson	Latta	Roybal
Dingell	Leggett	Runnels
Donohue	Lennon	Ruppe
Dorn	Lent	Ruth
Dow	Link	St Germain
Dowdy	Lloyd	Sarbanes
Downing	Long, Md.	Satterfield
Drinan	McClory	Saylor
Dulski	McCloskey	Scherle
Duncan	McClure	Schmitz
du Pont	McCollister	Schwengel
	McCormack	Scott
	McCulloch	

Sebelius	Stephens	Ware
Seiberling	Stratton	Whalen
Shoup	Stubblefield	Whalley
Shriver	Stuckey	White
Sikes	Sullivan	Whitehurst
Sisk	Symington	Whitten
Skubitz	Talcott	Widnall
Slack	Taylor	Wiggins
Smith, Calif.	Teague, Calif.	Williams
Smith, Iowa	Teague, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Smith, N.Y.	Terry	Winn
Snyder	Thompson, Ga.	Wolff
Spence	Thomson, Wis.	Wright
Springer	Thone	Wyatt
Staggers	Tiernan	Wydler
Stanton, J. William	Udall	Wylie
	Van Deerlin	Wyman
Stanton, James V.	Vander Jagt	Yatron
	Vanik	Young, Fla.
Steed	Veysey	Young, Tex.
Steele	Vigorito	Zablocki
Steiger, Ariz.	Waggonner	Zion
Steiger, Wis.	Wampler	

NAYS—32

Abzug	Green, Pa.	Nix
Badillo	Hechler, W. Va.	Rangel
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Rees
Carey, N.Y.	Helstoski	Reuss
Clay	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Collins, Ill.	Koch	Scheuer
Conyers	Lujan	Schneebeli
Dellums	Mikva	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Ohio	Waldie
Ford, William D.	Mitchell	Yates
	Nedzi	Zwach

NOT VOTING—43

Anderson, Ill.	Dwyer	Landrum
Anderson, Tenn.	Eckhardt	Long, La.
	Edmondson	Madden
Archer	Edwards, La.	Miller, Calif.
Arends	Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.
Barrett	Foley	Morgan
Blanton	Gray	Roberts
Blatnik	Gude	Rooney, N.Y.
Burton	Halpern	Rosenthal
Caffery	Hawkins	Sandman
Chisholm	Hébert	Shipley
Crane	Hicks, Mass.	Stokes
Culver	Howard	Ullman
Derwinski	Jarman	Wilson, Charles H.
Diggs	Jones, Tenn.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Burton against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Gray with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Archer.

Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts with Mr. Crane.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Foley.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. MIKVA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 661 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 661

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7248) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other Acts dealing with higher education. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI and clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived, and further, all titles, parts, or sections of the said substitute, the subject matter of which is properly within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the House of Representatives, shall be subject to a point of order for such reason if such point of order is properly raised during the consideration of H.R. 7248. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 7248, the Committee on Education and Labor shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 659, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7248 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to read a statement.)

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ordinarily do not take the well and read a statement during consideration of a rule, and I do so primarily to assure that the Members understand that this rule which I support is unusual, and I want to be quite precise about what is in the record.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 661 provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7248, the Higher Education Act of 1971.

Additional provisions of the resolution are as follows:

First, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Second, the substitute shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections.

Third, all points of order are waived against the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI—germaneness—and clause 4, rule XXI—appropriations.

Later in my statement I will detail why those provisions are included.

Fourth, all titles—and this is very important—parts, or sections of the said substitute, the subject matter of which is properly within the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the House other than the Committee on Education and Labor, shall be subject to a point of order for such reason if such point of order is properly raised during the consideration of H.R. 7248.

Fifth, after the passage of H.R. 7248, the Committee on Education and Labor shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 659, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7248 as passed by the House. I return to the question of the points of order being waived against clause 7, rule XVI and clause 4, rule XXI.

Clause 7, rule XVI deals with germaneness. Certain titles of the substitute might not be germane to the introduced bill. Examples are title XIV, which appear on page 215 of the bill, establishing a National Institute on Education, and title XIX, which appears on page 263 of the bill, dealing with youth camp safety.

Clause 4, rule XXI, deals with appropriations.

The substitute contains a number of fund transfers which may be considered appropriations. Examples are found in section 446 on page 133, transfer of funds between programs and section 712 on page 173, making revolving loan fund available for loan insurance.

During the Rules Committee's hearing on the granting of a rule on H.R. 7248, testimony was heard from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in opposition to the inclusion of title XII, constituting the College of the Virgin Islands and the University of Guam as land-grant colleges. He testified that this title involves amendments to eight agricultural acts and that the Committee on Agriculture had considered this proposal. Under rule XI, clause 1(d), of the rules of the House, the Committee on Agriculture is granted jurisdiction over

agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs appeared before the Committee on Rules in opposition to title XI of H.R. 7248, Improvement of Mineral Conservation Education. This committee is presently considering H.R. 10950, a bill to establish mining and mineral research centers. A similar bill has been passed by the Senate. Jurisdiction over this subject is granted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in rule XI, clause 10 (j), (k), and (l).

Before I yield to anybody, I would like to say although some of the provisions of this rule are unique, this is the only way I know of to get consideration for this highly important matter, and I support this rule and urge its adoption. I have taken this at least unusual proceeding for me in dealing with a rule in fairness to the Members, so they will know precisely what they are dealing with when they deal with this rule.

I see the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. Does he wish me to yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, first let me say I note with interest the gentleman from Missouri obtained a unanimous-consent request to read a statement in explanation of this rule. Certainly it needs one.

I am confused about the rule. In my judgment, the rule establishes a precedent which could be most unfortunate. Does the gentleman agree that this type of rule will make it virtually impossible for the House to act upon a comprehensive piece of legislation? Will points of order never before allowed by the Rules of the House now be valid because the subject matter in this section or that comes within the jurisdiction of another committee?

Mr. BOLLING. I was afraid that somebody would ask me that question because I do not know the answer. I do not know the answer because it carries me a step beyond my competence.

I do not know how the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, who presides over the consideration of this bill, is going to rule on the point of order. I do know what was the intent of the Rules Committee when it granted the rule, but I do not know how the ruling is going to be made.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, the gentleman knows the intent of the Rules Committee. In other words, it was the intent of the Rules Committee, if I understand the gentleman correctly, to act in a dictatorial manner and contrary to the views of the majority of the House? In other words, if this type of rule is adopted, can I conclude that it will narrow the jurisdiction of the House and place greater authority in the Rules Committee? The will of the House could be thwarted or thrown aside on almost any occasion in the future when we have a comprehensive piece of legislation. Am I correct in that conclusion?

Mr. BOLLING. No; I do not believe the gentleman is correct in his conclusion, because the will of the House would never be denied, because only a majority of the House could adopt this rule.

In other words, it would provide a new and different way in which the House of Representatives could in effect amend bills without amending them.

What I am trying to say to the gentleman is that it is very clear to me.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman has been here 23 years. Has he ever seen a rule of this type come before the House on a bill before?

Mr. BOLLING. I am afraid the gentleman must not have listened to my original statement. I said I almost never went to the well of the House and I never read a statement on a rule, and I did so because I thought this was a unique proceeding, and I clearly believe this is unique.

But I do not believe it is of any use to try to read into the rule that which is not there. The rule is unique. It is different. But it does not do anything remarkable until it is accepted by the House of Representatives. It does not arrogate to the Rules Committee a single thing.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me ask the gentleman this: Does this rule set aside the precedents of the House of Representatives, insofar as germaneness is concerned?

Mr. BOLLING. May I reply to the gentleman in this fashion: It just happens that I did not support this particular section of the rule, but I happen to favor consideration of the higher education bill. I am handling the rule, and I favor the rule with this section.

I do not believe the adoption of this section is going to do any great damage to the Republic, the House, or the rules of the House, so long as it is understood what the rule does. I happen to believe that the main purpose of our being here today at this moment is to adopt a rule which will enable us to debate a higher education bill.

I think I have made clear what my position is. I have tried very hard to be fair with the Members of the House, and I am not prepared to go beyond what I have already said.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am not quite clear as to what the gentleman from Kentucky is protesting—whether it is the waiver of the point of order with respect to appropriations. I doubt that because he has had ample opportunity during the past months to protest rules waiving points of order on appropriation bills. I am just at a loss to understand what part of the rule he is specifically protesting.

Mr. BOLLING. I will be glad to answer that. I think I understood the gentleman from Kentucky.

He is protesting that section of the rule which I tried to call careful attention to which, in a rather unique fashion, would make in order points of order against certain sections of the bill that might not be otherwise in order.

Mr. GROSS. By any Member. I had an idea that was what the gentleman was protesting, because to my certain knowledge he has never protested other rules that waived points of order in another fashion.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. This is repetitious, probably, but when it says it shall be subject to a point of order, do you say that that means there is the opportunity to have the Chair rule or that the Chair is compelled to rule?

Mr. BOLLING. The difficulty here is that I do not know the answer to that. The difficulty for me is that. The intent of the Committee on Rules, I believe—and I think I am fair in this—was to give an opportunity to any Member to make a point of order and have it then treated as if it were a normal point of order under normal circumstances. However, as I say, this is an unprecedented situation, and I frankly do not know what the ruling of the Chair would be. I do not believe anybody can compel a chairman to make a ruling in advance.

Mr. MONAGAN. Would it have been possible without this provision in the rule to raise that point of order?

Mr. BOLLING. It would not have been possible to raise it, but I am not going to prejudge what the Chairman's ruling would be, because it is not within my competence. I am not trying to evade, but to be precise. It is an extraordinarily difficult question.

I am delighted to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am just a little bit concerned here and a little surprised at the very distinguished and very able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor protesting here a rule that protects the rules of the House. He would be the first, I am sure, to raise the question if his committee's jurisdiction were infringed upon.

The intent of the Committee on Rules, as the gentleman from Missouri has stated in his judgment, was, even though he did not, as he said, go along with that provision, to protect the jurisdiction of other committees from being invaded by this committee. It is just that simple.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has explained this rule, House Resolution 661, in very great detail and extremely well. I agree with his statements.

I do not like to reiterate on the floor of the House, but in view of the fact that this is a rather unusual and unique rule and a situation could arise at some time in the future, I would like to have my opinions in the RECORD so that I will have them to rely upon in case we are asked at some time in the future what my interpretation of this rule was.

The Rules Committee, after the standard provisions providing for general debate of 4 hours and making the commit-

tee substitute in order, at the request of Chairman PERKINS of the Committee on Education and Labor, approved two specific waivers of points of order.

The first one waived the rule of germaneness, permitting the Committee on Education and Labor to include in the reported bill two matters within its jurisdiction which would not normally be germane to this bill, namely, titles 14 and 19.

The second waiver permits transfers of previously appropriated funds and the creation of a revolving fund for student loan insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the committee believed that both these requests for waivers should be granted and were justified under the circumstances and proceeded to do so since they were specific in nature and were requested by the Education-Labor Committee.

At that particular time an additional factor in our consideration of the rule to be granted was raised by the appearance before the Rules Committee of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Both of these distinguished gentlemen appealed to the Rules Committee to protect them from what they described as clear cases of jurisdictional encroachment by the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) specifically objected to the inclusion of title XII in the bill which provided for land-grant college status to the Universities of Guam and the Virgin Islands.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) specifically objected to title XI which authorized a new program of mineral conservation education and authorized support for mineral resources conservation programs at colleges and universities.

At that point a question was asked of Mr. POAGE as to why he did not make a point of order against the language. We discussed that in the committee and determined that in view of the fact that the language was in the original bill which is in the nature of an amendment, a point of order would not lie against any language in the bill which infringed upon the other committees. Therefore, the only thing we could do would be to write some type of rule which would waive that problem and make it possible to have a point of order made against the provisions in this particular bill which infringed upon the jurisdiction of other commttees.

Mr. POAGE stated in answer to the question, "Why do you not go ahead and offer the amendment to strike out that provision," that the Rules Committee gives to committees jurisdiction to handle specific matters and that we were supposed to send to the floor of the House a resolution setting the provisions as to how the bill is to be considered. He was asked the question as to how in his opinion it should be considered and he said words to the effect that—

I think the Committee on Rules has a greater responsibility to protect the jurisdiction of the other committees of the House than does a single Member.

That remark impressed us very much.

I will have to say, Mr. Speaker, to be completely fair, that much legislation by its very nature can sometimes touch another committee's jurisdiction. This is understandable. All Members recognize that the committee which reports such bills has not deliberately poached on another committee's jurisdiction, because of the overlap in such cases is casual and incidental. But when you find whole sections, parts of titles, indeed even whole titles of a bill which are properly within the jurisdiction of committees other than the one which reported the bill, and such other committees formally complain of such action, then it seems to me that the House should not permit such jurisdictional poaching. If it did, any committee's jurisdiction could be invaded by any other committee and supporters of legislation which was not reported by one committee could get it to a more favorable forum by having such legislation included in an omnibus bill properly referred to another committee. Such practices should not be supported by the House as a matter of good legislative procedure.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but what clause 1, rule XI spells out the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture on legislative matters which are brought to the floor of the House from the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee examined clause 1 of rule XI, which spells out the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and that clause grants to the committee jurisdiction over legislation dealing with agricultural colleges and agricultural education.

There is not any doubt but what clause 10 of rule XI gives jurisdiction and authority to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs over legislation dealing with "mineral resources of the public lands," "mining interests generally," and "mining schools. . . ."

So, Mr. Speaker, having reached this conclusion, the Committee on Rules was faced with the problem of how to solve this jurisdictional dispute. We could have refused to grant a rule on H.R. 7248. We did not do that because we believe the Higher Education Bill is important, and it should be brought to the floor for debate as a major piece of legislation. However, the usual rule, as I mentioned before, would have had the effect of protecting the jurisdictional encroachment because the parts of the reported bill complained of were part of the originally introduced bill, and no point of order on jurisdictional grounds would lie, even though, if such titles had been offered as an amendment then a point of order would lie.

Mr Speaker, I will give my opinion as to what I believe the result will be if the rule is adopted with this additional language. I think the language is very clear on its face. Any part of the reported bill which is properly within the jurisdiction of another committee can be stricken by a properly raised point of order. If this occurs, the entire reported bill, which is a committee substitute, will not in my opinion fail, because the rule states that only those parts:

Properly within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee . . . shall be subject to a point of order for such reason. . . .

Thus the committee substitute reported by the Committee on Education and Labor will remain before the Members for debate, amendment, and final action, as they shall determine. The normal procedures will apply to the consideration of the bill in all respects save for the one exception provided for in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the rule, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I do have one request for time, but if the gentleman from Missouri desires to proceed first I will defer to him.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question to clarify the intent of the rule?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules I am of the understanding that the words "subject to a point of order on the basis of jurisdiction" permit the chairman, in this case the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to raise a point of order at the proper time, but that the language does not in any way automatically preclude debate on the point of order when made.

Is that not the understanding of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BOLLING. Subject to correction, there is not, in my opinion, debate on a point of order except at the will of the Chair, and the Chair normally listens to Members who desire to be heard on the point of order. I do not know whether that is technically debate or not. But it would seem to me to be very much at the discretion of the Chair—and I have yet to see a Chairman who refused to give any Member the opportunity to be heard at reasonable length on any aspect of a point of order.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for helping to clarify that one point.

Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOLLING. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. When a bill containing matters belonging properly to the jurisdiction of two committees is referred to one of the two committees, and that committee does act upon the bill and reports such bill out on to the floor of the House, the House rules as they now exist provide that jurisdiction was properly exercised over all matter in the bill by the committee to which the bill was referred.

Now, my question is: Because the rule, now being proposed by House Resolution 661, in effect contravenes that House rule and in effect is an amendment to the House rules, would it not take a two-thirds majority for the passage of the resolution, in order that the section pertaining to jurisdiction might be legally effective?

Mr. BOLLING. Again I am afraid that

I am beyond my area of competence. I am not the person who would be required to interpret that if it were put either as a parliamentary inquiry or as a point of order.

My own opinion is that a resolution can be reported by the Committee on Rules if the Committee on Rules can, as it has in the past, reported a resolution making in order a bill that does not even exist at the moment of reporting by the Committee on Rules of the resolution. I am reasonably sure that it can report this rule. I know of no reason why the question of consideration could come up.

Again I would have to say quite simply that I am not competent to reply to the question because I simply do not know the answer. I am not the proper person even to consider the question.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman then yield further for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, at this point is it proper for the Speaker to determine whether a two-thirds vote would be required for the passage of this resolution, House Resolution 661, or merely a majority?

The SPEAKER. The resolution from the Committee on Rules makes in order the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7248) and a majority vote is required for that purpose.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Even with the reference to the last section, Mr. Speaker, relating to the raising of a point of order on a bill which is properly reported out by a committee to which the bill was referred, which would in effect contravene an existing rule of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Rules proposes to make in order in its resolution (H. Res. 661) the opportunity to raise points of order against the bill on committee jurisdictional grounds, but as is the case with any resolution reported by the Committee on Rules making a bill a special order of business, only a majority vote is required.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. I understand from the discussion, the gentleman from Missouri very carefully and very precisely explained what the rule contained, and I understood from his explanation and from remarks made by other members of the Committee on Rules that its unique provision was directed essentially at two titles of the bill.

But the question I ask the gentleman is: Would it not go beyond those titles? We find throughout this bill cross references to other laws, some of which might be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor and some of which are not, amendments to other laws as a part of conforming them to what the committee has done in this particular bill. Would not those be in the same position as the two titles which the committee had in mind?

Mr. BOLLING. I would think it would depend very much on the exact and precise language.

What the gentleman did in his explanation which was read was to specify the two chairmen of two committees who came before the Committee on Rules to raise points of order. The gentlemen then tried to make clear that the language of the rule was as it is and he took no position on anything beyond that. The language of the rule itself is general. It is not limited to propositions which were brought up by the two chairmen.

So each other point of order it was thought to be made in order by a Member could be raised. I believe, within the provision and the language of the rule, that is, this special language of the rule.

I am not prepared to answer individual points because again I am not the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole ruling in a particular situation. In general, the point the gentleman makes, it seems to me, is correct—and I say, "in general."

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman for that response.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that whatever the intent of the Committee on Rules might have been in this matter that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, whoever that might be, will very carefully consider any rulings he might make on a point of order in light of the exact language which I do not think really carries out what I am now told was the intent of the committee.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman if he has any further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. No. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 371, nays 7, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—371

Abbitt	Annunzio	Betts
Abernethy	Ashley	Bevill
Abourezk	Aspin	Biaggi
Abzug	Aspinall	Biester
Adams	Badillo	Bingham
Addabbo	Baker	Blackburn
Alexander	Baring	Boggs
Anderson, Calif.	Begich	Boland
Andrews, Ala.	Belcher	Bolling
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bell	Bow
	Bennett	Brademas
	Bergland	Brasco
Bray	Griffiths	Myers
Brinkley	Grover	Natcher
Brooks	Gubser	Nedzi
Broomfield	Hagan	Nelsen
Brotzman	Haley	Nichols
Brown, Mich.	Hamilton	Nix
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-schmidt	Obey
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanley	O'Hara
Broyhill, Va.	Hanna	O'Konski
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	O'Neill
Burke, Fla.	Harrington	Passman
Burke, Mass.	Harsha	Patman
Burleson, Tex.	Harvey	Patten
Burlison, Mo.	Hastings	Pelly
Byrne, Pa.	Hathaway	Pepper
Byrnes, Wis.	Hawkins	Perkins
Byron	Hays	Pettis
Cabell	Hechler, W. Va.	Peyser
Camp	Heckler, Mass.	Pickle
Carey, N.Y.	Helstoski	Pirnie
Carney	Henderson	Poage
Carter	Hicks, Wash.	Podell
Casey, Tex.	Hillis	Poff
Cederberg	Hogan	Powell
Chamberlain	Holifield	Preyer, N.C.
Chappell	Horton	Price, Ill.
Clancy	Hosmer	Price, Tex.
Clark	Hungate	Pryor, Ark.
Clausen, Don H.	Hunt	Pucinski
Clawson, Del	Hutchinson	Purcell
Clay	Ichord	Quie
Cleveland	Jacobs	Quillen
Collier	Johnson, Calif.	Railsback
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Pa.	Randall
Collins, Tex.	Jonas	Rangel
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Conable	Jones, N.C.	Reid, N.Y.
Conte	Karth	Reuss
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Rhodes
Corman	Kazen	Riegle
Cotter	Keating	Robinson, Va.
Coughlin	Kee	Robison, N.Y.
Daniel, Va.	Keith	Rodino
Daniels, N.J.	Kemp	Roe
Danielson	King	Rogers
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Roncalio
Davis, S.C.	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Davis, Wis.	Kuykendall	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Kyl	Roush
Delaney	Kyros	Roy
Dellenback	Landgrebe	Roybal
Dellums	Latta	Runnels
Denholm	Leggett	Ruppe
Dent	Lennon	Ruth
Devine	Lent	Ryan
Dickinson	Link	St Germain
Dingell	Lloyd	Sandman
Donohue	Long, Md.	Sarbanes
Dorn	Lujan	Satterfield
Dow	McClory	Scherle
Dowdy	McCloskey	Scheuer
Downing	McClure	Schneebeli
Drinan	McCollister	Schwengel
Dulski	McCulloch	Scott
Duncan	McDade	Sebelius
du Pont	McDonald, Mich.	Seiberling
Edwards, Ala.	McEwen	Shoup
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	Shriver
Eilberg	McKay	Sikes
Erlenborn	McKevitt	Skubitz
Esch	McKinney	Slack
Eshleman	McMillan	Smith, Calif.
Evans, Colo.	Macdonald, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Fascell	Mahon	Smith, N.Y.
Findley	Mailliard	Snyder
Fish	Mann	Spence
Fisher	Martin	Staggers
Flood	Mathias, Calif.	Stanton, J. William
Flowers	Mathis, Ga.	Stanton, James V.
Flynt	Matsunaga	Steed
Ford, Gerald R.	Mayne	Steele
Ford, William D.	Mazzoli	Steiger, Ariz.
Forsythe	Meeds	Steiger, Wis.
Fountain	Melcher	Stephens
Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe	Stratton
Frenzel	Michel	Stubblefield
Frey	Mikva	Stuckey
Fulton, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Fuqua	Miller, Ohio	Symington
Galifianakis	Mills, Md.	Talcott
Gallagher	Minish	Taylor
Garmatz	Minshall	Teague, Calif.
Gaydos	Mitchell	Teague, Tex.
Gettys	Mizell	Terry
Giaimo	Monagan	Thompson, Ga.
Gibbons	Montgomery	Thompson, N.J.
Goldwater	Moorhead	Thomson, Wis.
Gonzalez	Morse	Thone
Goodling	Mosher	Tiernan
Grasso	Moss	Udall
Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Griffin		Vanik

Veysey	Whitten	Wylie
Vigorito	Widnall	Wyman
Waggonner	Wiggins	Yates
Waldie	Williams	Yatron
Wampler	Wilson, Bob	Young, Fla.
Ware	Winn	Young, Tex.
Whalen	Wolff	Zablocki
Whalley	Wright	Zion
White	Wyatt	Zwach
Whitehurst	Wydler	

NAYS—7

Ashbrook	Rarick	Schmitz
Gross	Rousselot	
Hall	Saylor	

NOT VOTING—51

Anderson, Ill.	Eckhardt	McCormack
Anderson, Tenn.	Edmondson	Madden
	Edwards, La.	Mills, Ark.
Archer	Evins, Tenn.	Mink
Arends	Foley	Mollohan
Barrett	Fraser	Morgan
Blanton	Gray	Pike
Blatnik	Gude	Roberts
Burton	Halpern	Rooney, N.Y.
Caffery	Hansen, Wash.	Rosenthal
Celler	Hébert	Shipley
Chisholm	Hicks, Mass.	Sisk
Crane	Howard	Springer
Culver	Hull	Stokes
Dennis	Jarman	Ullman
Derwinski	Jones, Tenn.	Wilson, Charles H.
Diggs	Landrum	
Dwyer	Long, La.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Archer.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Dennis.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Foley.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Pike.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Howard with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Hall with Mr. Jarman.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Blanton.
Mr. Culver with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Sisk with Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Ullman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7248) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other acts dealing with higher education.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7248, with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I express my gratitude to the members of the Special Subcommittee on Higher Education, and especially to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) for his unfailing support. I am especially grateful to Congressman DANIELS of New Jersey, Congressman BURTON, Congressman DENT, Congressman SCHEUER, and Congressman PUCINSKI, who serve on my subcommittee and who have been of such great help through the many weeks of hearings and the discussion during the markup of the bill. Mr. DANIELS and Mr. ERLENBORN have been especially helpful in that part of legislation dealing with the secondary market provisions—as has Congressman FUQUA of Florida.

Mr. Chairman, the committee had 34 days of hearings last year and 15 days of hearings this year on this legislation. And I would like to make clear, Mr. Chairman, that additional hearings were held by other subcommittees on legislation that was finally added to this bill. The reason for these additions is that the bill which was passed by the Senate included many titles not on our original bill and which do not necessarily pertain to higher education. However, because the chairmen of the other subcommittees—and I think rightfully so—felt that there ought to be an opportunity to bring the House version of these measures to conference, they asked that they have permission to add these other titles and the additions were made in the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, briefly, the bill provides for the extension of existing programs in higher education, with a 5-year authorization in order to give colleges and universities an opportunity to do advance planning. We all know the very commendable work that has been done by DAN FLOOD and the members of his Subcommittee on Appropriations in bringing out an education appropriations bill early so that, indeed, colleges and universities could plan ahead and use the money far more wisely.

In more than half of the titles of this bill, Mr. Chairman, we departed from the former procedure and we used the words "such sums" instead of specific authorizations. I have felt many times that the nationwide effort to have full funding on a figure that was brought out of the authorizing committee was not fair to the members of the Appropriations Committee, and when we use the term "such sums," we enable them to make a determination of what, in their judgment, is the amount that should actually be appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, title I of the bill is a sample extension of Community Service. No changes were made. I am not going into other titles of existing legislation in any detail, but I would be very glad to respond in the debate today or tomorrow to particular questions that may come up.

There are some parts of the bill over which I am vitally concerned and which do offer a new direction.

Let me turn, first of all, to title IV, which has to do with student aid. The present student aid law defines need in every program in terms of the need of a particular student at the institution which that student is attending. It does not seem to me that it is in the national interest nor in the interest of the individual institution nor in the interest of any single student to move from flexible institutional decisions to rigid national standards.

And, Mr. Chairman, that will certainly be one of the matters which will probably generate a great deal of heat tomorrow.

We maintain in the committee bill an allocation by States, and it seems to me this highly desirable. In both Democratic and Republican administrations, it prevents manipulation of funds by the Office of Education. The allocation by States is based on a three-pronged formula: First, the number of high school graduates, second, the number of students enrolled in college in the State compared to the national total; and, three, the needs factor that has been used in various bills of a $3,000 family income figure. I offered a substitute in the subcommittee to do away with that $3,000 figure and to use instead the social security, legislation criteria for the aid to dependent children program. I think those figures would have been more up to date.

That substitute was defeated, however, in the subcommittee. So, it is those three factors that are employed in the allotment formula for educational opportunity grants, college Work Study, and the NDEA loans. The educational opportunity grants program was designed for students of exceptional need. I think it is important for the House to know how well this program has worked. The facts are that in the last year 88 percent of the educational opportunity grants went to students who came from families who had a gross family income of $7,500 or less. An additional 8 percent of the educational opportunity grants went to students from families whose gross income was between $7,500 and $9,000. I do not see how anyone can legitimately challenge the fact that this program under the present legislation has been working exceedingly well. We still demand in the Committee bill that EOG's shall go only to students of exceptional need.

We are going to add the other two factors in the EOG State allocation formula and we think it will work even better then. There is also a provision for 10 percent transferrability of funds between work study and EOG.

We provide that the educational opportunity grants must be renewed each year. The present law has been interpreted by the Office of Education to say if a student gets an educational opportunity grant of an x

number of dollars, for example, $1,000, then he is automatically entitled to that for the other 3 years he is in college. I do not think that was the congressional intent, but that is the way it has been interpreted. We change that and say they have to qualify on the basis of need each year.

We also reemphasize the fact that the student must be in good standing. I know there is a difference of opinion on this fact, but I am not very friendly to this business of waiving standards and giving an educational opportunity grant and work study to people on the basis of economic need with no particular attention given to the language in the bill which provides that they must be in good standing in the college. We have a tremendous number of dropouts as a result.

We also provide more discretion for the student aid officer, so he can sit down with the student who is applying for aid and put together an appropriate package, taking into consideration the aid the State is giving—and they give a tremendous amount—and the aid which the institution is giving along with that which the Federal Government is providing through NDEA loans, work study, and educational opportunity grants, and other forms of assistance.

We also are trying to put the NDEA loan program on a revolving basis. We have had a cancellation clause so that people who go into teaching could have their loans cancelled. We retain the forgiveness features only for those teachers going into the very disadvantaged schools, or into teaching of the handicapped, or into Headstart programs.

But now we have a surplus of teachers. We do not need that incentive to attract more into the profession and if we eliminate the cancellation clause, we will have a chance to put it on a revolving fund basis.

To summarize, Mr. Chairman, the new thrust we have in the committee bill is to decrease Federal control, to decrease the amount of the decisions that will be made in the Office of Education about family eligibility, and also to give that flexibility and greater opportunity for decisionmaking at the local institutional level.

I also want to emphasize another thing which the committee bill does, and that is finally to again give some consideration to the middle-income student. We find the way the Office of Education has been interpreting the law is that all assistance must go to the people in the lower socioeconomic class. I suggest that almost every bill we pass out of the House is directed that way.

If we have a housing bill, or a food stamp bill, or a health service bill, or free comprehensive medical aid, if the family is in the middle income and paying taxes, then it is not eligible for the programs.

Congress never intended that student financial aid should be made into a welfare program. It is an educational program. If there is a student from a middle-income family and that student would not otherwise be able to attend college except for the fact that he had that economic assistance, then the student financial aid officer is allowed—in fact encouraged—to give him that economic aid. It seems to me this is an essential part of the bill.

I am not a great admirer of Saul Alinsky, but he made a statement a few months ago with which I do agree.

He said that the most alienated group in the United States today is the middle-income group. There are no special programs for them of any kind. They have no programs to help their sons and daughters go to the universities. The only right they have is to be clobbered by inflation and taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is essential that this year the Congress reaffirm the decision which it has made before that the student financial aid should be administered as an educational program and not as a welfare program, and that the determination should be made on whether that student needs the money in order to go to that college.

I would like to insert at this point letters received in my office from middle income families on this question along with an editorial from an Akron, Ohio, newspaper:

SANTA ROSA BEACH, FLA.,
March 3, 1971.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: In today's Panama City News-Herald there is a piece on Congress Criticizes Nixon's Higher Education Aid Goals. In this piece your criticism of the program, as it discriminates against middle class income students is discussed. A valid point, and I applaud you on it.

I would like to suggest a criticism from a slightly different aspect. That is, that the degree of neediness is certainly not to be considered the criterion for priority of provision of financial aid.

In connection with the well-settled fact that—the nation's greatest natural resource is its reservoir of potential competence among our youth—I would suggest that the criterion for aid for students aspiring to higher education should be a function, strictly, of his assessed potential for future competence. By the time a student is in his senior year of high-school our present system provides a wealth of sources from which such an assessment can be made.

When a student who simply doesn't have any reasonable potential for competence is started off on the beginnings of a higher education—and his start on this path is triggered by his "neediness"—then, as I see it, we have set the stage for future social disruption by practicing another form of promising more than can be delivered.

Sincerely,

MARVIN S. ZIPP,
Colonel USAF (Ret.).

COQUILLE, OREG.,
March 3, 1971.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am enclosing an item from this morning's Oregonian and wish to tell you how heartily I endorse your stand on the unfair treatment of students from middle class families.

As a former high school librarian, I have often served on committees for awarding scholarships to high school seniors. To me, it seemed eminently unfair that an outstanding student should be disqualified immediately if both parents were working, or if the family income exceeded $15,000.

If a student from such an "affluent" family did have the temerity to apply for a scholarship, the questions regarding family income were so very personal that most heads of families refused to fill out the necessary forms. Doesn't this penalize the student for the thrift and industry of his parents?

Just yesterday three of us were discussing the case of a local high school senior. He is the youngest of four children, a 4-point scholar, and an outstanding member of his student body. He is interested in math and science, and has selected Stanford as the school he would like to attend. But, sad to say, his father has an excellent position, by small-town standards, and his mother is doing part-time teaching. You see his parents have sent three older sisters through college, seen two of them married, and now there is the boy who deserves the best education he can get. But rules are rules, Mrs. Green, and the Stanford education with its high tuition fees will probably never be realized. I cite this case merely as an example of the inequities you pointed out to Secretary Elliot L. Richardson, as reported in the enclosed newspaper clipping.

Congratulations on the stand you have taken—it takes real courage these days to point out the fact that poverty alone does not indicate the most deserving student.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CLARENCE S. OSIKA,
Coquille, Oreg.

AMHERST, MASS.,
March 11, 1971.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I read with interest a recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education concerning institutional aid for colleges.

Your continuing concern for students whose families earn $10,000 or more is very much appreciated. While I can understand the need for greater financial aid to students from low income families, it does not seem appropriate to eliminate subsidized loans to middle income families. While the position of the Administration is to give every qualified low income student the same financial access to a college education as a student from a middle income family, the effect of the proposals would be to greatly restrict higher education opportunities to middle income families who cannot afford to meet the full costs. The aid package presented by the Administration will force low income students to go into public higher education where costs are more in line with the limits of the aid package (because of state subsidized low tuition rates) and to also force many middle income students into public higher education since they would no longer receive any federal support. The net result is to eliminate the option of private higher education for thousands of students. Not only would there be a restriction of the freedom of the student's choice but the impact of reduced applicants to private institutions could be substantial, endangering their financial condition.

Thank you for your concern for both middle income students and private institutions of higher education.

Sincerely,

L. R. MORRELL.

FARMINGTON, MICH.,
March 17, 1971.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: I read with great interest recently the following quote attributed to you.

"I think it is highly unfair to ask middle income tax payers to foot the bill for someone else's child to attend an expensive school,

while they cannot afford to send their own children to such a school."

I am in complete agreement with this statement.

Excluding the children from families who earn a gross income of $15,000 a year is most unfair. In the first place, the $15,000 is not take home pay. Secondly, the middle income tax payer often has several children to educate. Such people are put in a terrible squeeze with inflation eroding the dollar, and with Federal, State, and local taxes becoming more and more of an intolerable burden.

I hope that you are able to count on the support of our Congressmen, Jack McDonald of Michigan. I am enclosing a copy of my letter to Congressmen McDonald. Thank you very much for your support of people who are being as you say, asked to foot the bill for someone else's child to attend an expensive school, while they cannot afford to send their own children to such a school, and I might add, not only to such an expensive school but perhaps to any school at all the way things are going.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. TOBIN.

MANCHESTER, N.H.,
April 1, 1971.

Re: College Work/Study program
Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Please take a moment to think with me about a problem which I must surely be sharing with many "mainstream" parents.

As a family provider, I have spent the past two decades hustling: advancing in a craft to journeyman, assuming a manager's role, night college, transfers, etc., so that my salary is now $18,000 plus per year. As a father of ten children this has all been necessary; it also has been in keeping with a traditional American life-style. I've never had any illusions about my ability to finance ten college diplomas. Of necessity, we've preached excellence in scholarship as the only method by which my brood could realize college educations. When our oldest graduated from high school (with honors) last year we found out that traditional groundrules had changed. *Need* has *replaced excellence* as the criterion for college entrance!

My reason for this letter is that my chagrin (and frustrated pride) of last year has been repeated this year. Under Federal Higher Education acts, my Number One child was ineligible for loans last year. Summer work plus my limited assistance got her through a freshman year. The only available work which we could line up was a city parks and recreation department job, which hopefully could get us well into a sophomore year. We find ourselves again rebuffed by federal acts, since the city requires certification and resulting aid under the Work/Study program; parents earning more than $7500 this year have ineligible children, according to the U.N.H. Financial office. Our own case is complicated by Number Two child's graduation and acceptance at U.N.H., but fortunately his after school job can extend until college entrance in September.

If this is to be more than a recital of woes, I should tell you what we don't like, what questions we're asking ourselves, and perhaps pose a question to you. We don't like the rewarding of excellence being replaced by the rewarding of recognized need. Our society should take both into account. We don't like the transfer of penalties from parent to young adult which has resulted. Equitable tax programs should account for these. Among the unsettling questions we are asking ourselves are these—:

Why should children try for good marks?

Would mine be eligible if I had remained an apprentice craftsman?

Should we feel a guilt because of inability to save for education?

Was I stupid by being truthful (unlike many) on Parental Financial statements?

If government seeks to level our society for the Common Good, can we be told what level to seek?

If working between college years will cause my children to take six or seven years to graduate, will their draft status change?

Is a limit of $7500 a realistic level at which to determine eligibility under college Work/Study or Grant/Loan programs?

Even though I don't know the answers to the above, it is probably unfair to ask you for them. Against the background of what has been happening to our country, I pose just one question. Does the philosophy and legislation of the mid-sixties apply to life in the seventies? I think we can do better.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM S. BANNON.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., April 16, 1971.

Hon. EDITH GREEN
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am sending you for your reference and information two documents: one which outlines recommendations for national action affecting higher education as prepared by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the other a memorandum prepared by the University's Financial Aids office outlining this institution's financial aid to disadvantaged project students.

Your continued strong support of student aid programs for the middle income group is much appreciated. It is vitally important to our middle Americans that they have in Washington a representative aware of and in tune with their needs. The family emerging into middle income brackets or the one locked into middle income groups, may indeed be needy when pressed to provide an education for older children. Your understanding of this situation is clearly apparent in your recent public statements.

I trust that you find the documents I am sending you helpful sources of information for your work in higher education.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT D. CLARK,
President.

MARYLHURST COLLEGE,
Marylhurst, Oreg., March 22, 1971.

Hon. EDITH GREEN
House of Representatives
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: It was just a month ago (February 22) that President Nixon presented his proposals for the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1971. I am forwarding to you my reactions and comments, especially in the light of the institution I serve, i.e., a small private liberal arts College.

I do not believe that any of us differ on the basic philosophy of providing opportunities for higher education for all. What I do question are some methods used to achieve this goal, as well as the ramifications of some of the current proposals.

In attempting to provide an equal opportunity for all in higher education, the past programs, and the new ones being suggested, have made it increasingly impossible for students from middle income families to select a private college. President Nixon's statement that "a young person whose family earns more than $15,000 a year is almost five times more likely to attend a college than a young person whose family earns less than $3,000" is true. However, a student from a family whose annual income is in the range of $10,000–$25,000 will in three out of four instances select a public university or community college in preference to a private college. This choice is determined not on the needs, desires, or interests of the student, but simply on the lack of financial assistance. The private college by this process is thus evolving into an institution of students from very wealthy families, or students from very poor families who can qualify for some of the various financial assistance programs. Thus, the diversity among the student body we hope to serve at a smaller private institution is eventually eroded.

I agree with President Nixon's observation that "many colleges, and particularly universities, have become larger, complex institutions which have lost their way." Yet those smaller, private colleges which *have not lost their way* are in their death throes. When was the last time you heard of a public college or university closing its doors? There is hardly a month that passes that one doesn't hear of such closures among private institutions that have served their communities well for many years.

I note that in the President's message he had special reference to help for Black Institutions. In his proposals he seeks to reform student aid programs for these institutions, assist these colleges through the National Foundation for Higher Education, as well as the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, and the Department of Agriculture. In these proposals, is there not a great deal of duplication of effort and an excessive concentration of limited resources?

One occasionally reads that the President and Secretary Richardson are "concerned" about the difficulties the private colleges and universities are facing, but that they have no specific proposal at this time to assist them.

What we may be experiencing is the demise of private colleges and universities, as we have witnessed in this country the disappearance of the small businessman or small farmer. If that is the case, I regret the loss of this national resource and the concomitant elevation of the large, complex, public institution into a monopolistic preeminence.

Thank you for bearing with me while I expressed a few of my thoughts. Best wishes in all of your activities and endeavors for the benefit of our great nation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. KRUPP, *President.*

LEVITTOWN, PA.,
March 3, 1971.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I have recently read about the government's desire to spend more tax money on increased "loans" and grants to "needy" college students. I am at my wits end in trying to determine how I can survive this environment of taxes and costs placed upon me, I am fortunate (???) enough to earn about $25,000 a year. For this, I am taxed $6,000, have to pay *full* costs for my *two* sons in college ($10,000 a year off the top with no relief) support a wife and additional child, support a dependent sister-in-law who lives apart from us and pay for my father (senile) in a nursing home. How much do you think is left for me to exist on? I—with that income— can't even take my wife out to dinner and am in debt over $10,000 and still borrowing.

If the government really wants to distribute funds for education fairly, let some of it go to those of us who are responsible enough to pay our own way—possibly in the form of making college costs a legitimate deduction from income tax. At least it would help.

Frankly, I am ready to throw in the sponge, quit my job and apply for relief. At least then I won't have to worry about my kids finishing school. Right now I don't know if I can afford it. Please help us "poor" people.

Respectfully,

GENE LIEBERMAN.

TOMS RIVER, N.J.,
March 25, 1971.

Rep. EDITH GREEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: More and more often my taxes help send students to college-tuition free—if the father earns under $10,000 per year. Yet I am unable to obtain a government *loan* for my son who is a pre-med student because I make over $15,000 adjusted income.

There should be a wider span between the person who receives an outright gift and the person who needs an interest free loan.

My son chose Pre-Med. This past summer he turned down jobs at $2.00 per hour—life guard etc.—to work at the local hospital. He ran blood and urine tests, took blood samples, and frequently worked on autopsies—all for $14 per 40 hour week. I was proud of his decision—until I recently found my income prevented him from obtaining a loan of $1,000 for his college tuition.

I have three children. Understandably this could alter my son's future plans.

Medical colleges are in a financial squeeze. U.S. is far behind several other countries in doctors per 100,000 population.

Student loans make a big difference—especially in the current rapid rise in tuition fees. As a member of the Toms River School Board (14,000 students) and the Board of Trustees for the Toms River Student Loan Fund, I know these loans make a significant difference.

Raise the adjusted maximum income from the present $15,000 to $20,000 in order to be eligible for the $1,000 government loans. At present, banks will not grant government backed loans whereby the borrower pays the interest during the student's college years.

Finally, may I suggest for those who are poor (economically) and superior (academically)—don't pay the full four year tuition. Make the first year's tuition an outright gift. Money for the other years can be granted as loans—or at the most—half cash gift and half loan. Once they finish college, the income is such that the graduate can pay it back readily as I did many years ago. There will be more money to go around. The students will also study more if they have a stake in their own education.

Sincerely,

RALPH M. GELBURD.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
August 11, 1971.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

MADAM: On August 10, I viewed you in a television interview commenting on how college scholarships are unjustly being given to students predominantly on the basis of economic need rather than on ability and future promise. As a result, frequently economically disadvantaged students without as great an ability as more wealthy students are rewarded with scholarships. Your speech was uniquely impressive and welcome in that you are the first government official who I have heard express such ideas. Since your comments were especially meaningful to me, I am in wholehearted agreement with your ideas.

I am presently a college student who, like countless others, was unable to obtain a scholarship solely because the combined income of my mother and father placed me in the "middle-class" income group. My past academic record as valedictorian of my high school class and eager desire to work diligently to succeed in college were duly noted but were not enough to qualify me for a scholarship from my college, the University of California, Davis campus.

Although my crowded college schedule has not permitted me to work during school, I have gratefully found employment every summer. In this way, I have been able to appreciably diminish the high expenses of my education.

This fall I will enter my senior year. I know that with continued perseverance and enthusiasm, I will be able to maintain my 3.85 grade point average so that I may graduate Magna Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Sciences degree. My major is "Biological Sciences," and I hope to go on to graduate work in microbiology.

In order to go on to graduate school, however, it will be essential that I obtain some type of fellowship, grant, or opportunity to work as a research assistant. This necessity stems from the fact that now my brother is also going to college and that the departure of my father due to divorce has placed all financial responsibility once shared to be held by my mother. I have confidence, in spite of the past, that my scholastic excellence and experience will allow me to gain that essential money.

I have told you my personal story only to serve as an example of one deserving "middle-class" income student who would have deeply appreciated and worked doubly hard to justify such a scholarship. I sincerely hope that you will be able to make progress in the initiation of a program which awards scholarships more fully on the basis of capability and performance rather than on economic need.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ILSA M. SCHMELZINGER.

ALOHA, OREG.,
April 12, 1971.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Court House,
Portland, Oregon

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Although you are not in my district, I wish to express my appreciation of your bill for financial aid to college students.

I have two daughters attending state universities and two high school age sons. In the past 14 years I have been a single parent with an income of between $3,500 and now $9,000. My daughters do have the marvelous benefit of Social Security survivors insurance but my sons will not have the benefits.

Because of my earnings the financial aid available to the children is very limited even after they are considered financially independent of me. They have worked under the work study program.

It seems that the family, who has college goals for their children but whose income is not on the poverty level and yet not above $12,000 a year has few financial resources to help their children while college costs are increasing.

Sincerely,

CAROLINE MCFARLAND.

MACON, GA.,
March 8, 1971.

Hon. EDITH GREEN, *Chairman, House Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. GREEN: As the father of two girls one presently in college and the second to begin next Fall I wish to protest strongly against the Nixon Administration Aid Program for college students.

I think it is highly unfair to make middle income taxpayers foot the bill for someone else's child's college expenses, in some cases in expensive colleges, just because this child comes from a low income family, while middle income taxpayers' children, although their parents pay more and higher taxes, are discriminated against and barred from any federal economic assistance.

Who can say fairly this is the dividing line between families who should get federal aid and those who should not? Is $10,000 a year family income the amount of money needed to put through college one or more students? What if this is the first year such amount is earned? What if serious financial burdens and mishaps have prevented this family from saving in the past? Is it fair to pay taxes at the present high rates and be barred from benefiting from the programs made possible with such taxes?

The communist after the Russian Revolution and for many years, gave aid for higher education only to those students who had a proletarian background. If Mr. Nixon's program were to be approved we would have in this country the same results as in communist Russia. The children of the middle class excluded from higher education.

It takes more than just dollars to have education. Apportioning every dollar to students coming from the neediest families alone will make sure that we are going to have mass college registration. But are these registrants going to be students? Will they be motivated to learn?

Any financial aid for students must not exclude the motivated and deserving and a family in this high cost of living era can be in need with incomes many times higher than $10,000.

Sincerely,

ARMANDO I. CASTELLANOS.

EDMONDS, WASH.,
March 7, 1971.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Thank you for your interest in the "middle class." Once considered to be the foundation and main stay of our way of life, this class now seems to be the one we need no longer be concerned about. It seems to me this trend, if continued to its conclusion, will lead to a two class society, a few rich and many, many poor, and a return to the unhappy conditions of by-gone ages.

The solution to our difficult problems is certainly not the pulling down of the middle class, even though this be done inadvertently.

Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

COL. W. O. PEALE,
U.S.A. (Ret.).

SHAWNEE MISSION, KANS.,
March 3, 1971.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: This piece in our *Kansas City Times* was extremely welcome reading to me. For several years I have believed that the middle-income people, including many like us (self-employed) receive the short end of the stick through government policies. Beginning with opportunities for higher education, we managed to scrape up enough money to send one of our sons, a merit scholarship finalist, to the school of his choice for one year, then were forced to admit we couldn't afford it with an older son already in his third year at a state university and one younger to follow in two years. This middle son switched to a local university for the rest of his undergraduate work because we were not really poor enough to be eligible for financial aid. Since then he has married, returned to the expensive school (Northwestern University) for graduate work, receiving tuition, books and an $1800.00 stipend from the university in return for his work in the opera workshop. This money does not cover the expenses for a family of three in that area, by any means, but his job at the school and his studies take all of his time so both families parents are still contributing.

As for medical opportunities, a cleaning woman who used to work for me when our boys were small receives free the best in medical care. My husband has had an operation for cancer and a heart attack in recent months and we are unable to pay the remaining 20% of bills not covered by Blue Cross because he had to close the business which

started a fast run down hill after he was first hospitalized. Nevertheless, he is required to pay unemployment security taxes, though he receives none, and has no sick leave benefits. Inflation and mounting expenses have made it impossible for us to have for a rainy day which has actually been a whole rainy year of recession in this Kansas City area plagued with strikes.

The oldest boy completely supports himself through summer work and is paying for his master's degree at K.U. but our youngest is applying for a scholarship at Indiana University because of their fine music department. If this scholarship is not granted he will probably have to find a job, if jobs are available for one with his limited training and skill. He is nineteen years old and eligible for the draft this year, a position he shares with many others, I know. He is receiving a partial scholarship now which covers his tuition at K.U. but after two years in the music school here he feels that another year in this university would be of little benefit to his musical education, therefore, his wish to transfer to Indiana University is important to his future, but his need for scholarship money is also urgent.

My point is that the owners of small businesses, at one time thought to be the backbone of the country, have become less and less prosperous over the years because of government regulations and taxation which seem to benefit the very rich and the very poor and penalize the middle-income for their independence. They have no lobbies or civil rights organizations working in their behalf and I foresee the day when all business will be big business and this big business will be tied and regulated by big government. The way things are going it appears to be inevitable. Anything you can do in behalf of small business would be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

BERNICE GRANGER.

LAKE HAVASU CITY, ARIZ.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I read your recent comments concerning aid to college education in a recent article in the U.S. News. The remarks were very sensible. In line with this I forward the following comments for your possible consideration.

I am retired living on a fixed income of app. $10,000 a year, so am pretty well restricted financially.

I have two boys in college—at my expense. No handouts, grants, etc. I contribute some $3000.00 to their education and about $1000.00 taxes per year, leaving $6000.00 to live on and provide a home.

The boys assist by working in the summer and odd jobs at school.

Recently my younger son sought a part time campus job—some 15 hours per week to help with the expenses. A job—not a hand out.

He was told that since it was Federally funded he had to be either black which he isn't or his father had to be on welfare! which I am not: to get a job.

I hardly think that this could have been Congress' intent and HEW should be advised to quit making up their own guidelines.

If this was the intent of Congress to place there restrictions on the program, then as a taxpayer I object and ask for their revision.

Yours very truly,

F. BRIGGS.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If there is catastrophic illness in the family, if there is a business failure, if that family has three other children in college at the same time, if there is a large expenditure of money to pay the costs of education for other children in private schools, all these factors must be taken into consideration by the student financial aid officer as he determines how much that student is eligible to receive.

Mr. Chairman, in the guaranteed student loan program we have added a secondary market, to provide liquidity for the lending institutions, so that loans may be made to many more students. Mr. FUQUA, of Florida, was an eloquent spokesman for this change in the legislation.

At the present time there are over 1 million loans under the guaranteed student loan program, amounting to over a billion dollars. I think that the banks and other lending institutions have done an admirable job.

Mr. Chairman, the second part of the bill that is of most importance—and it is a new direction—is institutional aid. I am convinced, from all the testimony during those 50 days of hearings and from all the reports and studies that have been made, that our institutions of higher education do in fact face a real financial crisis. I think that some institutions are going to close their doors. I think that some institutions are keeping their doors open only through deficit financing or by dipping into their endowment funds.

One need only read the Jellema study, the Cheit study, the private study made in Massachusetts, another study in New York, and another study in Pennsylvania, to see that this crisis is not isolated. It is nationwide.

In my judgment we cannot pass a bill just with a provision for x number of dollars for those institutions that are in the greatest need. If an institution has good management and it is in the black, and another institution has very poor management and it is in the red, does the Commissioner of Education say, "Well, then, we will give the institution in the red the money, because they obviously need it?"

If we do that, we penalize the good management of the institution that stays in the black.

If there is a State law that prevents State institutions from doing any deficit financing, and so they appear to be in the black, by cutting back departments and programs, or by not filling vacancies which occur, is that a basis for need? I do not think a fair criteria can be formed, and I would be opposed to any aid if we say we will only give it to the neediest institutions, because I do not believe those institutions can be identified on a fair and equitable basis.

I am going to insert with my remarks at this point a summary statement made of the studies showing this great need for institutional aid.

One of the studies done was by Mr. William Jellema, executive associate and research director of the Association of American Colleges. His study of 4-year colleges and universities, entitled "The Red and the Black" concluded:

> Most colleges in the red are staying in the red . . . Taken collectively, they will not long be able to serve higher education and the Nation with strength unless significant aid is soon forthcoming.

The study which prompted that conclusion was completed a little over a year ago. This summer Mr. Jellema updated his conclusions. They found the crisis 26-percent worse than originally forecast from preliminary study.

Dr. Earl Cheit, of the University of California at Berkeley, is another who has done extensive study of higher education institutions and testified before our subcommittee.

Dr. Cheit summarized his finds as follows:

> This study makes clear that the money crisis in higher education is indeed real. Almost no school is immune from its effects. For most schools, it will mean serious problems of retrenchment and readjustment. As this study has shown, the extent to which colleges and universities of all types are in economic trouble is great, and they are genuinely working at reducing their financial difficulties. But the schools cannot solve the problem alone.

A study of the State universities and land grant colleges opens with this statement:

> Five years ago there was not a single public university in the country with an operating funds' deficit. Last year there were 12 that ended the academic year in the red, and 11 universities are already predicting that they will finish this year with more expenses than they have funds to meet.

The study hastens to point out that a look at universities with deficits does not even begin to tell the story. The financial crisis at public universities is much greater than can be shown by a cursory look at university ledger sheets. Some universities have had to resort to emergency measures that are at best stopgap actions that cannot be continued indefinitely without doing irreparable damage to these institutions. Others are existing within the framework of standstill budgets. Practically none has managed to avoid taking economy measures that at times pose threats to the quality of instruction. For behind the mounds of deficits lie the remains of curtailed operations, decimated academic programs, innovation untried and creativity curbed. The deficits are great even though cutbacks have been made. If they had not been made, the deficits would have been much higher.

With few exceptions, our institutions of higher education have been forced to take severe measures to deal with their mounting fiscal crisis.

For 2 years Pennsylvania State University has been forced to go to private lending institutions for funds to meet operating expenses, because State appropriations were not made in time to meet their day-to-day costs. They have borrowed a total of $88.55 million which will cost the university in excess of $2 million in interest charges.

A study of the financial problems of Massachusetts private higher education showed that the debt level of private institutions in Massachusetts had risen from $63.7 million in 1962 to $191.8 million in 1969.

An easy first step taken by many institutions has been deferment of maintenance. However, the backlog of demonstrable needs is reaching incredible proportions on some campuses. The Uni-

versity of California reports a backlog of major maintenance needs to arrest deterioration on its nine campuses now standing at $6 million and growing rapidly. The university also reports that efficient use of existing facilities is prevented in many cases, because it has no funds to carry out necessary alternations to restore or convert outdated classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. The alteration backlog now stands in the tens of millions.

Another example is offered by Miami University. President Phillip R. Shriver says that there are demonstrable needs on the Oxford, Ohio, campus alone for at least a half-million dollars in deferred maintenance.

In Illinois, in fiscal year 1969, 39 private colleges, with 85 percent of the private enrollment, deferred maintenance in total amount of $20 million.

Other institutions have been forced to dip into unrestricted endowment principal to obtain funds for operating expenses. The University of South Carolina has been able to avert a deficit only by taking such action. Rutgers and Cornell have had deficits even after dipping into endowment principal. Cornell has also used funds obtained from appreciation of endowment funds to meet operating expenses, and the University of Vermont has taken the same action in the face of deficits for the past 2 fiscal years.

Of 762 accredited private 4-year institutions, 24 percent currently are borrowing from endowment.

Other institutions have been forced to eliminate new programs. Forty-two out of 78 State universities and land grant colleges, according to the study of those institutions, have eliminated new programs.

Another obvious pattern to be observed is the increase in tuition charges in desperate attempts to keep down spiraling costs.

A study conducted in the State of Texas in 1968, indicated that if the short trend uncovered in that study were to continue, by 1985 in constant 1968 dollars, the cost per student in major independent universities in the State of Texas would be $36,859 and the cost per student in senior colleges in the State would be $17,074. If the percentage covered by tuition were the same in 1985 as in 1968, the student at a private university would be asked to pay over $17,000 per year and the student at a senior college would be confronted by a tuition charge of just under $10,000.

This, of course, also has the subsequent effect of literally pricing private institutions out of the market.

A Pennsylvania study of private institutions of higher education showed the private school share of the total State enrollment dropped from 70 percent in fiscal year 1966 to 38 percent in fiscal year 1971.

George Washington University experienced a drop of 300 students and a subsequent loss of $900,000.

A vivid comparison is offered by the State of New York where no tuition is charged at City University of New York, tuition is $400 at the State University system, and the average tuition at private institutions ranges from $2,000 to $2,500.

Our institutions need help in meeting growing enrollments, growing responsibilities, and growing inflation.

Enrollments have doubled in the last decade. At the University of California for fiscal year 1971–72, there was a 34-percent increase in enrollment with a 6-percent increase in budget.

To maintain the same level of services in face of inflation and enrollment increases, university budgets must increase 10 percent annually. Forty-four out of 78 of the State universities and land-grant colleges reported their increases for the last school year to be 10 percent or less.

College and university administrators, too numerous to mention, have testified before the subcommittee and submitted statements certifying the crisis and the crying need for assistance.

Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina and now president of Duke University has written:

> Too many colleges, including state-supported institutions, are at this moment in urgent need of additional operating funds.

Robben Fleming, president of the University of Michigan, has stated:

> It is important to understand that all universities are in financial trouble.

From Father Henle, president of Georgetown, we heard the plea:

> There has got to be increased federal support to private higher education.

John G. Kemeny, president of Dartmouth, flatly states:

> Higher education, both public and private, is facing its most serious financial crisis in history. I see no alternative to a massive federal program of support to higher education.

Dr. T. J. Marchese, of Barat College:

> Over the long run, I doubt that Barat College and similar colleges can continue to operate without increased monies from state and federal sources.

Arthur W. Brown of Marygrove College:

> The handwriting is clearly on the wall unless new sources of income are found . . .

We live in a Nation where the largest railroad receives a Federal loan guarantee of $125 million in a deficit situation of more than twice that amount and where the Defense Department seeks $1,400 million to stave off bankruptcy for the developer of the C–5A transport plane.

We are rightfully willing to invest $221.9 million annually in the support of our six military institutions for the training of future defense leaders. Does it not seem equally right that we should make a similar investment in the training of our civilian leaders?

One commentator has described the current situation confronting higher education as "Hope, a little inebriated by unwarranted optimism seems to outrun despair." I would hope, that with a program of institutional assistance, we may make optimism warranted and outdistance despair.

Mr. Chairman, the formula that is in the committee bill is easy to understand, easy to explain, and it absolutely prevents manipulation by the Office of Education in any Republican or Democratic administration.

It simply says to every institution that they will be given a sum of money based on the following formula: $100 for every student in the lower division, $150 for every student in the upper division, and $200 for every student at the graduate level. It is on a full-time equivalency basis on credit hours earned.

This formula is in contrast to the one which may be offered. It would not give it just for bodies that are present. The dropout and turnover rates are tremendous. I am opposed to giving institutional aid unless credits are actually earned in the preceding year.

We were persuaded that small colleges face a greater financial crisis, so we put in a weighted factor for them so that colleges will receive an additional $300 for the first 200 students and an additional $200 for each of the next 100 students. That will help some of the small colleges to keep their doors open and continue to do the job that they are doing.

Mr. Chairman, there is one point for legislative history that must be made. There is concern among the community colleges. A great number of community colleges provide courses in occupational or vocational or career training, but these courses may or may not count for credit toward a bachelor's degree yet they certainly are postsecondary, given for credit, and a part of a student's academic program. The committee wants to make it abundantly clear in establishing the legislative intent that while such courses may not count toward a bachelor's degree it does not affect their being counted for general assistance purposes under the new title, title VIII.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The bill defines an institution eligible to receive general assistance as an institution of higher education as defined in the first section, 16018, which is section 1201(a) of the present law. That section defines such institution as one that provides an educational program which awards a bachelor's degree or which provides not less than a 2-year program acceptable for full credit toward such degree. A junior college which provides a 2-year program which is acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree qualifies as an institution which is eligible for general aid.

Once having qualified as an institution, all its courses, including occupational or vocational or career training, count as establishing its full-time equivalent enrollment for the purposes of receiving general aid. In other words, the colleges or community colleges or technical schools, if they are accredited and the credits are actually earned as required by

that institution, then those students earning the credits in any subject are counted on a full-time equivalency basis.

The final compromise—and it was an earnest effort to put the two formulas together—is that two-thirds of the money will be given to the institutions on the basis that I have just outlined, students enrolled on a full-time equivalency basis for credits earned. One-third will be given on the cost of education basis which will be presented later. Prior to the present time, fewer than 100 universities in the United States have been receiving 69 percent of all Federal funds. If you consider funds of the Atomic Energy Commission or the Department of Defense or the NASA program, it is a higher percentage than that. Three-fourths of the funds go to the same 100 institutions and the other 2,500 institutions in the country do not have the assistance necessary to maintain the academic standards and to accommodate increased enrollments. Therefore, it seems to me there is a Federal responsibility to help these institutions of higher education to provide the training for our civilian leaders in this country, that is, the engineers, the doctors, the teachers, the lawyers, and others that we are going to need in the years ahead.

In the current year, in terms of military academies, there are six institutions; namely, West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, the Merchant Marine Academy, and the Monterey Language School where we are providing over $200 million in operating expenses for these schools to train our military leaders. In this bill we are asking for only $800 million, only four times as much, for not six institutions, but for 2,600 institutions, for the training of civilian leaders. Surely the future of our country is as dependent upon the kind of civilian leaders we train as it is in the kind of military leaders that we train.

Mr. Chairman, this provision—this formula for institutional aid, has the support of every association of higher education in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has again expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

At this point, I insert in my remarks three additional pieces of correspondence pertinent to the legislation:

UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg., October 14, 1971.

Representative WENDELL WYATT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WYATT: The Higher Education Bill (H.R. 7248) which you will be considering shortly is naturally of very deep concern to all of us in higher education. Although I have not had an opportunity to consider all provisions of the Bill, I have given considerable thought to the section on aid to institutions, and I am in complete agreement with the Green amendment as reported out of the full Committee.

The University of Portland, despite our sincerest efforts, has faced an operating deficit during each of the past three years. As a result, we now have an accumulated current fund deficit of $835,000. For this present year, we anticipate an operating deficit of $264,000. We are seeking contributions from friends of the University to enable us to finance this year's deficit. However, the prospect of securing through contributions, sufficient funds to keep use solvent, is not very bright. Our very limited reserve funds will not permit us to allow the accumulated current fund deficit to grow any larger. Although we are doing all we can to reduce our expenses and increase income, we recognize that there is a limit to what can be done in these areas also.

As I am sure you are aware, our plight is not unique. Virtually every independent college and university in the nation is facing similar problems. If we are to preserve a dual system of higher education in America, then it seems evident that some kind of federal assistance is necessary.

I support the Green amendment because I believe that if institutional aid is to be of genuine benefit to colleges and universities, then it should address itself directly to the problem and not be tied to any other program such as aid to students.

As a matter of fact, some of our fiscal problems have been caused by federal programs of student aid. We are given an estimate figure of funds that might be available for these programs. We proceed to work out with the students, aid packages based on these preliminary figures. Then when the final appropriation comes, it is less than originally estimated and we are caught in the middle.

The amounts we have received under federal student aid programs have declined sharply since last year. The exact amounts we received are as follows:

	1970–1971
Economic opportunity grants	$51,000
National defense student loans	115,165
Work study	27,141
	1971–72
Economic opportunity grants	$40,000
National defense student loans	79,521
Work study	23,712

With regard to the Work Study funds, the cut was even greater than the figures would indicate since the $27,141 in 1970–71 covered the period from January 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970—a twelve month period; while the $23,712 for 1971–72 is to cover the period from January 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972—an eighteen month period.

To tie institutional aid to such fluctuating programs would not enable us to plan effectively and as a result could cause even further financial problems for our institutions. If the intent of the Congress is to help the institutions, then I hope that the legislation will address itself to this issue directly and not dissipate the effectiveness of the aid by subordinating it to other federal programs of student aid. For this reason, I believe the Green amendment merits support because in fact, it does face the issue directly and offers a solution that permits us to plan in a responsible manner. I therefore urge your support of the Bill including the Green amendment.

Finally, in the area of student financial aid, I would hope that you would support legislation designed to assist students from middle income families. As a minimum, I hope that some provisions might be made to enable them to borrow sufficient funds to finance their education at the same level of interest offered to students from low income families. The upper limits on the amounts which can be borrowed under existing federal loan programs are not sufficiently high to meet the needs of the middle income students who do not have available to them other grants (such as EOG) or opportunities to participate in the Work Study program. An extension of the borrowing limit would, I believe, enable a larger number of middle income students to enroll in the private colleges and universities, and thus ultimately save much more in tax dollars than the additional interest subsidy would cost. I personally believe that there would be sufficient savings to permit not only an interest subsidy but also some kind of scholarship or grant to these middle income students who are attending independent institutions where tuition and fees are so much higher than at the tax supported institutions.

The University of Portland is presently spending annually $5,200,000 for salaries and purchase of supplies and services within the State of Oregon. The other independent institutions in the State are expending proportionate amounts. Collectively then, we do constitute a major industry for the State. Under the provisions of Mrs. Green's amendment, we estimate that the Federal assistance to the University of Portland could amount to around $270,000 annually. For us it would mean the difference between a balanced operation and a deficit operation and ultimately, our fiscal solvency. Quite apart from any personal attachment to the University of Portland, I believe that such an investment on the part of the Federal government is a very sound one. It serves the national interest in preserving a dual system of higher education; and it serves the State of Oregon by providing educational opportunity for citizens of the State without additional expenditures from State tax funds. I sincerely hope that you will do all in your power to see that HR 7248 with Mrs. Green's amendment is passed.

Sincerely,
Rev. PAUL E. WALDSCHMIDT, C.S.C.,
President.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., October 16, 1971.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS AND MRS. GREEN: I wish to express my support for H.R. 7248 as reported out of the Labor and Education Committee. Your Committee has produced a good bill and acted wisely to extend with modifications the existing aid programs which are working well and need only to be more adequately funded.

However, I have read with considerable concern the "Supplemental Views" of Congressman Quie *et al.* contained in the Committee Report. What distresses me is the following which is quoted verbatim from page 242 of the Report:

"Those who favor the Committee EOG proposal must be willing to put an unusual amount of faith in the financial aid officer at each participating institution. They will be the ones making the crucial decisions in how students get assisted under this program. We are aware of many highly professional aid officers. Several of them have testified before our Committee. But we must look at the *national* [emphasis mine] picture. A recent survey on financial aid officers found that:

(a) There is a 28 percent turnover in the position of student financial aid administrator.

(b) Twenty-nine percent of financial aid administrators are employed part time.

(c) Thirty-seven percent of financial aid administrators are rated at a low level of professionalization. (Only 15 percent are rated at a high level.)

(d) From 34 percent to 42 percent of those financial aid administrators responsible for

aid policy are rated low in professionalization.

(e) Student financial aid administrators have the lowest median salary of all college administrators."

No citation is provided for the source of the data. Upon checking I find that it is from a publication of the College Entrance Examination Board, dated November 1970, entitled "Professional Development of Financial Aid Officers" by Warren W. Willingham. This study was conducted on a selected sample of 122 institutions in the Western portion of the United States. (States with respondents included: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.)

I deplore the representation of this data as *national* data when it is, in fact, based only on data from 122 schools in a unique section of the country.

Now, to some observations on each item.

(a) The figure of 28% turnover seems to come from Table 3 on page 18 of the Willingham study. This figure, 28%, applies to the number of aid officers who have held that posiiton less than one year. No mention is made of the fact that of those hired in the last year, 33% came from another college. On page 7, Willingham states: "the data of this survey indicate that among those recently hired, one in three was recruited from another college (table 3). *Half of these had worked in an aid position.*" [emphasis mine] So the actual figure is something less than 28% "new" people in financial aid.

(b) In the geographical area covered by the Willingham study, "Some 15% of the colleges in the West have less than 300 applicants . . . Most of those colleges with less than 300 aid applicants handle aid on a part-time basis." (page 7) Financial aid and admissions are often combined, particularly in smaller schools, or the aid officer may also have closely related responsibilities such as placement. It does not follow that because a person works only part-time on financial aid that he is any less competent or cannot do the job as well as a person employed full-time.

(c) The citing of data on professionalization is very misleading if no definition of professionalization is given.

(d) In the Willingham study "Professional levels are defined in terms of number of activities checked in question 12; Low=3 or less; Medium=4 to 6; High=7 or more." (page 32) The study itself states: "In order to provide some means of estimating the extent of professionalization of different *groups* [emphasis mine] of aid officers, each respondent's answers to the question on professional activities was scored from zero to ten according to the number of activities checked. This provides a rough index of professionalization for each respondent, *valid only for group comparisons and to the extent that such items as those listed do represent meaningful professional activities.*" [emphasis mine] (page 12)

Question 12 had ten items:

1. Read aid newsletter regularly.
2. Attend aid association meetings.
3. Participated in aid meetings (read paper, led discussion).
4. Follow progress of aid bills.
5. Read "Chronicle of Higher Education" or "Higher Education and National Affairs."
6. Attended ACAC, AACRAO, or APGA.
7. Committee work for aid association.
8. Published article on aid.
9. Served as consultant off campus.
10. Held office in aid association.

In view of the remoteness of some of the states and even institutions within a state; considering the fact that program content at ACAC, AACRAO, and APGA has limited appeal to aid officers; since aid associations are only a recent phenomenon in the West it is not alarming that few have participated in an aid meeting or read a paper or led a discussion or have engaged in committee work or held an office and that low "scores" were found. I fail to see the direct relationship between being a consultant off campus and publishing an aid article and being able to administer federal funds.

Let's look at the data on page 31: 90% of all respondents read aid newsletters regularly; 74% attend aid meetings; 75% follow progress of aid bills; and 61% read the Chronicle and the ACE Bulletin. This looks pretty good to me. The results reported for question 12 are based on a definition of professionalization that was for the purposes of the study and not on ability to administer federal aid and one can question the items selected for response in question 12. Even the author says that the items may not "represent meaningful professional activities."

e. The observation about salaries did not come from the Willingham survey, but was done by another group which was reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education on September 28, 1970. The Willingham survey only mentions the salary level. No citation is in the Committee Report that it is not part of the same survey.

In conclusion, I find it most regrettable that regional data was presented as representing national data; that the sources were not given so all could go to them; and that a questionable definition of professionalization was used to create misleading impressions in the mind of readers. Should the information contained on page 242 of the Committee Report need rebuttal on the Floor of the House or elsewhere, I hope the above information will be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

EDSON W. SAMPLE,
Director.

LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Eugene, Oreg., May 10, 1971.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am writing in support of your new bill, H.R. 7248, which would measurably improve financing of the nation's expanding community colleges.

As you know, we in Oregon are particularly impressed with the general block grant institutional aid aspect of the bill and the grants to part-time students.

I have reviewed the letter from Frank Mansel, Director of Governmental Affairs, AAJC, and am in general support of his comments. As an institution enrolling predominantly students from lower and middle income families, whose futures lie in the potential of the community college, we will do anything possible to support your bill. If I can be of assistance in providing additional supportive information, I would be pleased to do so.

In closing, may I again extend an invitation for you to visit Lane Community College when it is convenient for you to spend some time in Lane County.

Sincerely,

ELDON G. SCHAFER.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The gentlewoman indicated in her comments on educational opportunity grants that we have shifted the formula from the existing law pretty well over to the allotments to the States to graduates from school to children from families with incomes of less than $3,000.

What correlation does a graduate from high school have to do with the number of poor children who attend college and therefore would receive additional educational opportunity grants? The percentage of high school graduates who would attend college varies so greatly from State to State. Some States export more high school graduates while some States have an import of graduates as, for instance, in the State of Arizona where a very high percentage of high school students go on to college. What is the rationale of that?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The rationale is that we are trying to find a formula that will be the fairest for all the States. Certainly there is some relation between the number of high school graduates and the number who will be going on to college. We do not take into consideration, of course, 6-year-olds or 50-year-olds. However, more and more high school graduates are going to college and the proportion of graduates in the different States who pursue higher education is somewhat the same although not identical. Further, the needs factor is very relevant because we are trying to make it possible for highly motivated, qualified low-income students to attend college and we are trying through programs such as upward bound to identify those students who are highly qualified, but who do not have the financial resources to continue postsecondary education.

I think it is true that in the poorer States we will find the largest number of students who are not going to college. So I believe all three factors are relevant.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to ask a question relative to an instance of mine. I feel that one of the things that ought to be done to assist colleges is to assist in the development of programs which would encourage alumni giving to institutions and thereby enabling the institution to be strengthened privately or on a voluntary basis.

I am under the impression that the Educational Professions Development Act contains provisions for grants to train administrative personnel under which grants could be made for the training of administrators of alumni programs. I am also told that the developing institutions section of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is sufficiently broad to include grants for the development of alumni programs. This is authorized under a cooperative arrangement section and thus would require a stronger institution acting as a "parent" in helping the younger one strengthen its alumni organization.

Is this possible under the language of the legislation now pending before us?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have discussed this briefly with my colleague from Ohio and I want to assure the gentleman that the present law does pro-

vide this in that it provides for the training of administrative personnel. I agree with the gentleman's position that it is in the national interest to have alumni people who are very active in raising funds for these institutions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the authorization is there?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The authorization is there and in my judgment they should be included in title III for developing institutions and the Educational Professions Development Act.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the debate we are now beginning on this very comprehensive bill is the culmination of a great deal of effort begun December 16, 1969, when the Special Subcommittee on Education initiated hearings on the general needs of higher education. In the past 23 months, this subcommittee has had 56 days of hearings, during which we had the benefit of some 297 witnesses, including those who testified on the problem of discrimination against women in higher education. In addition, 239 individuals submitted statements, letters and supplementary materials related to the legislation, which have been made a part of the official record.

Indeed, if any one took the time to read through the six volumes of hearings published since December, 1969, he would have a wealth of information about the general problems and successes of higher education; the strengths and weaknesses of present laws in the area of higher education; and probably more competing and conflicting ideas of what the future role of the Federal Government should be than he would be able to assimilate.

The task before the special subcommittee—and that before the Congress today—is not a simple task. As we will all be reminded in the next couple days, the road to a consensus position on the proper and legitimate role of the Federal Government in higher education is a rocky, curving, tiring road. The higher education community always has been and always will be divided into several camps when it comes to specific philosophies of Federal support. The members of the committee and of this Congress are also divided into several camps.

It is for these reasons that our debate here today is so important. The issues are complex, the data sparse and incomplete. Yet we must and we will make decisions here that will have a profound influence on the future course of post-secondary education. It is not a bill one can be all for or all against. It is a bill with 20 titles. Any Member looking at any given title could probably find both good features and bad features.

The issues in this bill should not be partisan. The democratic process of having the issues discussed and then letting the majority rule is a good process. We have to decide on issues where fairness and equity for students is the main criterion. Other issues relate to what is best for public and private institutions of higher education. Others to the matter of relative priorities. Members will have to balance points relating to good national policy with how his State might fare under a particular formula.

Before I get into some of the issues I want you to know that there is no animosity among the individuals on the subcommittee. The gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), who has taken the lead here, as you know is an individual dedicated to education, especially higher education. She does her work well, and comes well armed with information to the subcommittee, the full committee, and here to the floor. I would say the same thing is true of our other colleagues, like the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), the ranking Republican on that subcommittee. He also has put a great deal of effort into his work, which leads all of us to have confidence in him because he comes to decisions with the kind of depth of thought that is necessary.

But there is disagreement between these two. And the same thing could be said about the other members of the Committee on Education and Labor on both sides of the aisle.

So there is no rancor among the Members that causes a division amongst us; it is just a difference in the decisions that the Members reach, and I would like to point out some of those differences in just a minute or two.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would appropriate to discuss briefly some of the highlights of the Federal role in education as it has emerged in the past couple decades. The figures I mention are taken from the Digest of Educational Statistics, 1970" and the "Special Analyses of the U.S. Budget".

From 1950 to the present time, the Federal contribution to institutions of higher education has risen from about $500 million a year to an expected outlay of $6 billion during fiscal year 1972. This staggering increase in Federal support for colleges and universities is due in part to our belief that higher education research and training is a key to our Nation's future and security, and more recently, to the objective of making higher education more accessible to every citizen of our Nation.

Prior to 1958, Federal interest in higher education was, for the most part, limited to land-grant college legislation, GI bills, and the purchase of scientific research and services by the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Department, and the National Institute of Health. Some grants, totaling a few million dollars a year, were given to institutions conducting research under the Cooperative Research Act.

The first major surge in Federal support for higher education came with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This legislation authorized student loans, fellowships, and assistance to colleges and universities for the expansion and improvement of their educational programs to meet critical national needs—particularly scientific and technological defense needs.

In 1963, when colleges and universities suddenly found themselves unable to readily accommodate the rapidly growing numbers of youth seeking higher education, Congress passed the Higher Education Facilities Act. This legislation provided Federal assistance to institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities.

The Federal role of higher education was again expanded in 1965 when the Higher Education Act provided Federal assistance to needy students and to developing institutions of higher education.

Since 1965, Federal contributions to colleges and universities have sharply increased from $1,993,000,000 to the estimated 1972 expenditure of $6 billion. During this 7-year period, however, a major change in program commitment has taken place. Whereas more than 50 percent of Federal higher education expenditures for the years 1965–67 was for research and training and only 17 percent was reserved for student assistance, Federal higher education budget estimates for the years 1970–72 allot almost 50 percent to student assistance. I hope this emphasis on student assistance will continue and applaud the present administration's commitment to making higher education available to every qualified student.

It is interesting to note that although expected 1972 Federal expenditures for higher education and for preschool, elementary, and secondary education are comparable amounts—$6 billion versus $5,458,000,000—Federal higher education expenditures representing close to 25 percent of the estimated total expenditures of U.S. colleges and universities, whereas Federal preschool, elementary, and secondary expenditures account for about 11 percent of the total expenditures of those schools. This larger Federal role in the finance of higher education is due, in part, to the fact that institutions of higher education have been asked to provide assistance in meeting specific national priorities. Colleges and universities provide community services, help meet national manpower needs, work toward the solution of national problems, and contribute through research and training to the cumulative wisdom and progress of our Nation. On the other hand, elementary and secondary education has traditionally been considered more a matter of local responsibility and support.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Chairman, rather than review each and every part of this mammoth bill, I would like to discuss in some detail the most significant issues and features. The soundness of our student assistance programs should be our first concern.

Arguments for strengthening the Federal role in assisting students are well known. First, the last three Presidents have emphasized over and over again a worthy national objective: no qualified student should be barred from further education for a lack of resources. We

have made progress in achieving this goal, but we are not there yet.

Second, student assistance programs allow students greater choice in selecting the institution best suited to meet their needs. This creates a healthy competition among the various schools to provide quality programs.

Third, sending Federal aid through the students makes it less easy for the Government to tamper with those areas of institutional autonomy which should be protected. In addition, the constitutional issues about aid to church-related schools is best answered by providing aid in the form of grants, work-study payments and loans to students.

Except for national defense student loans, begun in 1958, the Federal Government had little experience in administering student assistance programs prior to the Higher Education Act of 1965. We should be continually improving our programs as we learn from experience.

One thing we have learned is the inadequacy of talking about focusing student aid on the "low income" versus the "middle income" student. That is too simple and does not relate to the different costs associated with attendance at different institutions.

The financial aid community, with leadership from the College Scholarship Service and the American College Testing Corp., has developed quite sophisticated methods of determining what each student can provide out of his own and his family's resources. This is known as "expected family contribution." This approach to determining student aid is much fairer, in that some families making $12,000—because of number of children at home or in school, unusual medical or business expenditures, or any number of other financially-related factors—could actually be in a position to contribute less toward a college education than a family of, say $9,000 which has far fewer financial burdens and perhaps is in an area where the cost of living is less.

The bill makes appropriate changes in present law to recognize this fairer approach. However, in my opinion it does not go quite far enough—especially with regard to the education opportunity grant program. Although the bill moves in the direction of "family contribution" rather than "low income," it does not require that all institutions use the same method of determining expected family contribution. So a student may discover that one college expects him to contribute $500 after analyzing his financial situation, while a college 20 miles down the road would expect his to contribute $800. We should move as quickly as possible, for purposes of administering Federal student aid programs, to a point where a student's expected family contribution is the same regardless of which institution he applies for admission and financial aid.

Once a student's expected contribution is determined, then one has to consider the estimated "costs" of attending that specific institution. The difference between the family contribution and the cost is called a student's "need."

One other concept in financial aids that has proven successful is the financial aid "package." The financial aids officer often has up to 20 different Federal and State programs available to him. It is important that he have enough flexibility to tailormake a student's "package" of aid.

But he does not need the same degree of flexibility on each and every program. For example, the educational benefits under the GI bills offer no real flexibility to the institution. That program is based solely on the student's eligibility and enrollment status. In contrast, the national defense student loans are very flexible in terms of allowing institutions to choose who benefits and in what amounts the loans are given. As I intend to emphasize later, I believe the EOG program in the bill should be changed to provide greater equality and predictability for students. Institutions should not be given complete flexibility in saying yes or no to students under this program. For those whose family contribution is zero or very small, some assurance must be given that they can receive grant aid. In that situation, other options are very limited. Indeed, giving assurance to each student under EOG will allow many institutions to do a better job in putting together a workable "package" of aid.

Briefly, the bill makes the following changes and additions to present law which I believe are most beneficial:

The bill creates the Student Loan Marketing Association to provide a secondary market for the guaranteed student loan program.

Eligibility for interest subsidies under the GSL program has been changed from a ceiling of $15,000 adjusted family income to a criterion of need on the part of the student to meet his educational expenses.

The annual ceiling of $1,500 for guaranteed student loans has been raised to $2,500 and the aggregate amount of loans possible has been raised from $7,500 to $10,000.

The annual ceiling of $1,000 for NDEA loans has been raised so that a student may borrow $2,500 during his first 2 years.

The weekly limit of 15 hours a student may participate in the work-study program has been removed.

Students attending proprietary institutions are eligible for education opportunity grants.

Students attending half-time are eligible for aid under the EOG and work-study programs.

No family contribution will be expected in the case of veterans applying for student aid.

Mr. Chairman, without a doubt the weakest student-aid link in the committee bill is the EOG program. On this program, we have a considerable amount of data. We have 6 years of experience. In 1971 we should be in a better position as a Nation to make good on our years of rhetoric about equal access to higher education.

We know the inequities in the State allotment formula. There is no reason that cannot be changed. We know the inequities resulting from the grantsmanship game played in regional panels. There is no reason that we cannot correct much of that. Students are forced to shop around for the best deal. They have no assurance of grant aid even if they are from the poorest family in town. There is no reason this Congress cannot change that. Students' expected family contribution is computed to be different at different schools. We can correct that. Students with contributions of $500 or $600 can and do get larger EOG's than students with no contributions. We should and we can correct that.

As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, every one of our student assistance programs is designed for a different purpose. Each one requires a different set of variables in terms of who is served, in what amounts of aid, with what degree of predictability, and with what level of Federal versus institutional controls.

It is my strong belief that this one program—the educational opportunity grant program—should be written in the strongest possible way so that students are treated equitably regardless of where they live or where they choose to attend college. Furthermore, students whose families can not afford to contribute much, if anything, should be able to count on some assistance in advance of their need and be given assurance that it will be there if and when they get accepted into an eligible college or university.

The first level of gross inequity under the EOG program in the committee bill is the State allotment formula. Under the present law, "renewal EOG's" have first call on the appropriations. That would not be true under H.R. 7248. After that, each State is dependent on the State allotment formula for some share of the leftover funds to make "initial year EOG's." Last year the leftover funds met only 24.88 percent of the total national approved requests for such funds. But as table A shows, which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, some States got over 30 percent of their requests and other States got as low as 15 or 18 percent. All because of the allotment formula. Under H.R. 7248 the situation worsens. Taking out first the 10 percent the bill would reserve for the Commissioner to distribute, we see that Arkansas would still get 40.03 percent, Hawaii 42.10 percent, and South Carolina 40.17 percent. But others fare well below the national mean: New York would get only 14.45 percent, Illinois 16.96 percent, Michigan 18.61 percent, California 17.08 percent, and Minnesota 17.80 percent just to name a few. There is no justification on earth for that wide a discrepancy. Why should a student in one State get an EOG and a similar student in another State not get an EOG—simply because of such an ill-conceived State allotment formula? I believe that EOG money should go wherever the eligible students attend college, period.

Following is a table which shows the differing amounts and percentages of EOG money available last year for initial year awards; the present formula compared to the formula in H.R. 7248:

TABLE A.—ALLOCATION OF EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

	EOG—current law	State allocation divided by panel approved request (percent)	EOG—H.R. 7248 formula	State allocation divided by panel approved request (percent)
50 States	$63,923,424	24.88	$56,814,227	22.16
Alabama	975,279	17.54	1,416,959	25.48
Alaska	32,214	21.30	54,311	35.91
Arizona	681,575	24.16	528,250	18.72
Arkansas	553,630	27.03	819,961	40.03
California	6,974,278	24.85	4,792,532	17.08
Colorado	937,737	27.88	645,478	19.19
Connecticut	853,793	31.55	619,660	22.90
Delaware	149,442	21.34	127,118	18.15
Florida	1,773,270	30.62	1,668,095	28.80
Georgia	1,108,195	25.35	1,560,533	35.69
Hawaii	256,112	55.43	194,522	42.10
Idaho	274,988	36.98	219,680	29.54
Illinois	3,212,945	21.52	2,532,708	16.96
Indiana	1,688,441	28.37	1,317,938	22.15
Iowa	1,143,252	26.27	958,727	22.03
Kansas	929,320	27.24	694,519	20.36
Kentucky	927,512	25.98	1,164,975	32.63
Louisiana	1,095,472	27.82	1,406,562	35.72
Maine	264,726	27.62	282,395	29.46
Maryland	1,003,051	33.33	866,830	28.80
Massachusetts	2,367,371	29.34	1,431,849	17.74
Michigan	2,866,084	23.85	2,236,357	18.61
Minnesota	1,428,071	21.81	1,165,629	17.80
Mississippi	741,524	18.45	1,192,975	29.68
Missouri	1,506,071	31.80	1,323,653	27.95
Montana	$277,744	21.94	$228,005	18.01
Nebraska	612,558	32.32	492,218	25.97
Nevada	99,927	35.64	81,937	29.22
New Hampshire	276,649	24.62	187,332	16.67
New Jersey	1,134,454	18.78	1,248,220	20.67
New Mexico	353,812	24.59	378,054	26.28
New York	5,350,769	18.71	4,132,650	14.45
North Carolina	1,530,805	19.33	1,997,933	25.23
North Dakota	301,738	22.59	260,784	19.53
Ohio	3,063,084	28.24	2,545,761	23.47
Oklahoma	1,011,332	27.29	860,114	23.21
Oregon	888,370	22.57	586,474	14.90
Pennsylvania	3,219,601	30.15	2,951,768	27.64
Rhode Island	338,161	29.78	243,224	21.42
South Carolina	592,636	21.75	1,094,768	40.17
South Dakota	297,875	22.32	289,411	21.68
Tennessee	1,200,592	22.15	1,456,560	26.87
Texas	3,466,190	32.35	3,460,751	32.30
Utah	670,440	36.83	374,342	20.56
Vermont	202,992	21.46	149,870	15.85
Virginia	1,110,078	28.75	1,369,002	35.45
Washington	1,309,022	27.98	889,287	19.01
West Virginia	607,107	27.18	716,538	32.08
Wisconsin	1,644,500	23.40	1,224,110	16.05
Wyoming	130,320	16.65	101,717	12.99
District of Columbia	488,255	21.31	271,181	11.83

The State allotment formula and the process whereby each institution requests its total needs to a regional panel made up of selected financial aid officers, leaves institutions within a State in quite different situations. The request made to the panel is an estimate of need. Experienced financial aid officers can often make a better case for their estimate than less experienced ones. Fast growing institutions with large numbers of needy students often do poorly, especially if they start out with a small EOG program.

A couple examples will serve to point out the inequities of this part of the program. In fiscal year 1971, Ball State University in Indiana received enough EOG money to help every one of its needy students who came from families with incomes of $6,000 or below. Franklin College in the same State could help only 66 percent of the same kind of students. The University of Delaware got enough to meet 90 percent of the need of students from those income categories, while Delaware State got enough to meet only 75 percent of its need.

The next level of inequity is the way in which a student's expected family contribution is computed. As I mentioned earlier, we now have methods of calculating a family's entire financial situation in order to determine how much they should be able to contribute toward the costs of higher education. Although different methods can consider the same variables, they may not treat each variable in the same way. That means that a student can shop around until he finds an institution that expects very little from him. If the EOG program is to treat students equitably, their financial situations should be treated under one sound method.

It is my feeling that the services of the College Scholarship Service and the American college testing program are sound. If one system, however, were developed to treat all EOG recipients alike, I would expect that the system would be very close to these existing major systems. Indeed, I understand that representatives of these two organizations are already meeting in an attempt to come closer together.

To the extent possible, I would also like to see the needs analysis system reflect differing costs of living around the country. We know that $10,000 in New York City is not the same as $10,000 in rural Arkansas.

Finally, once an institution is given its allotment, it has so much flexibility that it can give larger grants to students with $600 family contributions than it gives to those with no contribution. It can even say "no" to one student and "yes" to another student in exactly the same financial need.

Where does this leave the student? Many are left frustrated, alienated, and pushed to stay out or drop out of school. Of course some are very lucky—so we hear few complaints from them. They know that they are getting more than someone else down the hall who is in worse condition financially.

This system means that thousands of students who can meet the standards of higher education do not get the chance to attend. No one has been able to estimate just how many students this might be, but we have received estimates of as many as 100,000.

Other students who get less than their share of EOG are forced to study half-time, or to take out a large loan, or to drop out one semester while a brother or sister gets a chance. Many do make it without the EOG, but often under unbelievable hardship.

What can we do about all of this? Plenty. I intend to join with my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) and others here in making amendments to this program which will eliminate the inequities which I have just outlined. Aid will flow to the students who qualify and in amounts which vary along a sliding scale, depending on cost and expected family contribution. The basic formula for an EOG will be $1,400 minus family contribution or an amount equal to one-half the student's need to attend that institution—whichever amount is the lesser. This two-pronged formula is equitable, predictable and reflects as much as possible the costs of attending a particular institution.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a small table which shows the amounts of EOG different students would receive:

TABLE B.—EXAMPLES OF EOG UNDER QUIE-FRASER PROPOSAL

Cost of attendance	Expected family contribution						
	0	$200	$400	$600	$800	$1,000	$1,200
$800	$400	300	200				
$1,200	600	500	400	300	200		
$1,600	800	700	600	500	400	300	200

Cost of attendance	Expected family contribution						
	0	$200	$400	$600	$800	$1,000	$1,200
$2,000	$1,000	900	800	700	600	400	200
$2,400	1,200	1,100	1,000	800	600	400	200
$3,000	1,400	1,200	1,000	800	600	400	200

Of course, students who attend only half-time would get different amounts. As under present law, no grant would be made in amounts less then $200. Students now receiving EOG's would be able to continue to receive them under the provisions of present law.

The estimated cost of this proposal is $500 million. The goal it will achieve is worth that price. And all for about one-half the estimated cost of institutional aid proposed under title VIII.

If the Congress did not appropriate the funds necessary, then the $1,400 figure would be floated downward until all students under that formula could be assisted. That is the best of all possible options to deal with inadequate funds. However, it is my fervent hope that the administration and the Congress would see this as one commitment worthy of full funding.

Now, if I could, I would like to turn to some remarks made earlier. The gentlewoman from Oregon indicated we are going to move away from the present educational opportunity grant State allotment formula where you just count the number of students in college, to a three-factor allotment formula, where one-third of the money is allocated, based on the number of students in college, one-third based on the number of high school graduates, and one-third based on the number of children in families with less than $3,000 income a year.

The formula being used right now is already inaccurate. The number of students in college is no indication of the number of needy students in college who deserve educational opportunity grants, but it certainly comes closer than the other two factors which are added in this bill.

The percentage of students who graduate from high school and who go to college varies greatly from State to State.

I am going to place a table in the RECORD at this point, which was made available to me. The source is "The Capital and The Campus: State Responsibility for Post-Secondary Education," a report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

COMPARATIVE ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION, BY STATE

States, by per Capita Income, Low to High, 1970	Ratio: First-time enrollments[1] (full time), to high school graduates, 1968	Ratio: Undergraduates[1] to 18 to 21-year-olds in State, 1968	Ratio: Public high school graduates, 1968–69 to public school 9th graders, 1965
United States	[2] 0.58	[2] 0.41	[3] 0.79
Mississippi	.64	.33	.68
Arkansas	.54	.34	.70
Alabama	.47	.32	.70
South Carolina	.39	.20	.71
West Virginia	.42	.33	.73
North Dakota	.62	.48	.86
New Mexico	.50	.39	.75
Tennessee	.46	.31	.71
Kentucky	.49	.31	.68
Louisiana	.49	.35	.70
South Dakota	.55	.47	.88
North Dakota	.41	.24	.67
Idaho	.62	.51	.84
Utah	.57	.53	.85
Maine	.34	.26	.82
Oklahoma	.62	.46	.79
Georgia	.41	.25	.66
Montana	.58	.45	.82
Wyoming	.70	.52	.76
Vermont	.34	.34	.84
Texas	.61	.37	.71
Arizona	.98	.48	.73
Florida	0.65	0.38	0.71
Virginia	.47	.26	.76
New Hampshire	.45	.35	.83
Missouri	.56	.40	.75
Oregon	.64	.48	.84
Nebraska	.56	.45	.87
Iowa	.53	.46	.90
Wisconsin	.48	.44	.85
Colorado	.61	.43	.83
Indiana	.46	.36	.79
Minnesota	.52	.45	.93
Kansas	.64	.45	.84
Pennsylvania	.43	.40	.86
Rhode Island	.67	.39	.86
Ohio	.51	.38	.82
Washington	.73	.46	.89
Michigan	.51	.41	.82
Delaware	.48	.31	.83
Maryland	.52	.36	.79
Massachusetts	.66	.49	.85
California	.75	.50	.88
Illinois	.68	.47	.78
Hawaii	.64	.32	.91
New Jersey	.59	.46	.83
Nevada	.54	.27	.74
Alaska	.46	.14	.78
New York	.71	.52	.77
Connecticut	.67	.51	.81

[1] Residents of State enrolled as undergraduates in any State.
[2] Includes District of Columbia.
[3] Excludes District of Columbia.

Source: "The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education," a report and recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971), pp. 45–46, 133–34, 139–40.

There are three columns. The first time enrollments in college as a percentage of high school graduates is one column, the undergraduates, as they relate to the 18- to 21-year-olds in the State is the middle column and the public high school graduates as they relate to the number of ninth graders who existed 4 years before is the last column.

You find that in a State like Arizona, where there was a net influx of student graduates in the year 1968, 98 percent of that number were first-time enrollees in Arizona. That means there was a net influx of students, it was more than their own graduates by a long ways. And this varies. Take, for instance, in Vermont and Maine, only 34 percent go on to college. South Carolina, 39 percent. In other States like Washington, 73 percent; California, 75 percent; New York, 71 percent.

So there is no indication at all that high school graduates will go on to college in the same percentage, State by State. Likewise, when they go on to college there is no indication that they need an EOG.

So what happens when you change this formula is that States who are now exporting—States like New Jersey—get an increase in allocation to their State, and States that are now importing them are reduced substantially.

So the bill makes it a more inaccurate formula as we add these other factors.

The third factor, as I mentioned, is basing one-third of the aid on the number of children below 18 who come from families with an income of less than $3,000 per year. Now that is the most inaccurate of all because, even though they are poor families, and you might think they are going to receive EOG grants, there is no direct relationship between the fact they are poor and the fact they might be going to college.

Because that factor varies from State to State even more than the percentage of all high school graduates who go on to college.

Also, you have to bear in mind we are using obsolete information. This year we are still using the information from the 1960 census. That was based on 1959 income—and how many of those children in 1959 are still going to school? That was 12 years ago. Anybody who was in the first grade is out of high school so when they are counted now, it is completely inaccurate.

Now you might say—we will go to the new census information. The census that will be available next year. But next year we will be using the 1970 census information based on 1969 income and that is already 3 years obsolete.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman recalls that in the subcommittee I offered an amendment to change that type of factor and use the social security welfare statistics, the ADC families.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If you recall, the gentleman from Minnesota voted against that substitute.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. And it was defeated.

It seems to me it is necessary to use later figures. I was hoping we could do that. I think the other would have been preferable, and if it is offered here, I would accept that.

So we would have figures for the year in which they are given rather than 10 years ago.

Mr. QUIE. I was going to get into the reason as to why that is also inaccurate information. But let me first finish this, if I may.

We are using obsolete information because it is 3 years old. I just want you to bear in mind that in 1969 there was very low unemployment in this country. Therefore, all of the unemployed children who now would be counted, if we used accurate information will not be counted. You know in the large metropolitan areas there was a substantial increase in unemployment and that will not be cranked into the formula.

Suppose we did move to use the welfare information that existed. That is inadequate because there are some States that pay high welfare and include people with quite high payments. Other States just do not count many people on welfare—they have to be extremely poor to be counted. For that reason, I think this approach is also inadequate.

There is only one fair way to provide EOG grants and that is to send the money wherever the kids are. If a needy student chooses to go to a particular college, wherever it is, whether it is in his own State or in some other part of the United States, that is where the aid assistance ought to go.

So no matter how you build a formula there are inequities. There are grave inequities now in the law and they will become even greater if we adopt the formula in this legislation.

I am hopeful that we can amend the EOG program so that at least we can eliminate this inequitable State allotment formula. But even more than that, I believe we know enough now about the EOG and its operation that we can and ought to make a commitment with some certainty to students who are in need so that they could receive some kind of grant or go to college, and to give it to them on an equitable basis compared to those who are not as needy.

This is the effort that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), and I are going to make with reference to EOG grants.

But in the time I have, let me move from that to some comments on institutional aid.

INSTITUTIONAL AID

Probably the issue which generated the most discussion on this bill was general institutional aid to higher education. And rightly so. If this Congress decides to share in financing the general operating costs of higher education, it will be a real first. To date, Federal aid has been tied to students, categorical and formula programs related to national priorities, or aid to institutions in return for certain services and research.

I am one who believes it is time to accept a new role for the Federal Government by providing institutional aid. However, I oppose the portion of the committee bill which ties institutional aid simply to the number of students. First, I believe aid should be more closely related to an institution's support of national goals. Second, I find no convincing rationale for giving $100 per lower division student, $150 per upper division, and $200 per graduate student. These figures are not at all related to the actual costs of educating students at various levels or in various curriculums.

Further, I am concerned that a per capita formula tends to reward those institutions which are already taken care of the best—large and growing State colleges and universities. Those institutions which tend to be in greater need at this point in time—black colleges, private institutions, and urban universities—tend on the whole to come out worse compared to the cost of education approach, which I believe is better. Certainly a per capita formula locks in private colleges to a decreasing share of the total pie, since the proportion of students enroiled in private colleges is less each year in relation to the total national enrollment.

Almost everyone engaged in the debate on this issue agrees on one thing: We do not know enough to come up with a sound formula which could stand the test of time. People who support the bill before us say that we can change the formula as we gain experience. But anyone familiar with the Congress knows that, after 1 year or 2 of funding something which will benefit most of the State colleges and universities, it will almost be impossible to alter the formula. One has only to observe the history of impact aid legislation.

The bill recognizes this need for better information by providing for two comprehensive studies on the financing of higher education. Why should we lock ourselves into an arbitrary per capita formula before we have the results of these studies?

Well, respond many individuals, the colleges are facing a crisis right now. They need help. But are we to believe that each of 2,600 colleges and universities is facing a crisis such that a $100–$150–$200 formula will meet its unique need? Surely no one would suggest that.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that if it is the emergency nature of a true financial crisis that moves a Member to be for institutional aid, he is better off supporting title XVIII, which is tailormade to meet emergency situations. That title allows the Secretary of HEW, with the help of a Council on Higher Education Relief Assistance, to make grants to specific institutions in specific, one-shot grants in order to give them the relief they need to get back on their own feet. Some institutions need sizable grants. Others not so much. Far less than half of all institutions would qualify for these grants, in order that the money might be targeted on those in real need.

I support title XVIII, but see it as a supplement to general, across-the-board institutional aid. While I am not prepared to get locked into any sort of per capita formula, I do support the cost of education grants, under which only one-third of the money in title VIII would be distributed. I think all the institutional aid should be granted on the basis of cost of education allowances. Under this approach, each institution would get a certain percentage—50 percent for smaller institutions, scaled down to 38 percent for the largest schools—of the amount of Federal EOG, work study, and NDEA loan money it receives.

My reasons for supporting this approach are several: First, cost of education grants reward those institutions which are doing the most to meet the educational needs of federally assisted students. If the Federal Government helps additional numbers of students attain access to higher education, it is a legitimate role for the Government to assist those institutions in meeting the costs of educating those students. No student pays his whole way.

Second, cost of education grants do not pose the same degree of opportunity for the Federal Government to meddle in the affairs of institutions. I believe Federal money in this form—following the students—also poses less of a problem in terms of the constitutional issue related to aiding church-related institutions.

Third, a cost of education approach at this stage of the game will not lock us in to any formula which would prevent future action based on the results of the studies commissioned under this bill.

Fourth, all of our computer runs show that those types of colleges which I believe are in the greatest need tend to come out better under a 100-percent cost of education approach that under the two-thirds–one-third formula in the bill.

In comparing any formula, it is important to compare them assuming the same level of appropriations. In the following tables, an appropriation of $100 million is assumed.

FTE in the tables relates to full-time equivalency, based on credits earned—the formula under which two-thirds of the money appropriated for title VIII would be distributed. SFA relates to student financial aid—the basis for determining cost of education grants and the approach under which one-third of the money appropriated for title VIII would be distributed.

In the first table, which I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, one can see the amounts and percentages of money flowing to public and private institutions under various formula options:

TABLE I.—AMOUNT OF INSTITUTIONAL ASSISTANCE RECEIVED BY PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS UNDER VARIOUS OPTIONS [1]

	2/3 FTE, 1/3 SFA (H.R. 7248)	1/2 FTE, 1/2 SFA	1/3 FTE, 2/3 SFA	0 FTE, 100 percent SFA
Public institutions:				
Total dollars	$65,199,382	$63,795,513	$62,373,542	$59,532,701
Percentage of national total [2]	65.2	63.8	62.4	59.5
Private institutions:				
Total dollars	$34,863,259	$36,290,759	$37,706,511	$40,539,467
Percentage of national total [2]	34.9	36.3	37.7	40.5

[1] All options assume an appropriation of $100,000,000.

[2] Totals may not add because of rounding.

Table II shows how much money would flow to predominately black institutions—a category of over 100 colleges which almost all our witnesses concurred were in deep financial need and deserved adequate Federal support.

TABLE II.—AMOUNT OF INSTITUTIONAL ASSISTANCE RECEIVED BY INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED PREDOMINANTLY BY BLACK STUDENTS UNDER VARIOUS OPTIONS [1]

	2/3 FTE, 1/3 SFA (H.R. 7248)	1/2 FTE, 1/2 SFA	1/3 FTE, 2/3 SFA	0 FTE, 100 percent SFA
Total dollars	5,429,102	6,642,382	7,852,870	10,279,304
Percentage of national total	5.4	6.6	7.9	10.3

[1] All options assume an appropriation of $100,000,000.

So I would like to arrange for institutional grants. I tried a year ago to find some way where we could provide it and not get ourselves to a point where the institution does nothing in return for the money; just receives the money because they are there—similar to impacted aid where money is sent out just because the students come from families who work on a Federal establishment. And you know what happens each year with impact aid. That is really what I am concerned about.

My first proposal was that institutions ought to be rewarded for bringing the student all the way through a program to completion. But there was not enough acceptance of that in our committee. So I now believe the cost-of-education allowance is the best thing we can do with the information we have before us.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. With respect to aid to institutions, would any consideration be given to those institutions that are already receiving some form of Federal assistance? For example, I am reminded that every one of our medical schools and every one of our dental schools is being subsidized through NIH in some

form or another. Would there be some calculation in that formula that would take into consideration the aid that those institutions might already be receiving in some form from the Federal Government?

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman that these moneys would not be considered in the cost-of-education allowance, which is how one-third of the money would be distributed. This portion of the formula takes into consideration the OEG, work study, and NDEA student loan moneys that go to students. But the grant of money to institutions is not taken into consideration. But neither does the two-thirds portion of the formula based on capitation. But the gentleman makes a good point, because from 1950 to the present time the total amount of Federal moneys going for higher education has increased from $500 million to $6 billion. I do not mean from the Office of Education, but the total amount of Federal Government assistance.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I listened to the gentlewoman from Oregon with respect to the, I think, 2,400 institutions of higher learning that would be the beneficiaries of some $800 million in institutional aid. That is, by a quick calculation, roughly $300,000 per institution. My concern as a member of the committee that will obviously be called upon to fund these programs in future years is not that it may be just a little drop in the bucket now, but that next year or the following year you would expect to double or triple that amount, and in a few years we would be up to a multibillion-dollar program of assistance to institutions.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman, who is the ranking Republican on the HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, is very competent in making that analysis and has seen it happen in the past. I think you are saying that would happen, and I would have to agree with you.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In looking at the bill, I do not see anything that applies to the high school or secondary level. Is it correct that this bill applies only to the college level or higher?

Mr. QUIE. There are some provisions in the bill that would have some effect on children below the college level—for example, the occupational education title, which I believe is an excellent title. It gives attention to secondary education. There are some other provisions of the bill that affect the elementary and secondary school levels.

Mr. SCOTT. But generally it is true that this applies to the college level?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, generally it is a higher education bill.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. I am quite concerned about this general institutional trend, which I think the gentleman will agree is a very fundamental departure which has social implications. My father spent 17 years as president of a small church-related college. Most of them were depression years. He certainly could have used the money. But he had the philosophy, and many others in those days felt that they did not want to receive Federal money to operate their school because they thought it meant Federal control and, in effect, the end of the private college. Maybe times have changed, but I know that is the way my father felt, and a good many other people felt in those days.

I would like to have the gentleman's comments on that problem of philosophy and also those of the gentlewoman from Oregon, whose judgment I admire as I do the gentleman in the well. But I will have to say that this concept troubles me.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that the closer we connect the aid to the student, the less chance there is of Federal influence on an institution. But by the same token we might be increasing the students' influence on the institution, so I guess we would be deciding—if any amendments are offered—between the cost of education allowance or a per capita formula. There is a tendency for the Federal Government to exert influence when it grants money. And some say there would be a tendency of more influence on the part of the students because they bring some Federal aid with them. I, myself, am in favor of the students rather than the Federal Government if any influence is to be made.

Mr. DENNIS. I will say to the gentleman, although I am not an expert in this field, that I rather tend to go for his view rather than the simple head count, because I think the simple head count would be a disservice to the small college I have some interest in.

But it seems to me that, even though it may be hard to determine which colleges are financially in an emergency situation, that if we go this route at all, aiding these emergency cases is the most we ought to attempt.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman that, while I indicated earlier that for some time I believed we ought to go in the institutional grant direction rather than expanding the categorical aid, I do not want to leave the impression I do not have some concern with this, the very concern the gentleman has raised. I ask each Member to think very carefully about this, because we are taking a very fundamental step in this legislation that will never be reversed. Once we begin institutional grants we will never get away from them. I will repeat that and say again: Once we begin institutional grants, we will never get away from them. I want all Members to be aware of what we are doing and know with what we will be faced in future years. I am willing to face that myself because of some of the problems I see with categorical aid, but I think all my colleagues ought to think very carefully on this point.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to title XVI.

Title XVI of H.R. 7248 is cited in the bill as the "Occupational Education Act of 1971." In my judgment it is—standing alone—one of the most important pieces of education legislation to be considered in this decade.

Title XVI, with a very few changes, is the same as H.R. 7429, which I introduced on April 7, 1971, for myself and 16 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. In fact, the cosponsors include most of the senior members on both sides of our committee. A few weeks later, on May 13, Senator JAVITS introduced a virtually identical bill—S. 1856—with equally strong bipartisan support in the other body.

I am citing this broad support for the provisions of title XVI to emphasize the importance which so many Members of the Congress place upon strengthening occupational education.

The first two of the findings and statement of purposes for title XVI point up the fundamental thrust of the title: That "our educational system should be responsible for assuring that every young person leaving secondary school is prepared for and assisted in placement either in productive employment or in further education at the postsecondary level," and that "the opportunity for postsecondary occupational education in programs which do not directly lead to a baccalaureate or advanced academic degree is severely limited in many parts of the Nation and is everywhere inadequate to meet existing needs, and that this situation adversely affects national economic and social goals."

Mr. Chairman, title XVI meshes nicely with the landmark 1968 Vocational Education Act by adding new dimensions to occupational education which vocational educators, acting alone, cannot achieve. Its provisions were carefully developed in consultation with the American Vocational Association and the American Association of Junior Colleges, and after review and comment by representatives of such organizations as the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the United Business Schools, Inc., among many others. It has the solid support of both the American Vocational Association and of the American Association of Junior Colleges, which may be the first time these two groups have united behind a single piece of legislation affecting the vital interests of both.

This title deals with two extremely important aspects of occupational education which require a new Federal initiative if we are to achieve vital national goals. The first is postsecondary occupational education which is not designed to lead directly to a baccalaureate degree, but rather to lead directly to a job. Although some such programs have been supported in recent years in a wide variety of postsecondary institutions under the Vocational Education Act, we lag far, far behind our needs for such education in every State in the Union; in some States it is scarcely available at all.

The second thing which this bill deals is the increasingly urgent matter of infusing occupational education and coun-

seling—and the responsibility for job placement—into the regular elementary and secondary school system on an equal footing with traditional academic education. We attempted to approach this through the 1968 Vocational Education Act, and that attempt may yet prove very helpful—but vocational education funds—including State and local funds—are no more than 4 percent of the total annual expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools. This does not provide much leverage in making fundamental changes of attitude and direction in such schools. We are therefore seeking in this bill yet another approach—another lever to move our huge educational system. This bill would involve general educators, vocational educators, postsecondary occupational educators, higher education and representatives of the general public in a cooperative effort to effect change.

Change of the kind this title seeks is long overdue in American education. The basic statistics relating to the need for occupational education at all levels—without embellishment or elaboration—tell a bleak story of unmet needs and neglected opportunities.

At the high school level, dropout rates of between 20 and 30 percent in many schools all too clearly indicate a lack of relevancy of courses labeled "general education" but leading nowhere—neither to a job nor to college. But the problem begins much earlier in the early elementary years where very few children are given any idea of the world of work, and it is compounded by a near-total lack of skilled occupational counseling in the late grade and early high school years. Most children are left literally ignorant of the wide range of careers and job opportunities open to them and how they might prepare for them. Accordingly, while eight out of 10 high school students are enrolled either in college preparatory or "general education" courses, fewer than two out of 10 will ever attain a baccalaureate degree. At the grade school and high school levels, we have our educational priorities reflecting almost the precise opposite of real educational needs.

Occupational education at the postsecondary level falls far short of known needs. There are 28 million persons in the 16-to-24-year-old population of whom fully 16 million in an average month are in the civilian labor force. Yet our existing training capacity for the occupational preparation of this prime target population, beyond the high school level, can accommodate little more than 2 million enrollments—or only one in 14 for the total age group and one in eight for the actual work force. This is terribly inadequate—and it is all the more so when examined more closely and existing programs are compared with emerging manpower needs in technical fields and subprofessional occupations needed to provide a wide variety of medical, educational, and social services.

At the postsecondary level the largest resource by far happens to receive virtually no public support aside from a relatively small amount of student assistance: This is the group of accredited, proprietary—private enterprise—trade, technical, and business schools which enroll about 1,200,000 students. The next largest group of enrollments are in the postsecondary occupational curriculums supported in a wide variety of public institutions under the Vocational Education Act; these number about 700,000, of which less than one-third are in the health and technical occupations. Another 275,000 enrollments are in our organized apprenticeship programs, which are both excellent and far too few. Perhaps a few thousand more places may exist in organized programs conducted by industry—although this is doubtful since many of the accredited proprietary institutions mentioned above are owned and operated by major corporations. This is the sum total of the Nation's capacity in postsecondary occupational education and it is disastrous when compared to our obvious needs.

In fact, a persuasive case could be made that important national thrusts in the last 10 years for the development of human resources has been seriously inhibited by the lack of training capacity for the development of subprofessional personnel in health, education, and social services. For example, enactment of title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act—dealing with disadvantaged children—created a vast new demand for trained teacher aides for which we had virtually no capacity to meet other than on a "catch-as-catch-can" ad hoc basis. I am convinced that this fact alone accounts for our failure to make more effective use of title I funds. Incidentally, we still have very few organized programs for training subprofessional people in education. Numerous other examples can be cited.

Time after time, in place after place, speaking here on the floor of the House or to groups of educators or to various civic organizations in many parts of the Nation, interested members of our committee have drilled home the point that four out of five of our schoolchildren will require education for a job other than that requiring a college degree. Yet this elemental fact seems so difficult to get across to the Nation's educational establishment, including those who during several national administrations have made policy for the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Title XVI is a carefully conceived instrument for dealing with that elemental fact. It aims toward the blending and fusion of occupational education with academic education beginning with grade 1 and continuing beyond the high school. As the third report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education stated last July:

> The primary reason this Nation has not yet established a society in which there is equal opportunity to learn and work is that it has not yet tried.

With this legislation we are beginning to try. The Advisory Council report also argued that "every secondary school should be an employment agency" just as colleges and universities operate employment offices for their students. We agree, and that is a major objective of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in developing legislation for these purposes we faced many difficult questions. What kinds of institutions would conduct the postsecondary programs? Which of several possible State agencies would administer the program at the State level? How could we assure the wide variety of professional and institutional interests that they would be meaningfully involved in this effort? Those who work in education will recognize that these are not easily resolved. Yet, by working carefully with major professional groups such as—but not limited to—the American Vocational Association, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the United Business Schools, Inc., and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, we resolved these questions in such a manner that lots of people support this title of the bill who have previously not been able to agree upon a single piece of legislation affecting postsecondary education.

The basic reason for this is that we have worked out an approach which concentrates on program content rather than administrative or institutional concerns. We did so for very practical reasons. In terms of State administration, there is no agency in most States which has responsibility for the programs which this title treats in a unitary manner, so we leave it up to the State to establish or designate an agency which then must broaden its structure to meet the requirements of this title and involve in an effective manner all of the educational and other groups involved in the programs. The involvement would include every significant activity from initial planning through evaluation of programs which are carried out.

In terms of institutional interests, there is no national pattern to follow. Today postsecondary occupational education is taking place in a wide range of public and private institutions, all of which would be eligible to participate in programs under this title. In fact, title XVI encourages broad participation on the sound theory that even if we utilized all existing facilities we could not meet existing needs. The title provides a flexible approach which can be fitted to the existing pattern of institutions in every State.

This title strongly emphasizes the need for careful initial planning and for continuous evaluation of the programs which are funded. This has been a weakness in some education legislation and we are determined that it not be repeated. It also provides for coordination with all existing programs—at the State level the Advisory Council for Vocational Education would expand its responsibilities to encompass this act—and it would insure—with respect to the now existing structure of the executive branch—that occupational education is placed on an equal footing with academic education.

This final point, Mr. Chairman, to which I have alluded, is a major purpose of this title. In my judgment, occupa-

tional education has been treated by the U.S. Office of Education for years—running through both Democratic and Republican administrations—as though it were not a legitimate part of our structure of education. I have publicly criticized this and have privately pleaded for change. Now I propose to accomplish by legislation what so many of us have been unable to bring about through exhortation. This title would establish a Bureau of Occupational Education within the U.S. Office of Education headed by a GS–18 with the rank of Deputy Commissioner and it would authorize additional supergrade positions to support the new Deputy. I believe that this action is completely consistent with Commissioner Marland's commendable new emphasis on occupational education. Commissioner Marland already has strengthened the existing bureau which includes vocational and adult education by finding one of the most able educators in America—Dr. Robert Worthington of New Jersey—to head it. This title would give additional weight to Dr. Worthington's contributions. Moreover, it would spell out the responsibilities of both the Secretary and the Commissioner in creating a proper emphasis upon occupational preparation and would insure that the coordinating responsibilities of the Department are carried out. One of the problems I have encountered with our manpower programs, for example, is that the educational oversight supposed to be exercised by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not been fully effective. This title would also help cure that problem.

I support the President's proposal for a new Department of Human Resources, and I feel that when it is finally approved we can achieve an even better administrative position for all of education, including occupational education and manpower training. However, in the interim period—which could be a long time—I am not willing to tolerate the continued neglect of occupational education in the executive branch.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope that title XVI will be approved with strong support from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, there is one final issue in this bill which will have a profound effect on higher education. I refer to title X in the bill, prohibition of discrimination based on sex.

I firmly support the provision of title X which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in employment in educational institutions. I am deeply concerned, however, with those provisions of title X which affect the admission policies of private institutions. My concern is not for the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sex, but for the further extension of Federal controls and regulations over institutions of higher education.

As I have stated many times, I do not feel it is in the best interests of this country to inject the Federal Government into the admission process at every college across the Nation, and for the Congress to reach into the very heart of private institutions and remove from them control over their own admission policies. Moreover, such an incursion is contrary to the historical position of Congress, and threatens one of the great strengths of the American higher education system—diversity.

Historically, Congress has consistently refrained from imposing Federal controls on the use of Federal funds by institutions of higher education. This longstanding policy was specifically embodied in section 804(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which significantly increased Federal assistance to education without a corresponding increase in Federal control of education. Section 804(a) states:

> Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to authorized any department, agency, officer or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

The rationale commonly advanced to support the absence of Federal control has been that higher education is a State and local responsibility, and that Federal educational programs should be administered by the institutions of higher education themselves.

It is also significant to note the alarm raised by the higher education community, Government officials and indeed many Members of Congress, when riders were placed on education appropriations in 1969 cutting off financial aid to dissident students. During the time when those riders were under consideration, the Secretary of HEW, Robert Finch, said in a speech on July 17, 1969:

> Techniques of repressive Federal intervention in the affairs of each local campus violates the most deep-rooted, the most honored traditions of American education and would, in the end destroy its essential nature.
>
> We do not want a monotonous and monolithic imposed unity in which all our educational institutions conform to a Federal code of conduct, to a stifling Federal intervention. To advocate such intervention, in my view, is a form of radical extremism.

As noted by Secretary Finch, Federal controls tends to impose monotonous and monolithic unity. An editorial in the October 1, 1971, New York Times, entitled "Diversity Endangered," expressed the same concern. The editorial said that diversity, the most astonishing and exciting mystery of life, is endangered by man, who is attempting to control, moves toward a deadening sameness and loss of variety. The editorial dismissed the provisions of title X with the following remarks:

> Now comes the House Education Committee, which has written a little provision into the higher education bill. It tells the colleges that if they admit any substantial number of the other sex, they have lost control of their admission policy. Henceforth, to receive any Federal aid, they have to admit students of both sexes on an equal basis." The editorial continued, "A truly humane politics, call it liberalism or conservatism, would help a society to protect diversity. But here the power of the law is again used to make life level and uniform . . . Cultural faddism is one of diversity's deadly enemies.

If the current provisions of title X are passed, they would be almost unenforcable. Investigations to determine discrimination in admission would require review of all applications filed at an individual institution—an almost insurmountable task. In addition, it would requre qualitative evaluation of the various decisions which make up the selection process in admissions. Factors considered in admissions are often designed to produce a diverse and balanced student body, and include such things as race, religion, athletic and other extracurricular activities in high school, community activity, geographic distribution, qualities of leadership, stability of personality, alumni parentage and scholastic ability, not to mention sex. It would be extremely difficult to enforce the provisions of title X and determine when, if ever, a college has denied a person admission solely on the basis of sex, rather than on a balanced consideration of all the factors involved in the decision process.

If the current provisions of title X are going to be enacted, I feel that colleges should at least be protected against severe financial strain and complete disruption of existing course offerings and faculty composition I, therefore, propose to amend title X so that no college will be required to impose a minimum quota on the number of persons of any sex. Under my proposed amendment, no college will be required to give preferential treatment to any person solely on the basis of sex so as to balance an existing imbalance within the composition of the student body. Thus, colleges can let their ratio of sexes adjust itself naturally on the basis of individual qualifications and the pattern of applications by eliminating any discrimination on the basis of sex in admissions.

Such an amendment is similar to a provision in title VII, section 703(j) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 regarding minority employment, and language added to title IV, section 403(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 by this bill, H.R. 7248.

I urge my colleagues to realize the full ramifications of the policy proposed by title X. Federal encroachment into the internal decisions and administrative policies of private educational institutions poses a grave threat to higher education. It is not an action which we should undertake lightly nor in the heat of emotion, but rather a decision to be made with all serious thought of the results and the precedent which would be established.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have the attention of the gentleman from Indiana with regard to his last question. I think we are going

to see a revolutionary change in regard to the financing of all education in the United States. The California case with respect to property taxes and secondary and elementary schools and the Mary- and suit that is pending will have great influence on educational financing.

I share the concern over Federal control, which is exactly the reason why I support the formula in the committee bill. No Federal strings are attached to the way it is spent. It really concerns me when I read a statement such as is in the bill offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) which says:

> The student's expected family contribution shall be determined by a method to be prescribed by the Commissioner by regulation (to which section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply) which shall be uniform for all institutions and shall include (A) the portion of its resources which a family can reasonably be expected to contribute to the education of the student . . .

First of all, I do not think the Federal Government or the Commissioner has any business putting himself between the family and the student and making a judgment of how much a family ought to contribute. I think that is a family decision. Also, students at the college level are becoming increasingly independent of their families. It is true the students' financial aid officer would look at the total income, but there is no national uniform standard we impose on every institution in the United States to try to require every family to contribute so much, or the student will not receive help.

Then when I read a letter from the Secretary of Education, this concerns me. It is on page 3 of a letter written to the minority leader from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in which he said:

> Our approach is based upon a belief that the Federal role in providing institutional support should be limited to assisting institutions responsive to Federal priorities.

I reject this approach 100 percent. I do not think in providing institutional aid that we ought to give an institution funds only if it will direct its efforts to what the Federal Government has decided is a national priority. I think we ought to respect the autonomy of the institution and let the institutions determine their priorities and needs. The Federal Government has no business saying if you do not do what we have decided is important—you would not get any funds. I say if we follow this course, we will have more and more Federal control, which is what I want to avoid.

One final factor, if we tied the institutional aid to EOG, work study and NDEA, I think we might be creating a situation which could become increasingly difficult in this country.

The gentleman knows that at the present time we give members of the faculty research grants. I am sure that every Member of the House realizes there are certain faculty members who go to the president of the institution and say, "I got that research grant. You are getting a certain amount of money you would not get, if it were not for me; therefore, you are going to do what I want you to do."

If we tie institutional aid to the number of students receiving EOG, work study, and NDEA loans and the total volume received, we would be inviting the most militant students to go to the administrator of the university, or the president, and say, "You would not be getting this institutional aid if it were not for us, so you are going to spend it the way we want you to spend it."

So we would have some more nonnegotiable demands.

I think that is not the way we should move. I think any institutional aid ought to be unrestricted. It ought to go to the university, and that university should make the decision as to how to spend it.

Somebody said that we might have some of the biggest student union buildings in the country, but the university would not be able to meet its payroll on the first of the month.

I thank my colleague very much and, Mr. Chairman, I yield him 5 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota on the condition that my colleague from Indiana does not go away, because I want to address myself to his concerns.

Mr. DENNIS. I will not go away. I want the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. SCHEUER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana later.

Mr. QUIE. I agree that the more money the student carries with him the more influence it is going to have on the institution, but the students are not monolithic as a group. Sometimes we think about that. We hear about a radical student, and we think that they are all that way.

We are now talking about thousands of students who are getting aid all having a different voice in the institution.

Now the Federal Government, on the capitation provision, has one voice. There is no control over the institution in title VIII now. What about the future?

It is recognized in another part of the bill that the Federal Government is going to tell the institution what kind of an enrollment policy it is going to have with regard to sex. That is a step reducing the freedom of the institutions. They had been able to have unisex, partially coed, totally coed, 50–50, or all kinds of mixtures. Now the Federal Government is going to look over their shoulder, exactly the same way the Federal Government looks over the shoulder of everybody else with regard to race.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself to the concern of the gentleman from Indiana, and I will be happy to yield to him at any time he wishes to interject a comment.

My support for this bill and my support for the approach to aiding colleges stems, as I think it does for all of us, from my life experience. I went to the kind of college the gentleman's father was the president of for 17 years, a small church-related college of 700 or 800 students in Pennsylvania, run by the Quakers. It was a perfectly wonderful education experience for me.

I subsequently went to larger institutions, to the Harvard Business School and Columbia Law School, but I cherish my experience of attending a small church-related college, to the extent that my two daughters are now attending that same small school.

These small private schools all over the United States—particularly in the South, but in the Midwest and Far West as well—are in extremis. Not only are the universities and colleges caught in the bind of inflation, but, also they are caught in the bind of their own new perceptions of the kind of educational job they ought to be doing, the explosion of rising expectations as to the kinds of facilities and services that the children going to those schools ought to enjoy. They have an enlarged sense of the education function they ought to play.

So they are not only caught by rising costs of what they were doing in the past but by their own determination to fill greater and broader needs than those that they conceived as their proper role to meet in the past.

In addition to that, when you take into account the fact that in this day and age of high personal and corporate taxes, corporate giving and the giving by affluent individuals does not play anywhere near the role that it played a generation or even a decade ago in supporting these institutions, you have a condition of an irresistible force meeting an immovable object.

The irresistible force is inflation and an enlarged perception on the part of the colleges of the role that they should be playing on the one hand, and the simple inability of the colleges to meet these increased costs either by corporate giving or by individual giving or by the very unhappy expedient of raising tuition is the immovable object.

What happens? Well, something has to give. The college can go in the red. But many private colleges and certainly the Quakers have an abhorrence for red ink. So they do other things. They increase tuition more than they would like to; they reduce the degree to which they were expanding enrollment; they reduce the degree to which they were expanding faculties; they reduce the very elements of educational excellence that made them effective educational institutions in the first place—the seminars and the small classes and the various enrichment courses. They eat into and defer maintenance. Surely, the college is not in the red.

Now, how do we evaluate what colleges are needy? We wrestled for months in the Education Committee and our devoted staff people on the majority and minority sides wrestled with us trying to develop criteria for aiming at this problem with a high-powered rifle with an eight-power scope rather than the shotgun of a general-aid program. With all of that dedication and professionalism in the majority and minority staffs and

with all of our individual efforts and with our reaching out to the academic community around the country, we got no help. We found it impossible to develop a formula as to what was "need," because under financial pressure the institution reacts in so many different ways.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. I would like to say before your time expires that I am really appreciative of the free time given by my distinguished and expert colleagues here, but this is my concern; it seems to me what the gentleman is saying is that private education cannot survive without Government support. That may be true, but when you have direct Government support it seems to me you do not have private education. So it seems to me this is a very sorry dilemma we are in if that is where we are.

Mr. SCHEUER. I agree with you that we should face honestly the fact that we are embarking on a new venture of public general support for our institutions of higher education. Yet, I do not see anything from the past which should fill us with worry. We have had 150 years of experience with land-grant colleges that have had direct Federal subsidies, and there has been no long arm of Federal control reaching onto their campuses.

Mr. DENNIS. The great virtue of private education, we used to say, is that it was different from public education. The public or State institutions had to listen to the State legislature. That was all right, but you had another sector of education that was free of all that. That is going to be taken out of the picture here in this bill.

Mr. SCHEUER. I only cite that the Federal Government poured millions of dollars into the Federal land-grant colleges without one iota of control. I do not believe once we pass, or even if we do not pass the element in this bill which requires nondiscrimination on the basis of sex, that that will be an open door for Federal control. I do not know of anybody in this Chamber who would not be appalled and abhorred by the idea of Federal control. To me, the very beauty of the general aid formula is that we put out $80,000 for each of these 2,600 colleges in the United States, which will particularly help the small college. We put out the money with no controls or criteria, no invasion of their prerogative of local control.

We are simply saying, "We know you have a problem in sheer survival, to do your thing and play your role in this heterogenous, pluralistic, higher education system that you are best prepared to play. If you want to emphasize the need of training disadvantaged students and having all kinds of support and services for them, do that, and I believe we should help them. If another institution wants to be a so-called elitist institution and train Ph.D.'s and Greek scholars and archeologists, do that."

To me the beauty of this program is that we will not interfere with pluralism, we will not interfere with heterogenity or diversity. On the contrary, this approach makes that possible, and without some kind of general education without strings attached, I would feel terribly uneasy for the future of small private institutions that the gentleman from Indiana cherishes.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. Of course I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. It seems to me that the gentleman from New York has made a very eloquent argument in behalf of revenue sharing. I am wondering if the gentleman would extend the same argument he is using to the colleges in their very difficult position to the cities and local governments generally, and if he sees any irony in the fact that we are apparently accepting it without question, the right for general education categorical grants and a general program for colleges while at the same time we have revenue sharing rather completely bottled up as far as the majority of this House is concerned.

Does the gentleman have any comment on that?

Mr. SCHEUER. I definitely do and I will risk the fact that my comments might be subject to a point of order as being nongermane, since we are not debating revenue sharing today.

Mr. CONABLE. We are discussing the same principle, are we not?

Mr. SCHEUER. I would be very happy to discuss it. I do not find any contradiction at all because I believe in the judgment and experience and insights of the presidents and boards of trustees of our 2,600 colleges around the country as does the gentleman from Indiana. I believe the small private colleges are enormously effective and relevant to the cause of higher education in this country. I want to see them continued. I do not think that the State and local governments have been anywhere nearly as sensitive to the needs of their constituents as have these 2,600 colleges.

Mr. CONABLE. The gentleman makes that statement despite the fact that the local officials are elected and the college presidents are not?

Mr. SCHEUER. Most of the administrators of these programs are not elected.

I believe if you will take a State employment agency or the local school system, I believe the experience is clear that categorical programs do play a very significant role. One of the most successful programs this Congress has passed in many years has been the Headstart program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would warrant that most of the Members of this House enjoyed preschool programs. I went to kindergarten and prekindergarten, and so have my children. So, there is no doubt among the middle class and upper middle class people of this country about the value of preschool programs. Yet, if our public school system had really been responsive, we would have long since had public school education extended down to the second year of the child's life. But, it was not responsive and, therefore, we passed a categorical program 5 or 6 years ago, when we had confidence in our insight that preschool child development programs were useful and in many cases indispensable. I believe they have made a great contribution to our public education system and I hope our systems of designing and delivering public services of all kinds will benefit from the very acute insight that the Members of this House have shown on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the contributions which my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor have made in improving the quality of public services over the last 5 or 6 years during which I have served in the Congress; they have demonstrated a remarkably fine and sensitive insight and we on our side have contributed to this end along with them.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. A little bit earlier the gentleman indicated that the land-grant college aid was an indication that Federal control was not offensive, or something to that extent, but I think we ought to put this in perspective. As I recall, the land-grant college aid only increased to $12 million, and now it is something less than $12 million; it is something like $10 million. So we are comparing $12 million, and now it is $10 million, to the proposed $900 million in the institutional grants here that will be available to all students. And the land-grant college aid was limited aid, and this would be one that would be just an across-the-board proposition on a per capita basis. So I think we ought to look at it in the correct perspective. I know that this does not change the gentleman's opinion on the aid.

Mr. SCHEUER. The gentleman is quite right. The aid program under the land-grant college aid has been on a smaller dollar volume than the general aid formula in this bill would produce, if fully funded, but the principle still stands that the lady cannot be half pregnant. Qualitatively "she is or she ain't." Qualitatively this Congress will either permit, or it will stand fast against, any intrusion of Federal control in the operation of our colleges. I have confidence in future Congresses that they will have the same total unanimity and total consensus against allowing any Federal Government to determine what will be taught and how it will be taught in our institutions of higher education as we share today. But if there is one thing we could find unanimity on I am sure it is that principle, and I would place my bets on future Congresses to protect that precious consensus, that precious history of

noninterference by the long arm of the Federal Government in what goes on on the 2,600 campuses in America.

With that principle firmly fixed in our minds, let me return to the financial crisis in higher education and what title VIII of this bill proposes to do about it.

Over the last several years, higher education has increasingly been feeling the harsh pinch of increasing costs and decreasing incomes, as institutional resources lag behind both inflation and the real costs of providing superior education in an ever more complex world. These pressures have grown as enrollments have expanded, since tuition covers only a part of the total cost of higher education.

In public institutions, for example, tuition accounted for 68.6 percent of general operating and maintenance expenses in 1959–60, 64 2 percent in 1969–70, and will account for only 63.5 percent in 1979–80.

Total contributions from alumni, foundations, corporations, and other private sources, after suffering an absolute decline in 1965–66, are now increasing, but at a rate that is well below the increase in higher education operating costs. Add to this the cutback in Federal research funds to colleges and universities, the general decline in Federal funds obligated by all agencies to universities and colleges that has continued since 1966, the growing demands on schools for higher quality, greater service, and academic innovation, all of which cost money, and the red ink on college budget books is easy to understand.

Few, if any, of these pressures are likely to ease. if and when the inflationary spiral and economic downturn are reversed. The evidence of this financial crisis is hard to miss. It is reported in Business Week and the New York Times, lamented in letters from college presidents to Capitol Hill and State houses, and analyzed by a wide variety of studies and reports. The Commission for Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania in March of 1971, reported that those institutions faced a "continued deterioration of—their—overall financial condition through 1975–76." The overall deficit was expected to increase from $0.9 million in 1969–70 to $41 million by 1975–76.

In a Carnegie Commission on Higher Education report in December 1970, based on a detailed study of the financial condition of 41 representative institutions, Dr. Earl F. Cheit concluded that 56 percent of our higher education institutions are heading for financial trouble, and another 21 percent are already in financial difficulty.

The National Association of State Universities & Land Grant Colleges in its study "People's Colleges in Trouble," reported that the overall increase in operating budgets for 78 institutions it surveyed fell below the requirements for maintaining even a standstill operation.

In my own State of New York, which adopted a program of general institutional aid to private institutions of higher education in 1968, 28 of 57 of these universities and colleges nonetheless showed deficits in 1969–70.

The evidence of crisis is voluminous and complicated. In the face of financial pressure, many institutions have cut back on quality rather than operate with a deficit so that they might appear to have their heads above water. Tuitions have been raised, enrollment expansion slowed or stopped altogether, new faculty hiring postponed, student aid cut, maintenance deferred. All of these developments, and not merely budget deficits, provide compelling evidence of financial distress.

After considering the evidence of financial crisis and its consequences, the committee decided that the Federal Government must assume a new role in support of postsecondary education. While the Federal Government has for many years provided student aid and a variety of specifically targeted categorical programs to aid institutions, it has not provided unrestricted funds for general operating expenditures. While assuming some responsibility for assisting needy students in attaining higher education and for the development of specific programs to meet Federal priorities, it has not assumed a responsibility to help colleges and universities as a group to function and survive. Until now, these Federal programs have been sufficient, but there is a real and present danger that educational institutions across the country will decline in quality and size without additional financial support.

I am sure my colleagues need no convincing that our educational institutions are national resources that must be maintained. Higher education not only enriches the cultural and intellectual life of the Nation, but provides clear economic benefits as well.

For example, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that in a lifetime of working, a college graduate will make $213,000 more than a high school graduate, thereby pumping more money into the economy to spur the growth of still more goods and services.

Although we can agree on the desirability of maintaining our higher education resources, the questions of social policy we must decide is how and from whom the necessary support will be provided. State governments, faced with severe financial pressures, which have won the sympathy of the Nixon administration and led to various revenue sharing proposals, are scarcely in a position to increase the support they already provide. Student tuition charges are already too high at many institutions and, I think, that few of us in this chamber would like to see tuitions increased substantially above existing levels, since not only students, but the whole society benefit from higher education. Private support is already severely strained, and its rate of increase in the last 3 years has dropped from that of the early 1960's.

The burden of supplying the necessary support must, therefore, be taken up by the Federal Government. The committee has recommended that this be done in three ways:

Two-thirds of the institutional aid authorized by title VIII will be distributed to eligible institutions on the basis of number of full-time equivalency students enrolled, with $100 for each freshman and sophomore, $150 for each junior and senior, and $200 for each graduate student.

In addition, each institution is authorized to receive $300 for each of its first 200 students and $200 for each of its next 100 students. This additional authorization is intended to benefit small colleges and will now provide $80,000 to each institution as a result of an amendment I successfully offered in committee to increase the per capita formula.

One-third of the institutional aid authorized by title VIII is to be distributed by a cost of education formula based on a percentage of the total dollars each institution receives under the EOG national defense student loans, and college work-study programs.

Finally, title VIII authorizes a $150 million program for each of 2 years to provide emergency transfusions of financial assistance to institutions which are in severe danger of collapse.

The proponents of each of these three parts of the institutional aid package originally intended that only the aid program, each of them designed, would be adopted, but in the true spirit of reasonableness, this package was accepted by the full committee. The complicated nature of the financial crisis in higher education and how it can best be solved accounts for this variety of approaches.

In approaching these questions the committee had to wrestle with many difficult questions:

Which types of colleges should receive Federal aid, and should some receive proportionately more than others?

If Federal financial aid is only to be directed to those institutions which are clearly in financial distress, where does one draw the line, and how does one measure that distress?

Which plan of aid will be most effective in motivating States and institutions to maintain their efforts to help themselves and not discourage them from trying to develop other avenues of support?

Should Federal financial aid be given only with the condition that an institution meet certain standards for management efficiency and effectiveness in using its resources? If so, how can this be written into a formula?

If aid is to be keyed to those institutions which are responsive to Federal priorities, whether they be enrollment of disadvantaged students, provision of high quality education, or initiative in undertaking much needed reform, how can an aid formula be drawn which is both fair and not too incredibly complicated to administer?

One serious problem with basing institutional aid on a percentage of the Federal student aid dollars which an institution collects, for example, is that States which have their own student financial aid programs are penalized. New York, California, Michigan, New Jersey, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, for

example, have sizable student financial aid programs which effectively augment Federal aid to students. Both should be counted in determining the effort institutions are making to enroll disadvantaged and low-income students.

For example, two major public institutions in the Buffalo, N.Y., area with a large percentage of minority and disadvantaged students receive $3.5 million in Federal student assistance while New York State, from its own sources, is providing $6.7 million in student assistance, or almost twice the Federal amount. This large State effort in providing student assistance is not taken into consideration in an institutional aid program based on a percentage of Federal student assistance.

In view of the complexity of all the possible criteria for Federal institutional aid, the committee has provided for the establishment of a 17-member National Commission of the Financing of Post Secondary Education to study and report to Congress on the entire problem of how to finance higher education.

This Commission will provide a comprehensive review of the causes of the financial crisis in higher education and its most effective solutions. There is a compelling need for such an assessment of how our colleges and universities are being supported and the most effective level and form for Federal, State, and private aid.

Adequate information already exists to justify general Federal institutional aid this year. This Commission will evaluate the effect of the fiscal crisis in higher education of all of the various proposed and existing Federal programs, and provide the Congress with the information and analysis needed to revise, extend, or replace them in the future.

The hard, statistical information and cost benefit analysis this Commission is directed to provide is not currently available. For example, the GI bill and the Social Security Act are two of the largest sources of student financial aid, yet no one knows how many students receiving aid under these programs attend each of the 2,600 higher education institutions in this country. As the Commission produces this kind of information, as it conducts systematic, nationwide studies of the need for additional funds among all types of institutions, as it evaluates the various alternatives for meeting that need and develops others, the Congress will be in an increasingly better position to adjust and revise Federal higher education support programs.

In 1968, I proposed a similar commission as part of the Higher Education Act amendments which was accepted by the Education and Labor Committee, but deleted on the floor of the House. It was claimed at the time that between the Office of Education and the various committee and subcommittee staffs, there was sufficient expertise to conduct such a study. Nonetheless, the conference report on that bill did have the following provision in title V, section 508:

> On or before December 31, 1969, the President shall submit to the Congress proposals relative to the feasibility of making available a post-secondary education to all young Americans who qualify and seek it.

In March of this year, when the Education and Labor Committee was repeatedly running into the brick wall created by a lack of information and analysis, I wrote to Secretary Elliot Richardson at HEW, and asked for a copy of that report. He replied that, in effect, no such report was ever made.

The exchange of letters follows:

MARCH 10, 1971.

Hon. ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 contain a provision, which resulted from a portion of the bill for which I was responsible, directing the President, in the words of the conference report: "to submit to the Congress proposals relative to the feasibility of making available a post-secondary education to all young Americans who qualify and seek it."

I am informed that the President's Message on Higher Education which he sent to the Congress in March 1970 was intended to express his proposal. However, I would like to know whether your Department prepared a report which presented a wider range of proposals. If so, I would appreciate your sending me a copy.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. SCHEUER,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 29, 1971.

Hon. JAMES H. SCHEUER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHEUER: Thank you for your letter of March 10 in which you inquire whether the Department prepared a report which presented a wider range of proposals in support of post-secondary education than those which were included in the President's Message on Higher Education last year.

There were some internal working papers and documents prepared as a part of developing the Administration's position but no single document became the basis for that position. None of these documents has official status and they have not been prepared for distribution.

If there is any particular type of proposal which you are interested in pursuing, I am sure that technical staff within the Office of Education could be helpful in gathering together available informational materials.

Please let me know if we can be of assistance in your efforts.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Since the continually hard-pressed committee staffs have never done the kind of study and analysis which this Commission is directed to conduct, it has never been done, despite the assurances of 1968. I urge my colleagues, this year, to support the establishment of this Commission. It is clearly the only way the Congress will ever get the information it needs to evaluate and restructure Federal education programs effectively.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself finally to only one more of the many significant titles in the bill we are considering today. In title IV, section 426 of H.R. 7248 adds a new section 447 to the college work-study program, establishing a work-study for community service learning program.

This program will authorize $50 million for direct grants to public or private nonprofit institutions to pay the full costs of part-time employment of students, with a preference for veterans of the Armed Forces who served in Indochina or Korea after August 5, 1964, to help them meet the costs of higher education.

Institutions such as State and local governments or private social service agencies which develop programs of meaningful, responsible, quality employment can apply directly to the Office of Education for funding. These jobs must be related, in so far as possible, to the students' courses of study and must be designed to improve community services or solve particular problems in the community.

Employment can be provided in such fields as environmental quality, health care, education, welfare, public safety, drug abuse control, crime prevention and control, transportation, recreation, housing and neighborhood improvement, rural development, conservation, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and community improvement.

College and university student financial aid officers will determine which students are eligible to participate in this program, with the emphasis on veterans and students from families with incomes of $10,000 or less. The jobs generally will pay from $2 to $3.50 per hour, with no limitation on the number of hours worked each week. This will enable participating students to earn from $500 to $1,000 each year while attending school.

The work study for community service learning program builds upon the highly successful work-study program established in 1965. Funded at $244,600,000 for fiscal year 1972, the work-study program primarily provides on-campus jobs which are usually not related to a student's course of study. Only about 25 to 30 percent of the 375,000 students who participated in work-study programs in 1970, for instance, worked off campus, since college administrators and professors are understandably interested in keeping these federally supported students working in academic and clerical fields within the college.

The new section 447 will authorize assistance to some 40,000 to 50,000 additional students in off-campus jobs exclusively so that local governments or social service agencies will no longer have to compete with colleges to employ work-study students.

Although this program is not intended to replace existing opportunities for off-campus employment, it will increase the number of students who can earn Federal financial aid through useful community service.

This program is uniquely suited to the needs of returning veterans, who often have great difficulty adjusting to the sudden change from military life to post-secondary education. This program will allow many of them to perform meaningful services to their communities while attending school, thereby easing the

transition and reintegrating them with the civilian world. It will also supplement the meager $175 per month the veteran now receives to continue his education in a period when part-time employment is often impossible to find.

A precedent exists for this type of program in the urban corps that New York City and some 60 other cities have established. These urban corps programs have employed students in various city agencies all year round and paid 80 percent of their wages through Federal work-study funds. The work study for community service learning program will encourage the development of successful programs like these by providing 100 percent wage reimbursement, an allowance for reimbursement of administrative expenses incurred in operating a program, and the opportunity to deal directly with the Federal Government rather than through colleges.

This program is based on the concept of combining work and learning, originally embodied in the new careers program, which is increasingly gaining wide acceptance. It not only provides a new source of financial assistance to needy students and veterans, but also gives new impetus to the trend for extending the learning experience beyond the classroom into satisfying community service.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address myself to several of the provisions in this higher education bill. It is a large, complicated bill, with many titles, and I could not possibly discuss all of them, nor am I qualified to discuss all of them.

I would like to mention first one part of the bill which basically is based upon legislation that I introduced in the last Congress, and reintroduced in this Congress, calling for the creation of a secondary market for the guaranteed student loan program.

The gentlewoman from Oregon has made the point that there are no Federal higher education programs to aid the middle-income groups. I think that the guaranteed student loan program is such, as is the student financial assistance program that does a very good job of aiding the middle-income groups.

The financial institutions, banks, and so forth, have performed well in providing funds for higher education through the guaranteed student loan program. Many of these financial institutions do find that these loans are different than their customary commercial loans which begin repayment immediately upon the loan being granted, and usually are repaid within a short period of time. The guaranteed student loan, on the other hand, may not begin repayment for 4, 5, or maybe as much as 6 years, and then the repayment continues over a long period of time, consequently, the financial institutions have found that they are getting a greater and greater percentage of their loanable funds invested in the guaranteed student loan program. There has been no device such as we have in housing loans to provide a secondary market for this paper, so that the institutions can cash this paper and get additional funds to be reinvested in new loans.

The provisions in this bill in title IV, part F, is the creation of a student loan market association for such a secondary market.

This is patterned after the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Government National Mortgage Association, which are called Fanny May and Ginny May, respectively, and the Student Loan Market Association can now be referred to as Sally May.

So this new lady can join our financial community in order to keep the guaranteed student loan program a good and viable program providing many, many students with funds that they would not otherwise have for higher education.

There has been some discussion already in the debate concerning general institutional aid. I would like to address myself to this discussion as well.

There were certainly many different opinions in the subcommittee and in the full committee on this question of general institutional aid. I am one who has felt a case has not been made for the Federal Government to enter into this new relationship with higher education.

We are told that there is a crisis in financing in higher education at the present time. I think the evidence of this is slim. I would point to the fact that the Office of Education is now conducting together with the Columbia Research Associates in Cambridge, Mass., a study of the problem of financing in higher education.

Recently I received a letter from S. P. Marland, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education, concerning some of their initial findings. I will quote from this letter which was dated October 18, 1971, where Commissioner Marland says:

> The Cost of College—

Which by the way is the name of the study—

> The Cost of College does not support as strongly the conclusions elsewhere that higher education in general is facing a discouragingly bleak future. Of those colleges in trouble, there are indications that the difficulties involve expenditures rather than revenue. This study concludes, in fact, that existing financial difficulties in the institutions studied result in large part from internal decisions within the colleges themselves. Although there is little doubt that some institutions will continue to have financial difficulties, much more can be done through better institutional management and planning to moderate the impact of inflationary cost increases and to reverse historical trends toward lower productivity.

I think this is evidence of the fact that really the crisis in higher education financing is not as great as we might be led to believe by some who have been discussing it.

I should like also to call to your attention at this time the testimony of Alice M. Rivlin, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, before the subcommittee. She said in her testimony:

> Is there really an emergency or a crisis in higher education finance and, if so is this type of institutional aid program the best way to meet it?
>
> Hard facts are difficult to assemble in this area. My own impression from available studies and conversations with higher educators is that there is no *general* crisis of higher education finance. Rather, there are several sets of factors affecting various kinds of institutions in various ways at the same time, some permanent and some temporary.

Then she goes on to point out what these factors are:

> 1. Some major research institutions are suffering from cutbacks in federal research programs or federally funded graduate study programs. Some of them hired tenure faculty in anticipation of continued federal funding and now have to meet these salaries out of their own sources.
>
> 2. Some, but by no means all, state-supported institutions are suffering from smaller than usual increases in state support, partly due to state legislative reaction to student radicalism, partly to the general tightness of state budgets in the face of rising expenditures for other purposes and resistance to tax increases.
>
> 3. Some institutions, especially private ones, are finding themselves over-extended as a result of ambitious attempts over the last decade to improve the quality and variety of their programs to attract better faculty and a more nationally representative student body. Some find themselves with expensive commitments to scholarship programs, others with dormitories and other buildings, often financed with federal funds, that can no longer be filled.
>
> 4. Some institutions are suffering the combined effect of recent recession and inflation. Private institutions are the hardest hit. Private gifts have dropped sharply, although they seem likely to recover somewhat this year. Students are less likely in a recession to be willing to pay the difference between public and private tuition. At the same time, wages, salaries, and other costs have continued to rise steeply.
>
> 5. Some institutions no longer offer what students appear to want.

I think that is an important point to address. The institution that is not responding to today's need is not offering what will attract the student. Should we through this general financial aid program subsidize those institutions that are not responsive to the needs of today's youth and, therefore, are in financial difficulty?

There are many problems with general institutional aid. One of the questions I think we have to ask ourselves is—should we through this formula give assistance to very small institutions who may not be responsive—and to what extent are we going to be aiding these small institutions?

I have some figures from the Office of Education that are really quite interesting—that is, small institutions with a full-time equivalent student enrollment of less than 500. These are small institutions. Under the formula that is in the bill—that is, two-thirds based upon Mrs. GREEN'S capitation, one-third on the cost of education allowance—if $100 million were appropriated, one institution with 440 equivalent full-time student enrollment would receive 4.4 percent of its general operating expense. If fully funded, they would receive 42.5 percent of

their general operating expenses from this allocation. Almost half of the cost of operating that institution will come through the general institutional aid that is proposed in this bill.

That is the one largest amount. But running through a list of 14, they range from 11 percent, 30 percent, 25 percent, 32 percent. These are small institutions that will have anywhere from 10 percent to over 40 percent of their total cost of operating provided through this general financial aid.

I do not think the case has been made that general institutional aid is necessary at this time. I think the talk of crisis is being used to pass a program that is not intended to meet a crisis. A crisis by its very definition is something that is of short duration. But even those who tried to sell this program before our subcommittee admitted that once we embark on this, it would be a permanent program, a permanent new relationship between the Federal Government and institutions of higher education.

One of the provisions calls for a maintenance of effort. The maintenance of effort provision provides that an institution must continue to expend at least as much as the average of the last 2 years of their expenditures. Does this mean that if the institution loses students they will have to increase their per-student expenditures to maintain the same level of expenditure? It is not tied to the per-pupil expenditure but the total expenditure of the institution. Does this mean that if a State lessens its support for a particular institution, maybe because they have decided that they are going to put more State funds into 2-year community college institutions and decreasing support for the 4-year institutions—does this mean that this lessening of State support might then disqualify the 4-year institution from getting any aid under this program? I think this legally would happen. I think it is a dangerous provision, and I will at the proper time move to strike the title that provides for general institutional aid.

One last thing I would like to discuss is title X, providing for nondiscrimination as to sex in the faculties of higher institutions and also undergraduate and graduate enrollment. I think that it became quite clear a few years ago when we had student unrest on the campuses, many people in this House felt it would not be proper for the Federal Government to involve itself in the internal affairs of institutions of higher education. Some of the people who very tellingly made that argument a few years ago are now supporting this, which is a direct interference in the internal operating affairs of institutions. I have decided that I will offer an amendment to exempt undergraduate enrollment from the provisions of this title.

Since making that decision I have heard from many of the institutions that would be affected who are quite happy to know that such an amendment would be offered. I received a call from Father Hesburgh this afternoon, who said Notre Dame was considering the question of co-educational experience. They may make some arrangements with St. Mary's College, but they are not certain they could or would go ahead with this experiment in coeducation if there were such a provision as title X.

Other institutions looking at the language in title X say that they started to move toward co-education 4, 5, or 6 years ago. This language in title X says they will have to complete that process in a 7-year period. So upon the passage of this title they would find they have only a year or two more in which to complete the 7-year phase-in called for in title X.

Title X, without giving any legislative direction to the Office of Education, says that those institutions that are moving from being primarily an institution for one sex to one that is coeducational must do so under a plan approved by the Office of Education. And yet there are no legislative guidelines, no standards given to the Commissioner of Education to determine how this should be done.

It occurs to me that if a plan is to be filed, they are going to have to set some goals or quotas, so we are going to have in this area goals or quotas as to nondiscrimination in sex—the very thing we have tried to avoid in nondiscrimination in other fields and in employment. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 specifically prohibits quotas.

In the Rules Committee I referred to this as a sort of "Philadelphia plan" for institutions of higher learning with their goals for nondiscrimination in sex.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I recall the gentleman from Illinois in discussion of EOC was all in favor of the Philadelphia plan, and that he was in favor of goals then. Has the gentleman changed his plan?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I still support the Philadelphia plan. I just do not think we ought to impose the Philadelphia plan on all institutions of higher education in this country. I feel arguments are aptly made, and they quite convinced me a couple of years ago, that we should not interfere with the workings of institutions of higher education and they should have freedom, and freedom in education is a very important factor.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is opposed to quotas based on sex?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Definitely.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then the gentleman would offer an amendment to do away with quotas?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am announcing I intend to offer an amendment to do away with or to exempt undergraduate enrollment quotas.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. To do away with quotas based on sex?

Mr. ERLENBORN. No, I will move to exempt undergraduate enrollment from the provisions of title X.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But the gentleman is opposed to quotas based on sex?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 323]

Abourezk	Eckhardt	McDonald, Mich.
Addabbo	Edmondson	McEwen
Alexander	Edwards, Calif.	McKevitt
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, La.	McMillan
Anderson, Tenn.	Evans, Colo.	Madden
Archer	Evins, Tenn.	Martin
Arends	Findley	Miller, Calif.
Aspinall	Flood	Mills, Ark.
Baring	Foley	Mink
Barrett	Fraser	Mollohan
Blanton	Fulton, Tenn.	Morgan
Bolling	Galifianakis	Pike
Brasco	Garmatz	Podell
Burton	Gibbons	Poff
Cabell	Gray	Powell
Caffery	Gubser	Reid, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Gude	Roberts
Cederberg	Halpern	Rogers
Celler	Harrington	Rooney, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Harsha	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Harvey	Sebelius
Clark	Hébert	Shipley
Clay	Hicks, Mass.	Sikes
Conte	Howard	Slack
Conyers	Jarman	Springer
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Stanton, James V.
Davis, Ga.	Kastenmeier	Stokes
de la Garza	Kee	Thompson, Ga.
Dent	Koch	Widnall
Derwinski	Kuykendall	Wilson, Charles H.
Diggs	Landrum	Wolff
Dingell	Long, La.	
Dowdy	Long, Md.	
du Pont	Lujan	
Dwyer	McClory	
	McCulloch	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7248, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 327 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentlewoman from Oregon had consumed 40 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota had consumed 33 minutes. Does the gentlewoman from Oregon desire to yield time?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that should be completed by tomorrow evening. I feel confident if we can obtain the cooperation of all of our friends and keep a sufficient number of Members on the floor, we can finish gen-

eral debate within the next hour. On our side there is no intention, no desire to take all the time allotted for general debate.

Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable pride that I rise in support of H.R. 7248. I am proud because the Committee on Education and Labor has designed a piece of legislation which—

Builds on the successes of the past,

Departs on new and necessary programs, and

Responds in a meaningful and significant way to the complex and pressing problems associated with the financing of higher education.

I am proud that the committee followed the recommendations and suggestions of college administrators rather than the ivory tower recommendations of certain theorists and economists. In so doing we have a comprehensive measure—one carefully designed to address the magnitude of needs throughout all of higher education.

It recognizes that there are financial crises not only in institutions of higher education, but among parents and students as they struggle to finance the increasing costs of higher education.

I am proud that it does not, as some have suggested, eliminate from the scope of the Federal interest large categories of students and institutions. It is a balanced measure.

It continues and strengthens previous Federal commitments—

To exceptionally needy students.

To colleges who need additional academic facilities.

To developing institutions in their attempts to improve their academic offerings.

And to disadvantaged students who need motivational, special help, and remedial programs.

There are some who have suggested that we should curtail some of our previous commitments. I, for one, will have no part of an authorization bill that, on its face, admits that there simply is not enough money available to do the job. Our responsibility is to identify need and design a program to meet that need. We would be derelict in our responsibilities if we did less.

Again, I will say that I am proud that the Committee on Education and Labor did not, under the guise of targeting aid and economy, retreat from previous objectives and goals.

Let me review with you some of the issues.

We had a choice between relying solely on mortgage insurance and interest subsidy payments as the vehicles to assist colleges and universities in meeting the facilities shortage—and between doing this plus extending and strengthening the direct loan and grant programs under the Facilities Act. The former would be less expensive—the latter more effective and in the long run less costly. The committee chose the latter.

We had the choice between eliminating the interest subsidy provisions and special allowance provisions in the insured loan program—and between expanding those provisions so as to reach even a greater number of students who are in need of assistance. The former would target assistance—the latter expand coverage. The committee chose the latter.

We had to choose whether to rely solely on the private money market for NDEA-type student loans—or to extend and expand title II of the National Defense Education Act. The committee chose the latter.

We were asked to establish a Higher Education Foundation which, according to its proponents, would make unnecessary the continuation of proven higher education programs such as continuing education and community services, equipment grants and fellowships. The committee chose to extend and strengthen rather than terminate these programs.

We had a choice between quote targetting student aid moneys closed quote—and between extending expanding and strengthening programs with outstanding records. The committee chose the latter.

Mr. Chairman, I could continue on, indicating those areas where the committee bill responded to the well-documented needs at all levels and in every area of higher education. We properly did not allow budgetary considerations to be the sole criteria as we reached our decisions. This is a bill which is based on a solid foundation of existing programs, and on the very best evidence and advice offered to us. Let me list for you the prestigious and important associations who have endorsed H.R. 7248, as it has been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor:

The American Association of Junior Colleges.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

The American Council on Education.

The Association of American Colleges.

The Association of American Universities.

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

The National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities—33 individual States associations, all of which endorse the bill.

The National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.

The National Catholic Education Association.

This great bill, so widely endorsed, is largely due to the great and untiring efforts of Mrs. GREEN and her Special Subcommittee on Education. The gentlelady from Oregon has once again put together a bill which has the support of virtually all of higher education.

And this has not been an easy task. For over 2 years, Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee has conducted hearings and studies relative to programs and needs in higher education. After the subcommittee had begun its legislative sessions, a Senate-passed comprehensive higher education bill was referred to our committee. That bill contains a number of proposals which were not part of the legislation being worked on by Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee. The Senate bill included a variety of proposals which were then pending before other subcommittees of our committee. Because these Senate-approved proposals will be before us in conference, the committee very carefully considered whether or not to amend our higher education bill with similar provisions.

Realizing that it was late in the session and that we would facilitate more expeditious action, the committee has amended the higher education bill with provisions corresponding to similar provisions in the Senate bill. These include youth camp safety, occupational education, ethnic heritage studies, and the National Institute of Education. These measures have been perfected in other subcommittees, and I wish to compliment these subcommittees and their chairmen—the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), for the leadership and determination he exercised in incorporating in this legislation support for an area which has for too long been neglected—postsecondary occupational education. Mr. PUCINSKI and his subcommittee are also responsible for the ethnic heritage studies program, a long overdue program, title XV of the bill.

To Mr. DANIELS and his subcommittee I wish to express appreciation for the work on a measure which, I am confident, will draw the unanimous praise of every Member of the House—a youth camp safety measure which will protect the very young in this Nation from the hazards involved in youth campsites and activities. This is title XIX of the bill.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) and his Select Subcommittee on Education—for their work on the National Institute of Education, title XIV of the bill.

Obviously in a bill of this size, we are considering costs which are substantial. In this connection, we should initially consider that the bill affects 34 existing separate higher education programs, whose total dollar authorizations this year amounted to approximately $3.5 billion.

In certain instances the committee reported bill extends existing authority with cost estimates at a reduced level. To the present authorization, we add more than a billion dollars during the current fiscal year. Virtually all of this is for a new program of institutional assistance. In succeeding years the bill provides for sizable increases in authorization for student assistance programs, for the establishment of a strong program of support for occupational education and for the continuation of the program of institutional assistance.

It is only because of the automatic extension provision approved in Public Law 91–230 that we are not today in a crisis situation. But for this provision, all higher education provisions expired at the end of fiscal year 1971. It is imperative that we move on this legislation as soon as possible. All higher education programs being extended or established are authorized through fiscal year 1976

in the bill. This in my judgment is one of the most significant aspects of this legislation—for we will with passage of H.R. 7248, provide greater continuation and stability to the Federal role in higher education.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to touch upon only a few of the provisions of the bill which I believe are of major importance. H.R. 7248 continues assistance for title III of the Higher Education Act, with a substantial increase in the authorized level of spending. This program, which assists developing institutions in their efforts to improve their academic offerings is a key element in the overall Federal effort to broaden and improve higher education opportunities.

There is another amendment in the bill which I believe to be of great benefit to developing institutions. Section 2002 of the bill authorizes the Commissioner of Education to raise the Federal share on any higher education programs when he determintes that such is necessary. Developing institutions which are unable to meet the full Federal share will now be able to obtain a waiver in the statutory requirement.

The program of special help for disadvantaged students is continued for 4 years with certain amendments which I believe will make for a more effective overall program. The committee bill attempts to consolidate the three programs so as to provide for more efficient administration. However, it is the committee's intention that these three separate programs—Upward Bound, Talent Search. and Special Services—not lose their identity.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that the institutional aid program should be stricken and that he will make a motion to do so.

In the light of experience, the bill would amend title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modernize Federal support for college library programs.

The bill would, for example, authorize the Commissioner of Education to waive the "maintenance of effort" requirements in appropriate circumstances.

The maximum amount available per student in the form of the unmatched supplementary grants would also be increased, under the bill, to reflect realistically the price trends in recent years of books and other library materials.

I should like to emphasize that the bill would not change the requirement that three-fourths of the appropriation for grants for college library resources be expended for basic grants. This provision of existing law has been flouted by the administration. It was our intent, as we made plain in the committee report on the 1965 act, that priority be accorded to the matched basic grants of $5,000 per institution, yet the Office of Education advised colleges and universities in February of this year that, in order to receive a basic grant, they would also have to apply for and qualify for a supplemental grant.

The effect of this bureaucratic requirement, unsupported by congressional intent or authority, is to deny any Federal support for more than two-thirds of the colleges and universities that would otherwise be eligible. In Kentucky, for example, it has been estimated that only 16 out of 34 institutions would be able to get grants under title II–A in the current fiscal year. Nationally, only 876 out of 2,161 institutions are likely to receive grants, if the Office of Education persists in this unauthorized and misguided policy. So that members may be aware of the consequences in their own States, I insert a State-by-State tabulation at this point:

ESTIMATED REDUCTION IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO GET FISCAL YEAR 1972 GRANTS UNDER HEA TITLE II–A

Institutions are likely to receive grants:
Alabama: 14 out of 32.
Alaska: 8 out of 10.
Arizona: 5 out of 15.
Arkansas: 9 out of 21.
California: 43 out of 175.
Colorado: 9 out of 28.
Connecticut: 20 out of 41.
Delaware: 3 out of 5.
Florida: 15 out of 59.
Georgia: 17 out of 44.
Hawaii: 7 out of 11.
Idaho: 2 out of 8.
Illinois: 30 out of 97.
Indiana: 8 out of 42.
Iowa: 22 out of 51.
Kansas: 31 out of 45.
Kentucky: 16 out of 34.
Louisiana: 3 out of 19.
Maine: 14 out of 21.
Maryland: 24 out of 42.
Massachusetts: 35 out of 93.
Michigan: 20 out of 65.
Minnesota: 22 out of 44.
Mississippi: 18 out of 31.
Missouri: 27 out of 52.
Montana: 6 out of 11.
Nebraska: 15 out of 24.
Nevada: 1 out of 3.
New Hampshire: 9 out of 14.
New Jersey: 11 out of 41.
New Mexico: 5 out of 14.
New York: 48 out of 175.
North Carolina: 47 out of 78.
North Dakota: 6 out of 12.
Ohio: 39 out of 89.
Oklahoma: 13 out of 29.
Oregon: 13 out of 32.
Pennsylvania: 54 out of 125.
Rhode Island: 3 out of 13.
South Carolina: 32 out of 46.
South Dakota: 5 out of 14.
Tennessee: 29 out of 50.
Texas: 28 out of 93.
Utah: 2 out of 10.
Vermont: 13 out of 17.
Virginia: 30 out of 51.
Washington: 4 out of 34.
West Virginia: 9 out of 24.
Wisconsin: 25 out of 59.
Wyoming: 4 out of 6.
District of Columbia: 3 out of 12.
A total of 876 out of 2,161.

The number of institutions is liable to be even more restricted in the event that some of the above do not have disadvantaged students enrolled.

Similarly, the committee found it necessary to mandate use of at least half the funds available under the bill for training in librarianship for support of fellowships and traineeships; that is, for support of the advanced training that prepares leadership personnel in contrast to the shorter, less complex institute training programs.

To offset the shortages of librarians with advanced training that are present and developing, we must not slacken our support of fellowships and advanced traineeships. The committee, of course, endorses the training and utilization of aids and assistants in the library as in other institutions, but experience has amply demonstrated that the Office of Education can benefit from a clear congressional indication of the best balance between the two types of training.

Mr. Chairman, let me mention the educational opportunity grant program. We know that an amendment will be offered to this section which will drastically revise the present operation of the program. Mr. Chairman, the evidence in our hearing record overwhelmingly demonstrates that the program as constituted in the past has achieved remarkable results. Statistics show clearly that aid has been targeted on the most disadvantaged population.

The committee bill provides for a continuation of that focus. It provides for an improved State allotment formula with the all-important provision that no State will get less than it received in fiscal year 1972. There is a great deal of talk about assurances and entitlements. But the only assurance that is really involved is the assurance in the committee bill that no State will receive less than it received in fiscal year 1972.

Yes, there have been inequities in the grant program, but these are due exclusively to the inadequate level of funding provided. What is needed is not the drastic revision being suggested but rather a more realistic level of financial support. In my judgment, the present program with the modifications proposed in H.R. 7248, will provide a more effective mechanism in meeting the needs of the disadvantaged than will the proposed substitute through its national and arbitrary guidelines and criteria.

We have had much experience with such national criteria and guidelines which more frequently than not create more inequities than they solve. I refer you to the recent debate on the school lunch program.

I do not think that anyone can tell us there is not an educational crisis in this country among the colleges and universities.

Colleges are closing their doors throughout the length and breadth of this country. We have a crisis at all levels of education. Clearly, it has come to the point that the Federal Government must make a greater contribution.

I should like to mention a few of the recent studies which overwhelmingly demonstrate the need for institutional assistance. I refer the gentleman from Illinois to the Jellema study, to a study of the State universities and land grant colleges, to the study of private education in New York, to the study of private education in Massachusetts, to the study of private education in Pennsylvania, and to the numerous other studies which have been conducted.

We cannot afford to wait for the economists and the researchers. Look at the facts as they exist in this country today. We have a crisis, and the across-the-board approach taken by the gentlewoman from Oregon, is the best solution that has been offered.

H.R. 7248 would provide $955 million

for fiscal year 1972 for institutional aid; for fiscal year 1973 we would provide $1,004 million; for fiscal year 1974, $1,059 million; for fiscal year 1975, $1,115 million; and for fiscal year 1976, $1,167 million. Let us keep in mind in debating institutional aid that institutions are composed of students. In my judgment, this new program will be of direct benefit to all parents and all students who, virtually without regard to income level, are experiencing difficulty in financing a higher education. Aid provided institutions under this program will assist substantially in holding down—hopefully even reducing—charges which have spiraled upward at both public and private institutions in recent years.

Let me say to the committee that this approach is supported by the experts in the business. I have already listed numerous associations which endorse H.R. 7248 as reported from the Committee on Education and Labor. Bear in mind that such prestigious organizations as the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, the Land Grant College Association, and the Association of Junior Colleges—all of the associations I mentioned a moment ago—endorse the institutional assistance program recommended by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and the committee.

I would be the first to admit that this approach is not perfect, but it is much more equitable than any other suggestion, which has been offered.

So it is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that in the consideration of this bill we will retain the institutional assistance program. This is the best approach that has been brought before the committee and it is the best and will be the best approach presented to the House.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this program has been carefully considered. Mrs. GREEN outlined this approach more than 2 years ago. Hearing after hearing was conducted by the Special Subcommittee on Education. The views of the best experts in the country were heard. There is nothing here that is irrational; there is nothing in this approach that has not been carefully thought out.

I certainly hope that we will hold intact the institutional assistance program that we have brought before the House. It is a great program. This is a great piece of legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As has been said by several prior speaker, my colleagues, this is an extremely complex bill. We have here, as every one of us knows, a bill with some 20 titles. We have here 180-plus pages of the bill as it is before us, and we have a host of individual specific points on which any of us could talk and on which every one of us should be knowledgeable before we finally cast our vote whenever the time comes for voting on the bill.

I am not going to try to cover all of the features involved in the bill at this time, but I would like to talk to two of them, two particularly significant issues as I see them.

There has been prior discussion between the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. QUIE, on the first of the really critical issues in controversy on this bill, that is, the matter of economic opportunity grants. I am not going to try at this moment to go into it any further.

The second feature that has been touched on from several different standpoints on which I would like to make some comment is the matter of institutional grants.

Let me say as a preliminary comment that I personally am persuaded that there is a very real need for institutional Federal aid to higher education. I think that we cannot turn back from this particular demand.

The institutions of higher education in the Nation are in need, although they are in varying degrees of need. For some the need is desperate. But we do not at the moment have all of the sound data that we need in order to go forward with the beginning of a sound permanent program in this field of Federal institutional grants.

There has been reference by the chairman of the subcommittee and there has been reference by the chairman of the full committee as to how long the hearings of the subcommitte went on. We have spent a great deal of time talking among ourselves about this particular issue. We have dwelt at great length on the question of need.

Mr. Chairman, we have a series of opinions on this bill, but the thing that is really critically lacking before we launch forth into a permanent program is the sound data on which this Congress, moving forward into a new field, should base any formula for determining how many dollars we should invest in this area of critical need and how those dollars should be allocated.

Everyone of us who has spent much time in a State legislature or in this Congress is fully aware of the fact that the march of government in this type of situation is almost irreversible. Granting the need, granting as some of us are prepared to grant that we should move forward to meet that need, the practical irreversibility of any action we take makes it imperative that we move soundly. Before we enact legislation in this field we should have sound data on which to base our action.

The Carnegie Commission has come out with a report which makes clear that we do not have the data we need. We had a task force under the leadership of Frank Newman which has said we do not have the data we need. We have the testimony of Alice Rivlin, a representative of the Brookings Institute, saying that we do not have the data we need. Time after time witnesses have appeared before our subcommittee and said, whether or not you feel there should be aid of a Federal general institutional nature, before you move forward and create a formula, the data you need should be available so that whatever you do is sound. That data, gentlemen and ladies of the Congress, we do not have.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more involved as to this issue. There is the question as to what formula should be applied. We are faced with the question as to whether or not we should launch forth at all with this completely new role of the Federal Government. We have the question of what the dynamics of financing higher education really are.

We have the question as to the interplay between tuition, endowments and public support. When an institution is in a red ink situation, does that automatically mean that we should go to its aid? When an institution is working in the black, does that mean it should not get Federal help? Should an institution in the red and an institution in the black be given exactly the same kind of help? When we talk about lower division and upper division and graduate education, should Federal aid really be $100 for each student for so many credit hours in one instance, $150 in another and $200 in the third instance? We did not have the data before our subcommittee which said that the proper relationship is $100, $150 or $200, or any other specific amounts.

When it comes to the special question of whether a small institution should be given more help than a large institution, where was the full and deliberate testimony before the subcommittee which said a small institution should be given some special help and that that should be a certain number of dollars for an institution below 200 students and a certain number of dollars for an institution beyond 200 students? If the initial decision of the subcommittee on this point was based on sound data, how does it happen that in a simple almost undebated amendment made in the full committee, there was a 50-percent change in the subcommittee's proposal on this point?

It would appear either that the study data was not sound that the subcommittee had upon which it made its decision, or if the data was sound the subcommittee arrived after 50-some days of hearings at a completely erroneous conclusion, because the full committee went to a completely different level of implementation.

I am persuaded that what it means is that we did not have the necessary data and still do not have it, and before we launch into a permanent formula we should conclude that we must have that data.

There is a difference between the 5-year provisions of this bill so far as aid of a general institutional nature is concerned, and the emergency which is cried for in several places in the bill. And when we come to the question of what should we do in this particular area, the provisions of title VIII lead off by saying that the Congress "hereby finds and declares that an emergency condition has arisen which threatens the continued ability"—and so on. I think an emergency condition has arisen. But the very fact of an

emergency calls for doing something now, but that something does not of necessity have to be permanent, and certainly should not be permanent until you have what you need to make a sound permanent decision.

And it is with this in mind that we on the minority side come before the Congress and plead, do not, on the basis of studies which are not yet completed, on which we have only some indications of what the way to do this is, do not for the sake of acting immediately jump the gun and move in an irreversible fashion.

If we do so move we are apt to find ourselves, when the full data is before us, in a situation which should not be final and irrevocable—and it will take on the nature of finality if we lock this in with a 5-year formula. Of course, it can be said that it is not really final because we have the opportunity to revise the formula next year and the year thereafter. But, with the crises that face the Congress in other fields than education, how many of you think that it is realistic that at the end of 1 year, when the authorization locks all of it up for 5 years, we are really going to go into it thoroughly and restudy it before that should become required?

The only way to be sure there is a restudy is to provide a short-time authorization, and the minority's proposal in this particular area reduces the term to 2 years.

Let us secure the facts and let us move now. Let us move now on the basis of the crisis to take care of the crisis that some of us feel very strongly does exist. But let us not under the banner of a crisis and under the cry of "emergency aid" lock in without adequate background study that which is apt to become permanent, and do what many of us in the future may very well wish we had not done in writing a permanent formula.

The second part of the bill to which I would like to make comment is what I consider one of its serious defects. The defect is that it does not include any authorization for the proposed National Foundation for Higher Education, or, as it is termed in the Senate bill dealing with this particular field, the National Foundation for Post-Secondary Education. But by whatever title we call it we are faced in this type of situation in higher education in addition to the crisis, or emergency, of keeping the educational ship afloat, with a second crisis or great need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, the second type of crisis that higher education faces is in addition to the crisis of keeping the educational ship afloat, while we take care of operating expenses, it is the crisis and the need for reform, for innovation with the funds in the hands of the institutions to do what they themselves have come forth with time after time in the way of proposals which they would like to implement, but which in their operating budgets they have no funds to implement and which, as they look to other sources of possible availability of money, they find no such funds are available. This crisis or need is just not taken care of in this bill.

Stated simply, the purpose of the Foundation would be to help colleges and universities help themselves to change and grow so that they may substantially enhance their capacity to serve the needs of all citizens.

I want to make very clear from the outset that there are significant differences between the Foundation, which was proposed by the administration, and the National Institute of Education. Basically, the Institute would research and study the need for change while the Foundation would implement change. The process in NIE would be concerned with questions, while the Foundation would be concerned with answers that have originated in the higher education community.

This last point is significant: the Foundation would reward institutional initiative, so that funds would go to those institutions which had decided on their own that they wanted to institute reform.

As early as 1968 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education called for the establishment of a National Foundation for the Devleopment of Higher Education.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I simply want to associate myself with his remarks.

I think the Committee on Education and Labor was derelict very seriously in its refusal to include as part of this higher education package an opportunity for providing funds to innovate postsecondary education in the United States.

Everyone recognizes that this is one of the serious weaknesses existing now within higher education—at a time when funds are tight and, it seems to me, very shortsighted and counterproductive to deny institutions the opportunity to get additional resources through a foundation as proposed by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) and under whose leadership this proposal has come a long, long way.

I support the gentleman in his efforts to support the foundation and would ask the gentleman if it is not true, not only is the Carnegie Commission strongly in support of the foundation but associations of higher education like the American Council on Education and other groups of that kind who have indicated their support for this concept?

Mr. DELLENBACK. The gentleman is absolutley correct and I appreciate very much the gentleman's remarks.

Of course, it is not only the Carnegie Commission which has supported the idea of such a foundation. I was referring to the Carnegie Commission as having first put forth this idea some 3 years ago. But there have been a host of individual institutions and individual associations which have also voiced strong support for this concept—as indeed almost any person closely tied to higher education in my thinking could, and would, voice strong support if they really understand what it is proposed to do.

As I was saying, as early as 1968, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education called for the establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education. To quote from the Commission's highly regarded report, "Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education":

> The Commission believes that the federal government can play an extremely valuable role in encouraging developmental programs in higher education by providing initial funds for such undertakings. The continuing rise in the costs of higher education makes it particularly important to develop existing facilities to their greatest potential and to try out new methods and techniques in order to improve operational efficiency and quality. But many institutions find that they do not have a margin of funds for such undertakings.
>
> The Commission proposes the establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education to provide encouragement, advice, review, and financial support for institutional programs designed to provide new directions in curricula, strengthening of essential areas that have fallen behind or that have never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and development of programs to improve educational processes and techniques. The Foundation would be a governmental agency operating under the direction of a board and organized along the lines of the National Science Foundation.

In the opinion of the Carnegie Commission, the need for such a foundation has not diminished since 1968. Indeed, in the 1970 supplement to their report, the Commission reiterated their support for the concept.

I think every one of us here today sees that continued reform and innovative growth are essential in higher education today. The need for fresh vision and new techniques has been manifested in a number of different ways: student discontent and unrest, disaffected faculties, declining private support at a time when enrollments are soaring and a general loss of purpose.

Yet at a time when much of society is demanding change in higher education, institutions are caught in such tight financial squeeze that they are forced to set aside innovative projects. I believe we must insure that colleges and universities do not postpone reform in the face of severe financial difficulties. The theory that we cannot afford innovation in times of fiscal stringency threatens the ability of higher education to meet the needs of our society in the future.

Let me emphasize that the potential for reform is very much evident in institutions of higher education today in the form of exciting new proposals for learning approaches. Regrettably, however, much of this potential is not being realized because no funds are available.

It is this potential for self-directed change that the foundation can help realize. It could provide, for the first time, a stable source of funds to which institutions can turn when they want to initiate new approaches but lack support.

For example:

Grandview College in Des Moines, Iowa, needs $50,000 to develop a special pro-

gram for talented youth in cooperation with two other other educational institutions.

American University is requesting $1 million to begin an experimental career-education program that will involve students and faculty in a new problem-oriented curriculum.

Pikesville College in Kentucky is seeking $500,000 to develop a cooperative arrangements among 60 colleges in 13 States in Appalachia where each college would develop expertise for the group in one area which would be of assistance to students from that region. The proposal is known as Project Apex.

Evergreen State College in Washington has sought $72,500 for an innovative program of recruiting students and placing them in field assignments as part of the academic curriculums.

The State University of New York College at Old Westbury is also in need of funds for the placement of students in field assignments. Old Westbury is seeking $100,000 that cannot be provided by the State of New York.

The College of Human Services in New York City, known to many of us as a very exciting and creative institution, has been unable to find $95,000 to assist its students in obtaining paraprofessional training.

Many more examples could be cited. But the point is clear. Without new sources of aid, embryonic reform projects will be still-born.

The Foundation, an agency within HEW with a presidentially appointed and Senate-confirmed Director and Board of Directors, would meet this need. Its mission is to provide funding for projects which will try out new directions in post-secondary education. After its initial breakin year, funded at a level of $100 million, the Foundation would be an essential source of assistance for a variety of experiments with new approaches to learning.

The Foundation—a flexible agency responsive to the needs of the post-secondary communities and directed toward genuine reform and change—would be a major contribution to the continued fruitful growth of American higher education.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 324]

Abernethy	Brasco	Culver
Abourezk	Brooks	Danielson
Addabbo	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Alexander	Burton	Dent
Anderson, Ill.	Byrne, Pa.	Derwinski
Anderson, Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Diggs
Archer	Cabell	Dorn
Arends	Caffery	Dowdy
Baring	Carey, N.Y.	Dulski
Barrett	Cederberg	du Pont
Belcher	Celler	Dwyer
Bell	Chisholm	Eckhardt
Biaggi	Clark	Edmondson
Blanton	Clay	Edwards, Calif.
Boggs	Collins, Tex.	Edwards, La.
Boland	Colmer	Evans, Colo.
Bolling	Conte	Evins, Tenn.
	Conyers	Findley
Fish	King	Reid, N.Y.
Flood	Koch	Riegle
Foley	Kuykendall	Roberts
Ford, William D.	Landgrebe	Rogers
Fraser	Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.
Frelinghuysen	Lennon	Rooney, Pa.
Galifianakis	Long, La.	Rosenthal
Garmatz	Long, Md.	Saylor
Gettys	Lujan	Seiberling
Gibbons	McCulloch	Shipley
Goldwater	McDonald, Mich.	Sikes
Gray	McMillan	Sisk
Griffiths	Macdonald, Mass.	Slack
Gubser	Madden	Smith, Calif.
Gude	Martin	Springer
Halpern	Miller, Calif.	Stanton, James V.
Hanley	Mills, Ark.	Stephens
Hansen, Wash.	Mink	Stokes
Harsha	Minshall	Sullivan
Harvey	Mizell	Symington
Hawkins	Mollohan	Talcott
Hébert	Morgan	Teague, Calif.
Hicks, Mass.	Moss	Teague, Tex.
Holifield	Patman	Thompson, Ga.
Howard	Pepper	Ullman
Jacobs	Pike	Van Deerlin
Jarman	Podell	Widnall
Johnson, Pa.	Poff	Wilson, Charles H.
Jonas	Powell	Winn
Jones, Ala.	Purcell	Wolff
Jones, Tenn.	Quillen	
Karth	Rees	
Kee		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7248, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 281 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentlewoman from Oregon had consumed 50 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) had consumed 48 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Minnesota or the gentlewoman from Oregon desire to yield time?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of title XIV, the National Institute of Education. Responding to the call of President Nixon in his March 3, 1970, message to Congress on educational reform, members of the Education and Labor Committee of both parties gave strong support for this proposal of the President.

Explaining the need for the establishment of a National Institute of Education, the President declared last year that, "We are not getting as much as we should out of the dollars we spend on education," and that it was time for "a searching re-examination of our entire approach to learning."

Mr. Chairman, research and development in education has never received adequate support.

Indeed, in comparison to health research, for example, research in education has commanded meager resources and recruited a relatively small community of scholars.

Since 1959, the Nation has spent less than $1 billion on educational research—and $14 billion on health research.

Today research and development receive barely 0.3 percent of the education dollar—and 4.6 percent of the health dollar.

In 1968, the number of man-years devoted to research and development came to 5,390 in education—and 59,500 in health.

The number of researchers working on education is only 4,000 or 5,000—and 30,000 receive support from the National Institutes of Health.

Insufficient resources and personnel have not been the only hindrances to a vigorous educational research and development effort.

Education research has been concentrated heavily on a few university campuses—most of it has been conducted in some 200 such institutions. Very few results have emerged from other kinds of institutions.

Another hindrance has been the lack of an adequate mechanism to enable education consumers—teachers, students and a decent market—to make effective use of new approaches emerging from our research and development efforts.

Finally, educational research has lacked the leadership of a national agency with high visibility and institutional strength. The creation of a National Institute of Education would place leadership in just such an agency.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed Institute would have the authority to support a broad range of research and development activities at every level of education, preschool through postgraduate school, within formula institutions of learning and in nonformal learning situations.

The new agency would be placed within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as an entity separate from the Office of Education. The district organizational identity of the Institute would permit it both the visibility and flexibility it requires to be effective.

The Institute would be led by a Director of the same executive level as the Commissioner of Education, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. A National Advisory council on Education Research and Development, also presidentially appointed, would bring together outstanding persons from the public and private sectors to advise the Director on Institute policy. In addition, the Council will report annually to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the President, and to Congress.

The Director will have special authority to hire and compensate staff—up to one-third of the full-time, regular technical or professional employees—exempt from Civil Service classification law. This authority will permit the Institute to evolve the kind of special staffing patterns which other outstanding research and development agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health have found so successful, indeed, indispensable in attracting outstanding researchers. For example, this exemption will allow distinguished scholars and researchers whose permanent career commitments are to universities or school systems to serve at the Institute on a short-term basis.

Most of the research activities now

vested in the Office of Education will be transferred to the Institute. The National Institute of Education will assume responsibility for basic and applied research and development centers; regional education laboratories; researcher training and experimental schools. The Office of Education will retain responsibility for education policy research relating to Office of Education programs, statistical gathering, some demonstration projects, and a modest share of dissemination activities serving both agencies. The Institute, however, will have principal responsibility for dissemination of the results of research.

Although the National Institute of Education would conduct a small amount of in-house research, most of its work would be performed by grant, contract, or other arrangement, by other agencies, institutions, and individuals.

It is anticipated that an increase in funds for educational research and development will accompany the establishment of the National Institute of Education. Ninety million dollars is now spent under the Cooperative Research Act. During the first year of operation—fiscal year 1972—$3 million is budgeted for the planning of the Institute. In fiscal year 1973, the first year of the Institute's full operation, the agency's budget is expected to begin at $150 million, of which $118 million represents on-going programs and $32 million, new monies.

Mr. Chairman, the creation of a National Institute of Education will:

Provide a new beginning for research and development at every level of American education, preschool through post graduate school, in formal institutions of learning and outside them.

Provide a focal point for bringing together a consistuency of consumers, researchers and interested public for educational research.

Provide enough stability in research policy to make it possible to carry out plans and obtain results.

Provide visibility to the research effort.

Make possible a personnel policy such as exists at the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation in order to insure the highest quality of research.

Do for education what the National Institutes of Health are doing for health—increase available resources and provide a focal point for planning and program implementation.

Increase the likelihood of getting the results of research and development into education systems.

Mr. Chairman, title XIV of this bill is the result of considerable work by members of the Select Subcommittee on Education of your parties, but I should like to take this opportunity to acknowledge, too, the important work done by Dr. Roger E. Levien, of the Rand Corp., whose study, "National Institute of Education: Preliminary Plan for the Proposed Institution," has been most useful to Members working on the bill. Commissioned in 1970 to work on this legislation by then Commissioner of Education, the late James Allen, Dr. Levien has since that time performed a valuable service not only for the administration but also for the committee studying this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, although I do not always find myself in agreement with President Nixon, I believe the National Institute of Education he has proposed is a splendid initiative that can do much to improve the quality of education in our country by focusing the best research effects in the problems of real teachers and real students in real schools, colleges, and universities.

I hope the Committee of the Whole House will give the same bipartisan support to this measure which it received from the subcommittee and in the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like also to commend him for his leadership in the development of this legislation for the National Institute of Education. Inasmuch as section 1405 of the bill provides for an exemption for certain clinical and professional personnel from the civil service requirements, I would like to outline for the Members of the House examples in other agencies and departments where similar exceptions have been granted by statute.

The outline follows:

POSITIONS EXCEPTED FROM THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE BY STATUTE

ENTIRE EXECUTIVE CIVIL SERVICE

Employment under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (PL 79–600; 60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), which reads: "The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other Act, may procure the temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil-service * * * laws * * *."

Personnel outside the States of the Union and the District of Columbia necessary to carry out the functions under title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Act of June 30, 1949, as amended; 63 Stat. 398; 74 Stat. 418; 40 U.S.C. 514(c)) of the head of each executive agency responsible for the disposal of foreign excess property under that title.

Temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract, for the purpose of carrying out the food and feed conservation program provided for by section 8 of the Act of December 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 947; 50 App. U.S.C. 1918).

Personal service paid from the appropriation under the heading "Emergency Fund for the President," in the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Act, 1965 (title III of PL 88–392, August 1, 1964; 78 Stat. 374).

Temporary additional personnel employed by any Federal agency for activities under section 7 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1111; 42 U.S.C. 1855f), "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes."

Personnel employed by a local educational agency, or the head of a Federal department or agency, which has arranged with the Commissioner of Education, to provide for certain children in areas affected by Federal activities, education comparable to the maximum extent practicable to specified standards (section 6(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, 64 Stat. 1107, 20 U.S.C. 241, as amended by section 8 of Public Law 83–248, August 8, 1953, 67 Stat. 535, and further amended by 69 Stat. 433, and 74 Stat. 89).

Readers for blind Government employees. The head of each department is authorized to employ, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, a reading assistant, or assistants for any blind employee of the department, to serve without compensation from the department. (PL 87–614, August 29, 1962; 76 Stat. 408, 5 U.S.C. 43a).

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office. Personal services paid from the appropriation under the heading "Salaries and Expenses" in the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Act, 1965 (title III of Public Law 88–392, August 1, 1964; 78 Stat. 373).

Employees paid from the appropriation under the headings "Executive Mansion and Grounds" and "Special Projects" in the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Act, 1965 (title III of PL 88–392, August 1, 1964; 78 Stat. 373).

Central Intelligence Agency. All positions. (Section 8, formerly section 10 of the Act of June 20, 1949; 63 Stat. 212; renumbered 72 Stat. 337; 50 U.S.C. 403j).

Council of Economic Advisers. Specialists and other experts necessary to carry out its functions (60 Stat. 24; 15 U.S.C. 1023(b)).

National Aeronautics and Space Council. Seven employees who may be paid without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 at rates not above the highest rate of grade GS–18. (PL 85–568, July 29, 1958; 72 Stat. 428; as amended by PL 87–367; October 4, 1961; 75 Stat. 792; and further amended by PL 88–426, August 14, 1964; 78 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)).

National Council on the Arts. Temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants (PL 88–579, September 3, 1964; 78 Stat. 907; 20 U.S.C. 788(b)).

Office of Economic Opportunity. One or more advisory committees to advise the Director on his functions under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (PL 88–452, August 20, 1964; 78 Stat. 529; 42 U.S.C. 2942(c)).

National Advisory Council in the Office of Economic Opportunity to review the operations and activities of the Office. Composed of the Director and not more than fourteen additional members. (PL 88–452, August 20, 1964; 78 Stat. 531; 42 U.S.C. 2945.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Employment on a temporary basis and for a term not to exceed 6 months in any fiscal year of technically qualified persons, firms, or organizations to perform research, inspection, classification, technical, or other special services necessary to the administration of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1091; August 14, 1946; 7 U.S.C. 1627).

Advisory committee, size to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, to study data and make recommendations upon request of an applicant who has been refused registration of an economic poison under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended. (PL 88–305, May 12, 1964; 78 Stat. 191; 7 U.S.C. 135b(c)).

Commodity Credit Corporation. Expert positions (62 Stat. 1073, June 29, 1948, as amended by PL 81–85, June 7, 1949; 15 U.S.C. 714h).

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Personnel paid by the hour, day, or month when actually employed, and county crop insurance committeemen (Act of August 25, 1949; 63 Stat. 665; 7 U.S.C. 1507(a)).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Experts in marine insurance necessary under title XII, "War Risk Insurance of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936," as amended. (The excepting provision is in the Act of

September 7, 1950; 64 Stat. 776; 46 U.S.C. 1289(e).)

A U.S. Commissioner, New York World's Fair (PL 87–545, July 25, 1962; 76 Stat. 210).

Area Redevelopment Administration. To the extent that the Secretary of Commerce finds necessary, temporary (not in excess of 6 months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment to carry out the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act (PL 87–27, May 1, 1961; 75 Stat. 57; 42 U.S.C. 2511(10)).

National Bureau of Standards. Employees conducting observations on radio propagation phenomena in the Arctic or Antarctic regions (Act of September 2, 1958; 15 U.S.C. 278e; as amended by PL 88–527, August 31, 1964; 78 Stat. 723).

Weather Bureau. Employees to conduct meteorological investigations in the Arctic region (Act of June 2, 1948; 62 Stat. 286; 15 U.S.C. 327; as amended by PL 86–397, March 28, 1960; 74 Stat. 11).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

National Security Agency. All positions. (PL 86–36; 73 Stat. 63; 50 U.S.C. 402; as amended by PL 88–290; 78 Stat. 168.)

Department of the Army. Experts necessary to carry out the functions entrusted to the Secretary of the Army under the Bonneville Project Act, as amended (50 Stat. 736, August 20, 1937, as amended by the Act of October 23, 1945, 59 Stat. 547; 16 U.S.C. 832l).

Employment outside the continental United States, paid from the appropriation made under the heading "Ryukyu Islands, Army Administration" in title II of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965 (PL 88–634; 78 Stat. 1020) when necessary to carry out the purposes of the appropriation.

NOTE.—The Act of June 19, 1952 (PL 82–397; 5 U.S.C. 150k) provides: "That civilian employees, compensated from nonappropriated funds of the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, Army and Air Force Motion Picture Service, Navy Ship's Stores Ashore, Navy exchanges, Marine Corps exchanges, Coast Guard exchanges, and other instrumentalities of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces conducted for the comfort, pleasure, contentment, and mental and physical improvement of personnel of the Armed Forces, shall not be held and considered as employees of the United States for the purpose of any laws administered by the Civil Service Commission. . . ."

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Advisory Council on Public Welfare. Twelve members. To be appointed originally in 1964; thereafter Councils may be appointed from time to time. Each Council is to report its findings and recommendations not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which appointed, and each then will cease to exist. (PL 87–543, July 25, 1962; 76 Stat. 191; 42 U.S.C. 1314(b), (d), (e).)

Advisory Committees. Advisory committees the Secretary deems advisable to help carry out the functions under the General Welfare Amendments Act of 1962. (PL 87–543, July 25, 1962; 76 Stat. 91; 42 U.S.C. 1314(f).)

Office of Education. Twelve members of the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media; and as deemed advisable by the Commissioner, experts in the utilization and adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes. (Section 761 (a) and 762, PL 85–864, September 2, 1958; 72 Stat. 1596, 1597; 20 U.S.C. 561(a), 562.)

Advisory Committee on Graduate Education. Eight members. (PL 88–204, December 16, 1963; 77 Stat. 371; 20 U.S.C. 733(a).)

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education. Twelve members. (PL 88–210, December 18, 1963; 77 Stat. 410; 20 U.S.C. 35h(a).)

Advisory Council on Vocational Education. To be appointed in 1966 and submit report by January 1, 1968. Successor councils will be appointed thereafter at intervals of not more than five years. Twelve members. (PL 88–210, December 18, 1963; 77 Stat. 411; 20 U.S.C. 35j.)

Committee to review nurse training programs. To be appointed before July 1, 1967. (PL 88–581, September 4, 1964; 78 Stat. 917; 42 U.S.C. 298(b).)

National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions. Sixteen members. (PL 88–129, September 24, 1963; 77 Stat. 169, 42 U.S.C. 293e(a).)

National Advisory Council on Nurse Training. Sixteen members. (PL 88–581, September 4, 1964; 78 Stat. 917; 42 U.S.C. 298(a)(1).)

Public Health Service. Commissioned officers both of the Regular Corps and of the Reserve Corps; special consultants employed in accordance with the regulations to assist and advise in the operations of the Service; individual scientists designated to receive fellowships; the twelve appointive members of the National Advisory Health Council, the National Advisory Cancer Council, the National Advisory Mental Health Council, the National Advisory Heart Council, and the National Advisory Dental Research Council; the twelve appointive members of the national advisory councils established under section 431(a), or section 432, or section 443 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (sections 203, 208, 217, and 432 of the Public Health Service Act, 58 Stat. 683, July 1, 1944, as amended by the Acts of July 3, 1946, 60 Stat. 442, June 16, 1948, 62 Stat. 469, June 24, 1948, 62 Stat. 600, and August 15, 1950, 64 Stat. 447; 42 U.S.C. 204, 209, 218, 289b, 289f; further amended by PL 87–838, October 17, 1962; 76 Stat. 1072).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Employment of Navajo and Hopi Indians on project under the Act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 45; 25 U.S.C. 633), entitled "An Act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations and for other purposes."

Members of the advisory committee to exercise consultative functions on the administration of the Act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1057; 30 U.S.C. 16), providing for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region.

Members of the advisory committee authorized by section 4 of the Act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85; 30 U.S.C. 404), to exercise consultative functions on administration of the act. (The act provides for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the North Dakota lignite-consuming region to investigate the mining, preparation, and utilization of lignite; to develop uses and markets, to improve health and safety in mining; and to study comprehensively the possibilities for increased use of the lignite resources of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems and to make its natural and human resources of maximum usefulness in the reconversion period and time of peace.)

Bonneville Power Administration. An assistant administrator, a chief engineer, and a general counsel; physicians employed under agreement to make physical examinations of employees or prospective employees who are or may become laborers, mechanics, and workmen; experts necessary to carry out the functions of the Administrator under the Bonneville Project Act, as amended (50 Stat. 736, August 20, 1937, as amended by the Act of October 23, 1945, 59 Stat. 547; 16 U.S.C. 832l).

Bureau of Mines. Members of the advisory committee to exercise consultative functions on the administration of the Act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 179; 30 U.S.C. 458), which relates to inspections and investigations in coal mines to obtain information on health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases.

Personal services, by contract or otherwise, for work of a temporary, intermittent, or emergency character, to carry out the act providing for control of coal mine fires (Act of August 31, 1954, 68 Stat. 1010; 30 U.S.C. 556(a)).

Office of the Solicitor. Hearing examiners appointed for Indian probate work. (PL 88–356, July 7, 1964, 78 Stat. 284; 25 U.S.C. 372–1).

Office of Coal Research. Director (PL 86–559; 74 Stat. 336; 30 U.S.C. 664).

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation. All positions (Act of July 28, 1950, 64 Stat. 380; 5 U.S.C. 341c).

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security. Temporary employment to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (PL 78; 65 Stat. 119; 7 U.S.C. 1461–1468) and paid from the appropriation under the heading "Salaries and Expenses, Mexican Farm Labor Program" in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1965 (title I of PL 88–605, September 19, 1964; 78 Stat. 961).

Wage and Hour Division. Industry committee (Act of June 25, 1938, 52 Stat. 1062, as amended by PL 81–393, October 26, 1949; 63 Stat. 911; 29 U.S.C. 205).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Foreign Service (Foreign Service Act of August 13, 1946, 60 Stat. 999; 22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), specifically:

Ambassadors (22 U.S.C. 901);

Foreign Service officers (22 U.S.C. 906);

Foreign Service reserve officers (22 U.S.C. 922);

Foreign Service staff officers (22 U.S.C. 936);

Alien clerks employed abroad (22 U.S.C. 946);

Consular agents (22 U.S.C. 951).

NOTE.—Section 571(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, (22 U.S.C. 961) provides for assignment of Foreign Service officers to competitive duties in any agency. It reads: "Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than four years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this four-year period for not more than four additional years."

Employees of the faculty or staff of the Foreign Service Institute when their appointment without regard to the civil service laws and regulations is deemed necessary by the Secretary for the effective administration of title VII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1018, August 13, 1946; 22 U.S.C. 1044).

The Secretary of State, to carry out the functions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Interchange Act of 1961 outside the United States, including participation in binational or multinational foundations or commissions, may appoint or assign persons in or to the Foreign Service Reserve or Foreign Service Staff and alien clerks and employees, under the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) PL 87–256, September 21, 1961; 75 Stat. 530; 22 U.S.C. 2454(c).

Members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (PL 87–256, September 21, 1961; 75 Stat. 533; 22 U.S.C. 2456(c)).

Employees paid from funds appropriated under the heading "International Conferences and Contingencies" in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1965 (title I of

PL 88–527, August 31, 1964; 78 Stat. 713).

Staff of the member of the International Whaling Commission representing the United States of America (Whaling Convention Act of 1949, Act of August 9, 1950; 64 Stat. 425; 16 U.S.C. 916l).

Secretariat of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation (60 Stat. 713, July 30, 1946; 22 U.S.C. 287r).

Staffs of representatives of the United States at the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (60 Stat. 714, July 30, 1946; 22 U.S.C. 287r).

United States representative or representatives and alternates on the International Labor Organization, and their staff (62 Stat. 1151, June 30, 1948; 22 U.S.C. 272a).

Staff of the United States delegates and alternates to the Pan American Railway Congress (62 Stat. 1060, June 28, 1948; 22 U.S.C. 280k).

Staff of the United States Commissioners on the South Pacific Commission and their alternates (62 Stat. 15, January 28, 1948; 22 U.S.C. 280b).

Staff of the United States representative and alternate on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization (62 Stat. 441, June 14, 1948; 22 U.S.C. 290b).

Architectural and other expert technical services necessary to carry out the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926, as amended (PL 82–399, June 19, 1952; 66 Stat. 140; 22 U.S.C. 296).

International Joint Commission, United States and Canada. Clerks and other employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary of State and paid from the appropriation "American Sections, International Commissions," in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1965 (title I of PL 88–527, August 31, 1964; 78 Stat. 714).

Agency for International Development. Individuals employed outside the United States under authorization by the President (Sec. 625(d) of The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, 75 Stat. 450; 22 U.S.C. 2385(d)).

NOTE.—Other agencies may use this exception to appoint or assign employees to work on Agency for International Development overseas projects.

The Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Officers, employees, agents, and attorneys employed for service outside the continental limits of the United States (61 Stat. 781, August 5, 1947; 22 U.S.C. 281b).

United States Mission to the United Nations. All positions (59 Stat. 621, December 20, 1945, as amended by the Act of October 10, 1949, PL 81–341; 22 U.S.C. 287e).

United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico. Employment as consultants of retired personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States (American-Mexican Treaty Act of 1950, September 13, 1950; 64 Stat. 847; 22 U.S.C. 277d–3).

Board of examiners to hear claims under the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 (PL 88–300, April 29, 1964; 78 Stat. 185; 22 U.S.C. 277d–19).

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Five assistant general counsels. These are other than that Assistant General Counsel who serves as Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service and who is appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. (Sec. 7801 Internal Revenue Code of 1954; 68A Stat. 915; as amended by PL 86–368, September 22, 1959; 73 Stat. 642; 26 U.S.C. 7801.)

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The staff director, and other employees the Chairman of the Commission deems necessary (PL 86–380, September 24, 1959; 73 Stat. 705; 5 U.S.C. 2376).

American Battle Monuments Commission. Architects, firms of architects, and other technical and professional employees engaged by contract or otherwise (60 Stat. 317, June 26, 1946; 36 U.S.C. 138b).

Atomic Energy Commission. Officers and employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, to the extent that Commission deems employment without regard to the civil service laws necessary to discharge its responsibilities (68 Stat. 948, August 30, 1954; 42 U.S.C. 2201(d)).

Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Commission. Employees necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission (PL 87–759, October 9, 1962; 76 Stat. 755).

Civil Aeronautics Board. Secretary to the Board, plus a secretary and administrative assistant for each member; and for temporary service qualified consulting engineers or agencies, or other qualified persons necessary to exercise and perform the powers and duties of each. (PL 85–726, August 23, 1958; 72 Stat. 742; 49 U.S.C. 1322).

Civil War Centennial Commission. The executive director and employees necessary to carry out its functions (Section 6, PL 85–305, September 7, 1957; 71 Stat. 627; 36 U.S.C. 746(a)).

Detention Review Board. Preliminary hearing officers (section 104(d) of the Act of September 23, 1950; 64 Stat. 1022; 50 U.S.C. 814(d)).

District of Columbia Armory Board. Employees necessary to carry out the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 (PL 85–300, section 8, September 7, 1957; 71 Stat. 621; D. C. Code 2–1726).

District of Columbia Government. Employment of personal services by the Commissioners to provide additional municipal services from July 8, 1965 through July 17, 1965, for the 1965 Shriners Convention. (PL 88–386, July 28, 1964; 78 Stat. 337.)

Farm Credit Administration. The Secretary of the Farm Credit Board; the Governor of the Administration; elected members of the district Farm Credit Boards (sections 4(e), 5(a), and 14 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, PL 83–202, August 6, 1953; 67 Stat. 392, 396; 12 U.S.C. 636c, 636d, and 640b).

All directors, officers and employees of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, the banks for cooperatives, and the Central Bank for Cooperatives (PL 86–168, August 18, 1959, effective January 1, 1960; 73 Stat. 387; 12 U.S.C. 6401(b)).

Purchase of manuscripts, data and special reports by personal service (section 602 of the Act of September 21, 1944; 58 Stat. 741; 12 U.S.C. 833).

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review. A secretary of the Board and legal counsel the Board deems necessary (Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, May 7, 1941, section 205; as added by section 1 of the Act of July 16, 1952, PL 82–552, 66 Stat. 698; 30 U.S.C. 475(e)).

Federal Communications Commission. A legal assistant, an engineering assistant, and a secretary for each Commissioner, and, in addition, an administrative assistant for the Chairman of the Commission (section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934; as amended by the act entitled "Communications Act Amendments, 1952", PL 82–554, July 16, 1952; 66 Stat. 711; 47 U.S.C. 154(f)(2)).

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. Conciliators and mediators (61 Stat. 153, June 23, 1947; 29 U.S.C. 172(b)).

Federal Power Commission. Experts necessary to carry out the functions of the Federal Power Commission under the Bonneville Project Act, as amended (50 Stat. 736, August 20, 1947, as amended by the Act of October 23, 1945, 59 Stat. 547; 16 U.S.C. 832i).

General Services Administration. Temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, to carry out titles I, II, III, V, and VI of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 391, June 30, 1949, as amended by the Act of September 5, 1950, 64 Stat. 590; 5 U.S.C. 630h(b)).

Not to exceed five historical experts who are especially informed on the various phases of the territorial history of the United States and are specially qualified for the editorial work necessary in arranging for publication of the official papers relating to the territories from which States of the United States were formed (Act of October 31, 1951; 65 Stat. 714; 4 U.S.C. 142).

To carry out the duties imposed on the Administrator of General Services Administration by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, as amended: certified public accountants, qualified cost accountants, industrial engineers, appraisers, and other experts (section 4(d) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, 58 Stat. 651; 41 U.S.C. 104).

National Archives Trust Fund Board. All positions (55 Stat. 582, July 9, 1941; 44 U.S.C. 300hh).

Public Building Service. Employment, by contract or otherwise, of the services of established architectural or engineering corporations, firms or individuals, whenever the Administrator of General Services finds it necessary and to the extent he may require for any public building authorized to be constructed or altered under the Act of September 9, 1959. (Sec. 10 of the Public Buildings Act of September 9, 1959; PL 86–249; 73 Stat. 481; 40 U.S.C. 609.) (This authorization does not apply to the employment of corporations, firms, or individuals on a permanent basis.)

Housing and Home Finance Agency. Urban Renewal Commissioner (PL 81–171, July 15, 1949; 63 Stat. 417; 42 U.S.C. 1456).

Federal Housing Administration. Special Assistant to the Commissioner for Cooperative Housing (PL 84–345, August 11, 1955; 69 Stat. 636; 12 U.S.C. 1715e note); and special assistant to the Commissioner for Armed Services Housing and Mortgage Insurance (PL 84–345, August 11, 1955; 69 Stat. 651; 12 U.S.C. 1748f).

National Aeronautics and Space Administration. To the extent the Administrator deems necessary to the discharge of his responsibility, but not more than 425 scientific, engineering and administrative personnel (PL 85–568, July 29, 1958; 72 Stat. 429; as amended by PL 86–481, June 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 153; PL 87–367, October 4, 1961; 75 Stat. 791; and PL 88–426, August 14, 1964; 78 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)).

National Capital Planning Commission. The temporary or intermittent (not in excess of one year) services, by contract or otherwise, of city planners, architects, engineers, appraisers, and other experts or organizations thereof necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission (section 2(c) of the National Capital Planing Act of 1952; PL 82–592, July 19, 1952; 66 Stat. 783; 40 U.S.C. 71a(c)).

National Commission on Food Marketing. All employees. (PL 88–354, July 3, 1964; 78 Stat. 271; 7 U.S.C. 1621 note.)

National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Employees the Commission deems advisable to carry out its duties (PL 88–444, August 19, 1964; 78 Stat. 463; 29 U.S.C. 141 note).

National Science Foundation. Deputy Director; members of divisional committees and special commissions; technical and professional employees employed by the Director as necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under the Act of May 10, 1950 (PL 81–507, 64 Stat. 155; 42 U.S.C. 1873(a)).

Office of Emergency Planning. Temporary employment of additional employees required to meet the Civil Defense requirements of an attack or of an anticipated at-

tack. (Section 303 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; Act of January 12, 1951; 64 Stat. 1252; 50 App. U.S.C. 2293(f); Reorg. Plan No. 1 of 1958, as amended, 50 App. U.S.C. 2271 note.)

NOTE.—President may delegate this authority to other agencies for employees "required to meet the civil defense requirements of an attack or of an anticipated attack." The delegation may not be extended to other governmental operations.

Public Land Law Review Commission. Staff director and additional personnel necessary to carry out its functions. Federal employees employed by the Commission shall retain civil service status. (PL 88–606, September 19, 1964; 78 Stat. 985; 43 U.S.C. 1399.)

Railroad Retirement Board. One administrative assistant to each member of the Board (PL 84–383, August 12, 1955; 69 Stat. 716; 45 U.S.C. 228j(b)).

Employees to accept registration of unemployed railroad employees, and perform incidental services thereto, in areas where no employer facilities are located (PL 84–383, August 12, 1955; 69 Stat. 716; 45 U.S.C. 362 (l)).

Renegotiation Board. General Counsel of the Board (PL 86–89, July 13, 1959; 73 Stat. 211; 50 App. U.S.C. 1217(c)).

Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission. Employees necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission (PL 87–586, August 14, 1962; 76 Stat. 386).

Small Business Administration. Temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment (section 5(c) of the Small Business Act, PL 85–536, July 18, 1958; 72 Stat. 387; 15 U.S.C. 634(c)).

Smithsonian Institution. Head of the National Air Museum (60 Stat. 997, August 12, 1946; 20 U.S.C. 77).

The executive officers of the National Gallery of Art (Trust Indenture, dated December 1, 1942, and the Act of April 10, 1943; 20 U.S.C. 74a).

Employees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (sec. 5(b) and (c) of PL 85–874, 72 Stat. 1698, as amended by PL 88–260; 78 Stat. 4; PL 88–260, 78 Stat. 4).

Members of the National Portrait Gallery Commission and the Director of the National Portrait Gallery (PL 87–443, April 27, 1962; 76 Stat. 62; 20 U.S.C. 75c, 75f).

Temporary Alaska Claims Commission. (A temporary commission, if necessary, to settle disputes arising between the United States and the State of Alaska before January 1, 1965.) Employees the Claims Commission deems necessary to carry out its duties (PL 86–70, section 46, June 25, 1959; 73 Stat. 152).

Tennessee Valley Authority. All positions (48 Stat. 59, May 18, 1933, 16 U.S.C. 831b; 54 Stat. 1211, November 26, 1940; 5 U.S.C. 631a).

United States Information Agency. Employees outside the continental limits of the United States (Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, 5 U.S.C. 133z–15 note).

To carry out international information activities, including employment, on a temporary basis (not to exceed $20,000), aliens within the United States, and aliens abroad for service in the United States to translate or narrate colloquial speech in foreign languages (PL 88–527, August 31, 1964; 78 Stat. 733).

United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. An Executive Secretary and additional employees for the Commission to carry out its functions. (Any Federal employee detailed to the Commission retains his civil service status.) (PL 88–271, February 20, 1964; 78 Stat. 17; 48 U.S.C. 731 note).

Veterans Administration. Department of Medicine and Surgery. Physicians, dentists, and nurses. The following employment also is executed from the Classification Act as well as from civil service laws and rules: (a) Physicians, dentists, nurses, dieticians, social workers, librarians, and other professional, clerical, technical, and unskilled employees (including interns, residents, trainees and students in medical support programs) on a temporary full-time or part-time basis; (b) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other professional and technical personnel on a fee basis; and (c) residents and interns. (Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1245–1247; 38 U.S.C. 4106, 4111, 4114, as amended by PL 87–574, August 6, 1962; 76 Stat. 309.) The act as amended also limits the duration of part-time and temporary employment.

Employees necessary to transact the business of the veterans' canteen service at canteens, warehouses, and storage depots (Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1248; 38 U.S.C. 4202).

NOTE.—Under the Act of August 6, 1962 (PL 87–574; 38 U.S.C. 618), provides: "The Administrator . . . may utilize the services of patients and members in V.A. hospitals and domiciliaries for therapeutic and rehabilitative purposes, at nominal remuneration, and such patients and members shall not under these circumstances be held or considered as employees of the U.S. for any purposes."

Virgin Islands Corporation.* All positions (section 4 of the Act of June 30, 1949; 63 Stat. 352; as amended by the Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1759, 48 U.S.C. 1407c).

NSF

Total permanent staff	1,011
Professional and technical	336
Excepted	284

Excepted personnel are all professional and technical, as specified by their exception authority. There is no other limitation on excepted personnel. Excepted personnel are concentrated at the top levels of the agency.

NASA

Total permanent staff	27,013
Professional and technical	17,369
Excepted	366

Excepted personnel are in scientific, engineering, and administrative jobs, as the exception authority specifies. The authority also limits the number of excepted employees to 425; this has risen from 260 when the agency was established in 1958. NASA has requested larger increases in numbers authorized. All excepted personnel are in the supergrade range.

NASA also has an allotment, from the Civil Service Commission, of 305 "nonquota" GS–16 positions. Although these are regular civil service positions, they are exempted from the supergrade quota under a provision of the civil service laws which makes special provision for "professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicines" in the supergrade range.

AEC

Total permanent staff, 6,920; all employees are excepted.

The AEC has its own merit system, which operates without Civil Service Commission involvement. Some professional and technical personnel, generally in the supergrade range, are in ungraded positions and can be compensated on a more flexible basis than regular employees.

NIH

Total permanent staff	13,434
Professional and scientific	4,019
Sub-professional and technical	1,838
Commissioned Corps Officers	1,124

Commission Corp Officers are not under civil service but are like the uniformed services on military pay levels. NIH has fellowships which are excepted under Special Public Health Authority specifically for research. This is under Civil Service approval but they are not on GS pay scales but reecive stipends comparable to GS levels.

Number of excepted personnel in 1968

(Excepted by statute)

Agency for International Development	73
Peace Corps	409
Department of Treasury	5
Department of Justice	523
Department of Interior	3
Department of Agriculture	60
Department of Commerce	1
Commission on Obscenity and Pornography	4
District of Columbia Government	4
Farm Credit Administration	1
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	1
Federal Communications Commission	15
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	290
General Services Administration	5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	389
National Science Foundation	217
Public Land Law Review Commission	33
Railroad Retirement Board	3
Smithsonian Institution	1
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	12
Council of Economic Advisers	21
Executive Mansion and Grounds	3
National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development	7
Canal Zone Government	73
National Aeronautics and Space Council	3
Department of State:	
Foreign Service Institute	79
Office of U.S. Representative to U.N.	27
Advisory Commission on the Arts	10
International Commission on International Athletics	1

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, there are many aspects of this bill to which I would like to address my remarks. I think that first and foremost we should give credit to the chairwoman and the ranking member of the Higher Education Committee, and also to the ranking member of the full committee, for their leadership again in the area of higher education. During the next few days we will have a detailed discussion and some disagreement over the procedures through which we might bring about funding of the various programs. But I think it goes without saying that their leadership in this field is without question. I commend to the committee the work in terms of broadening the EOG. I think we need to broaden the equal opportunities grants, and at the same time provide for a broader work study program leading into the middle-income family. I believe the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) will do this.

Second, I also believe that the Sally Mae program which was originated by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) and made a part of this bill, will provide for strong additional funds for student loans.

The second area is in the area of institutional aid. Some of my colleagues have already pointed out the need for

*Under direction of the Secretary of the Interior, who serves as Chairman of the Board of Directors.

institutional aid, and I would just indicate to them I commend them for their initiative in this field. I am sure we can come up with some type of delivery system that will be effective.

I call the attention of the committee to an amendment that was put in title II on the extension and amendment of programs of college library assistance and library training and research. An amendment which I offered, and which was unanimously accepted by the committee, requires that in any fiscal year not less than 50 percent of the grants made for training in librarianship under section 223(a) be used for establishing and maintaining fellowships and traineeships. I think it should be made very clear that the purpose of this amendment is to assure that the Office of Education will in no way cut out graduate fellowships in the area of library training. There is a movement on apparently within the Office of Education to change from fellowships into traineeships. I think that that line should be clearly drawn, and it is the committee's intent to recognize the need for traineeships on the one hand, but more specifically for continuation of the graduate fellowships in this program, because as the society and the library science area becomes more complex, we do need, without question, not only traineeship programs at the lower level but also graduate fellowships. The legislative record should be very clear to the Office of Education that they should not proceed otherwise.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would point out the question raised by title XIX of this bill which in effect does not relate in any way to the Higher Education Act of 1971, the Youth Camp Safety Act.

Mr. Chairman, I am vitally concerned with the safety of our young people who attend camps each year in this country, and am always interested in efforts to protect them. To me, the question is not whether to adopt youth camp safety standards, but rather how to proceed in an orderly manner in developing the best and most meaningful standards. In furtherance of my desire to protect young campers, I introduced H.R. 11227, which provides for initial protective standards and the orderly development of responsive regulations based upon actual statistics.

The legislation I have introduced, which is cosponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) is meant to be a viable alternative to the youth camp safety provisions contained in title XIX of the Higher Education Bill, H.R. 7248, that we are now considering. As stated in separate views filed with the committee report on H.R. 7248, I think the title XIX provisions far exceed any legislative action warranted by the limited evidence placed in the record during hearings, and are so sweeping in scope and replete with Federal powers as to endanger the continued existence of many youth camps.

All of the witnesses appearing in youth camp safety hearings earlier this year before the Select Subcommittee on Labor favored some type of initial action to protect young campers from the obvious hazards involved in camps, but all also acknowledged the extremely thin statistical data available. The president of the National Safety Council, while urging strong Federal standards and sanctions, stated that available data on youth camps is "fragmentary, limited and entirely too inconclusive to support reliable, long-range accident prevention program planning." I feel that this type of testimony convincingly demonstrates the need for a Federal approach which allows for initial standards, subsequent refinement of the standards based on compilation of statistical data, and a strengthening of enforcement powers as the need therefore is shown by the supporting statistics.

This kind of approach is responsive to not only the immediate need for initial protection, but also allows continued evaluation and development of meaningful standards. As to enforcement, I do not consider it prudent to grant extensive farreaching powers without an adequate showing of a need therefor. Once granted through legislation, power is seldom, if ever, revoked. In my opinion, there has been no need demonstrated for the stringent enforcement powers proposed in title XIX, and a grant of such broad powers without such showing is an imprudent discharge of congressional responsibility.

Under the bill I have introduced, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be primarily responsible for developing and promulgating minimum Federal youth camp safety standards, and through a Director of Youth Camp Safety responsible for implementing the minimum standards within the several States. Any State so desiring may adopt its own standards and youth camp safety program at any time—which must be at least as effective as the Federal standards—and qualify for a grant of up to 75 percent of the cost of its program or $75,000, whichever is less.

My bill also requires each camp to file annual reports on accidents, illness, and death. This provision is important, in that it creates the mechanism for compiling and developing precise statistical data on a nationwide basis as to the scope of the problem, and indicates the areas in which safety standards are necessary. In addition, my bill runs for only fiscal 1972 and 2 succeeding years, requiring Congress to reconsider and evaluate the program in light of actual experience and specific data. This would allow strengthening of enforcement powers, if needed, and any other responsive adjustments deemed necessary.

I would like to also note that my proposed substitute contains a realistic authorization level. H.R. 11227 is designed to meet a specific need, and I feel it meets that need within the reasonable limits of fiscal responsibility, and without provisions requiring inordinate funding levels in order to be effective or to achieve their designed purpose.

My bill calls for a total annual authorization of $4.5 million. Grants to States operating their own youth camp safety programs may not exceed $75,000 each, or an aggregate of $3.75 million in any fiscal year. Estimates from HEW indicate that it will require $75,000 per State for the Federal Government to operate the program, with the annual total running $3.9 million with the inclusion of Federal administrative costs and exclusive of costs for regulating travel camps and Federal recreational camps. Including the costs pertaining to travel camps and of such Federal recreational camps raises the funding requirements to the $4.5 million level called for in H.R. 11227.

I urge all of my colleagues to study the provisions of my bill, and to consider it as an alternative to the provisions of title XIX of the higher education bill now before us. I feel that the youth camp safety version proposed by the committee creates but another Federal monster top-heavy with penalties and inspection requirements. Such an approach is legislative overkill, and places the Federal Government squarely in the youth camp police business. I believe that the efforts of responsible government are best expended in other areas of critical need, and that adequate safety standards can be developed to protect our young campers without creating a Federal police force to patrol youth camps.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from Illinois both have explained very well the problems of institutional aid as contained in title VIII of this legislation. I will not attempt to repeat all the arguments that have been made and the questions that have been legitimately raised about this issue.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes during this debate on the Higher Education Act to discuss the National Institute of Education, title XIV of the bill before us today. In many ways, the establishment of the Institute holds as great a potential for the future of education as the rest of the bill put together.

That much is wrong with education in America today is no secret. Too many young children are not learning to read, the basic tool essential to the rest of the educational process as it is generally structured today. Many schools are plagued with violence within their walls. People leaving the educational system, with or without diplomas, are all too often not equipped to fill any but the most menial of jobs.

Honest attempts have been made by well-intentioned educators to reverse this state of affairs. New buildings have been erected, old ones refurbished. But some very excellent schools operate in dismal facilities while the accomplishments of some children in the most modern of school buildings were almost nil. Teacher salaries were raised so that a cadre of exceptionally qualified personnel could be attracted to the education profession. But there was the frustrating realization that a 17-year-old Amish high school girl could succeed better in teach-

ing the three R's to her charges without the benefit of 20th-century technology than could a great many inner city teachers. So other things were tried. Class sizes were made smaller. Additional manpower was brought in, in the form of classroom aides. Parents were mobilized, paid, and trained as paraprofessionals. Breakfast and lunch programs were instituted. Disadvantaged children were given a headstart. Community control, wresting some or all of the decision-making authority away from large central city bureaucracies, was implemented in some cities. Consolidation of farflung school districts was implemented in rural areas. Racial integration is being attempted. Educational technology has been brought into the classroom. Performance contracts have been let. Schools have been encouraged to innovate. Education has been told to become accountable. We are considering the implementation of a voucher system. The fads continue to come and go, often spurred by highly touted new Federal programs. They have made frustratingly little difference in the effectiveness of the educational system in preparing people for life outside the school. The Coleman report was a notable illustration of this phenomenon.

President Nixon, in his message on educational reform made this point when he said:

> We must stop congratulating ourselves for spending nearly as much money on education as does the rest of the world . . . when we are not getting as much as we should out of dollars we spend.

We have learned, at painful expense, that changing the inputs of the educational system seldom guarantees much impact on the outputs.

After trying all these initially promising schemes for reforming education, Johnny still cannot read. Why? Stephen Bailey of the Syracuse University Research Corp., appearing before our committee asked:

> Is it because of his mother's diet during the prenatal period; is it because of inadequate parental play in the early months of life; is it because of "cultural deprivations" in the home, whatever that slippery term means; is it because of the self-fulfilling prophecies of teachers who believed that Johnny was stupid; is it because of poor instruction; is it because of a low self-image reinforced by failure in terms of middle class grading norms; is it because of some ineffable combination of all these factors?

It would seem that wisdom dictates that we restrain ourselves from launching any more bold new initiatives aimed at solving the educational crisis until we learn more about why Johnny cannot read and why Jimmy can.

The establishment of the National Institute of Education had been proposed as a means of launching an intensive, focused inquiry into the basic problems of education. This is not a new idea. The National Academy of Sciences first proposed the agency in 1958. The President's Science Advisory Committee repeated the suggestion in 1964. The Commission on Instructional Technology echoed this suggestion.

David Krathwohl, former president of the American Educational Research Association made a similar suggestion. We should also acknowledge our indebtedness to Dr. Roger E. Levien, Director of the excellent National Institute of Education Planning Study under the sponsorship of the Office of Education. Dr. Levien has made a major contribution to this bill. The size of education in American life makes it imperative that the Institute be established as soon as possible. Every person, to a great or small extent, is touched by education. It accounts for $70 billion annually. Some 3 million personnel provide educational services to 60 million students.

Yet, compared with other areas of national concern and various private industries, education devotes only a pittance to research and development—the key to self-regeneration of the enterprise. The figures have been repeated to the point of triteness, but I can think of no better way to illustrate the discrepancy between research and development in education and other fields.

We spend 5 percent of our health budget on research and development, 10 percent of our defense budget—and about 0.3 percent of the education budget. Since 1950, the United States has invested $14 billion in health research, $7 billion in agricultural research—and less than $1 billion in educational research and development. The electrical equipment industry spends $4.2 billion annually on research and development; the aircraft industry, $5.6 billion. About 10,000 researchers work on education, most of them part time; the number of researchers working on health problems is three to five times that figure. In 1968, the number of man-years devoted to research and development in education was 5,390; in health, 59,500. Yet, few men will deny that the mission of educational research and development is certainly as challenging and complex as research and development in health, agriculture or private industry.

Before we continue to make ever-increasing investments in the existing education system and the efforts to reform it that have not succeeded, we should make an all-out attempt to find out, quite simply, what works.

This business of finding out what works is probably as complicated as the learning process itself. A number of things must be cranked in, according to the witnesses that appeared before the Select Subcommittee on Education. In addition to adequate financial resources and top caliber manpower, there must be a guaranteed continuity—some problems may take a decade to solve. NIH has served as a visible, separate unit pointing the way toward important advances in medical science. Educational research, in contrast, has been obscured within a large Federal bureaucracy, subject to many of the operational problems that congenitally plague any bureaucracy. Educational research and development lack prestige and fail to attract the talented scientists and researchers they need. Although psychologists have dominated educational research in the past, a wide range of disciplines relevant to the learning process must be brought into close cooperation—physiology, chemistry, anthropology, computer sciences, statistics, and many others. Research, development and dissemination must be tied together in a balanced manner so as to be mutually supportive. The focus of our education R. & D. to date has been diffuse; most efforts have been spread over too many small projects. The virtual monopoly of a few university campuses on educational R. & D. must be challenged.

The educational community cannot accomplish these changes itself. Ninety percent of educational R. & D. funds are provided by the Federal Government. It is up to the Federal Government to take the lead in strengthening its support and leadership.

The National Institute of Education, which we will vote on this week, has been proposed as the vehicle to carry these long-needed changes. The Select Subcommittee on Education has heard expert testimony on this proposal. Roger Levien of the Rand Corp. examined the concept and operation of the proposed Institute in detail, and the Office of Education has put considerable energy into further developing the details of implementation. This is a carefully conceived, well-thought-out proposal.

Pages 60 to 70 of Committee Report No. 92–554 are devoted to a detailed explanation of the major facets of the Institute's operation, so I will only touch on the key points.

FUNDING

The hitherto niggardly sums devoted by the Federal Government to educational R. & D. will be gradually increased until they total over a quarter of a billion dollars annually. For fiscal year 1973, an increase of some $30 billion over the $118 billion currently devoted to these purposes in existing programs. The increments each year will amount to about 20 percent, a rate of growth which experience has shown can be accommodated.

FOCAL POINT

The Institute would serve to pluck educational R. & D. out of the nether regions of Washington bureaucracy and provide the focal point needed to develop both the prestige and the leadership the field demands. The National Center for Educational Research and Development, now part of the Office of Education, would be transferred to the Institute. The Institute will be responsible for basic and applied research and development activities, including research and development centers, regional educational laboratories; researcher training and experimental schools.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The Institute will be headed by a Director who will be responsible to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and not to or through any other officer of the Department.

I feel that this separation of the Institute from the Office of Education is an important feature of the proposal which should not be compromised. Only through a separate structure entirely outside the Office of Education can the Institute build the prestige and leadership crucial

to the success of the effort and escape the burden of the reputation associated with research and development previously conducted by the Office of Education.

But this is not to say that all relationship with the Office of Education need be cut off on either the formal or informal level. Research under the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped will remain within the Office of Education framework as will policy research centers, studies regularly conducted for OE program planning purposes and statistical research.

OBJECTIVES

The major substantive educational problems which the Institute will undertake will be determined by the Director in consultation with the Advisory Council and his staff. It is important that resources be concentrated on a few carefully chosen problems of fundamental significance rather than spreading them too thin. President Nixon suggested, in his message on education reform, that compensatory education, the right to read, television and learning, and experimental schools are the kinds of problems NIE should attend to. In the Comprehensive Child Development Act introduced by many Members of this House, attention was focused on the problems of early childhood development, and a National Institute for Child Development was proposed. It was understood, however, that if NIE were created, the activities surrounding early childhood research could be folded into that organization. I hope we will soon see that development taking place.

DISSEMINATION

One of the most critical problems in bringing about educational improvement is the great difficulty with which the findings of research and development efforts find their way into the classroom. The gap between the discovery of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a particular practice and the implementation of change in the classroom has often been literally generations—100 years or more. To make the situation even more difficult, we have learned that we cannot assume a straight line progression from research to development of findings into validated innovations and thence to systematic dissemination of developments into practice where they will be evaluated and the results then fed back to the researchers for further refinements of their findings. If it were this simple, our task would be greatly simplified. Unfortunately, this is the industrial model and is not applicable in most instances to the much more complicated process of dissemination in education. As the report says:

> The process is a dynamic one in which there are constant continuing interchanges back and forth between and among basic researchers, those who demonstrate the results and the consumers who apply the results in teaching and learning situations.

Because dissemination is such an integral part of the overall effort to improve education, it cannot be artificially separated from the rest of the R. & D. work. To do so would threaten the potential success of the Institute's mission.

One of the most common criticisms of educational research and development has been its failure to affect educational practice. One of the reasons for this failure has been its inability to bring results to consumers, teachers, and students in usable form. Only half of 1 percent of the teachers who read about an innovation adopt or try out any aspect of it in their classrooms. The National Institute for Education will increase the likelihood of getting the results of research and development into our education systems. The dissemination of the results of research and development in education will be one of its principal responsibilities.

We search for breakthroughs, for means by which we can improve the skills of all our teachers. For that reason I would like to outline two projects I have long been interested in, and which I believe are examples of the kinds of innovative suggestions NIE should promote.

One is the teaching process, a proposal for the use of network television to reach the Nation's teachers and achieve immediate change in American education. It has been proposed by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Laboratory for Research in Relevant Education. The second, proposed by Teachers Guides to Television, is a proposal to enable the Nation's teachers to utilize the millions of dollars worth of audiovisual resources now available on the national networks, through the use of Teachers Guides to Television.

President Nixon said in his March 3, 1970, message pointing out the need for the National Institute of Education:

> Local schools need an objective national body to evaluate new departures in teaching and a means of disseminating information about projects that show promise.

The teaching process could disseminate that information instantly—reaching millions all across the Nation—and in a few brief minutes wipe out the so-called cultural lag of 50 years between the inception of a new idea and its adoption across the country, that has plagued our Nation's schools.

The purpose of the teaching process is to secure an immediate upgrading in the quality of American education across the entire Nation—to change our Nation's schools, literally, overnight.

The proposed tool is network television, whose power and impact is well tested and can be matched by no other resource at the Nation's command. Its force and its vitality will be used in a massive program for the reeducation of the Nation's teachers, unprecedented in the history of the world.

Waiting for us in network television is a stimulating force of vigor and predominance, with which to reach into every teacher's home, indeed, into every American home—parents, paraprofessionals, school board members, voters, and with which to strengthen and elevate quickly standards of teaching as well as public understanding of education.

At a time when the cry for community control is carried across the land, school budgets are voted down and then voted down again, and "Crisis in the Classroom" has become a commonplace, television is a tool that can make it possible for our American Nation to reinvent its system of education.

Agriculture was reinvented in this fashion at the turn of the century by the introduction of the county agent. The "good dirt farmers" who had once laughed at the idea, today boast of the difference between what was once "a possible 30" and is now a "sure 150" bushels of corn. The "little black box" now in every home in the Nation can be the "county agent" of our educational system.

It can make the difference between "a possible 30 and a sure 150" students per teacher staying in and succeeding in school.

The children we grow are as important to us as a nation as our unexcelled system of agriculture is.

I believe the Teaching Process, as it has been proposed, can provide the "demonstration plots" that can enable our schools to reach a level of excellence that will be superior to any in the world—if we do not wait until it is too late.

The second innovation mentioned is Teachers Guides to Television.

Speaking of television and learning in his message of March 3, 1970, President Nixon said:

> Most education takes place outside the school. Although we often mistakenly equate "schooling" with "learning" we should begin to pay far greater attention to what youngsters learn during the more than three-quarters of their time they spend elsewhere.
>
> In the last twenty years, there has been a revolution in the way most boys and girls—and their parents—occupy themselves. The average high school student, for example, by the time he graduates, has spent 11,000 hours in school—and 15,000 hours watching television.
>
> Our goal must be to increase the use of the television medium and other technological advances to stimulate the desire to learn and to help teach.
>
> The technology is here, but we have not yet learned how to employ it to our full advantage. How can local school systems extend and support their curricula working with local television stations?

One of the answers to the President's question is through the use of Teachers Guides to Television.

A vast treasury of educational materials is available in almost every American home—homes which sometimes have nothing else—no plumbing, no furnishing, no books or newspapers—but all have a television set.

Despite their easy availability, millions of dollars worth of program materials, covering events in the entire world, and through all the ages of man, from the frontiers of scientific research to the excitement of Elizabethan drama, are going unused; and this at a time when our Nation cries for improvement in the quality of our education, and our youngsters beg for "relevance" in their studies.

Today's educators are discovering that education need not and should not be confined within the classroom's limiting

walls. The concept of "schools without walls" perhaps best illustrates their new understanding of the world as a learning environment. Television makes the world available as a learning experience in every home, day in and day out.

Television provides every student in the poorest hovel or the remotest rural village with a window on the world, an unlimited learning environment. This can be the best-educated generation in the history of man. But without a Teachers Guide, teachers are unable to take advantage of this king's ransom at every child's fingertips, the programs on the public airwaves.

Teachers Guides to Television provide the needed advance information and the lesson plans that enable teachers to utilize the vast and unsurpassed resources of network television as the motivation for classroom lessons. The television program provides the motivation for the teacher's lesson, the guide is a guide to the curriculum, a way of making use of the powerful excitement television can engender.

Teachers have not the time, the energy nor the resources to do the many hours or days of research necessary to discover sufficiently in advance whether a program is of outstanding educational value, and to build an exciting lesson—or weeks' worth of exciting lessons—around the excitement of the television presentation. But Teachers Guides to Television can. The lessons may range far and wide. A television presentation of Jane Eyre, for example, might lead to an exploration of social conditions in Victorian England, to a study of the novel as an art form, or to a survey of the role of women in Western civilization. A lesson about our explorations in Space can provide information not to be found in any textbook. The pupils' excitement and enthusiasm for their lesson will have been engendered by the tremendous excitement of television—an excitement with which the cold walls and hard desks of their schoolroom cannot compete.

No school budget could possibly provide this vast selection of exciting learning experiences. Yet without the teachers guide the most powerful communications tool ever invented by man with an impact unprecedented in all of human history often lies unused, untouched by the Nation's teachers.

Almost every parent in America has invested in a piece of educational equipment that is rarely being used for the education of his child—a television set. The effect of its use on the quality of education available in America's schools would be incalculable.

President Nixon has said:

> Mankind has witnessed a few great ages when understanding of a social or scientific process has expanded and changed so quickly as to revolutionize the process itself. The time has come for such an era in Education.

Innovating projects such as these can bring that era about—today.

For the purpose of legislative history provisions should be established to facilitate full dissemination of the results of research and development. Dissemination and research laboratories have found title 44, U.S. Civil Code—Printing and binding regulations—to seriously restrict their ability to design, create and test research materials effectively. Such restrictions as color and format restrictions have resulted in Congress recognizing the problem and granting USAID and NSF exemptions from title 44 of the U.S. Civil Code.

To expedite the dissemination of educational research the NIE should have the ability to publish or arrange for the publication of research and technical information so as to further the dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the National interest without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section II of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 United States Code, section III). The NIE should also have the capability to reinvest in further research and development such revenues generated through the sale of materials developed under NIE sponsorship.

PERSONNEL

If the Institute succeeds in focusing attention and prestige on educational R. & D., it will be able to draw upon the best of the world's talent. Individuals with high caliber scientific, technical and administrative skills are difficult to categorize according to conventional civil service patterns and in many instances would not be available for employment for the kinds of time periods typically imposed by the Civil Service. Therefore, the bill provides that up to one-third of the fulltime, regular technical or professional employees can be exempted from Civil Service Classification Law.

In closing, I would point out that educational R. & D. will not make policy decision for American education—who will pay for the schools and how they will be financed, what kinds of goals we set for those completing different phases of the educational process, how we handle larger social problems that closely affect education such as racial differences, drug abuse, the youth culture. What we can hope for is an enlightened understanding of how to achieve those policy decisions that we make and what the impact of those decisions is likely to be. Now, all too often, those important decisions are made in total oblivion. The National Institute of Education offers us the hope of fuller understanding.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the contribution of the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, after all the testimony in the period of time before the subcommittee and the full committee during which this bill has been considered, I think it is fair to say that there is a problem in terms of the financial standing of institutions of higher education, but the financial stresses of the late 1960's were not felt uniformly on each and every campus across the country. Though few institutions of higher education were immune from the economic downturn, the wide ranging factors of differing size, source of funds, endowment, fiscal management, geographic location, dependence on Federal research moneys, and so forth, have produced varying degrees of financial distress from campus to campus. There is little doubt that even with the prospect of general Federal assistance, an unacceptable number of colleges and universities will face financial collapse in the immediate future. Simply put, some institutions are financially in alot worse shape than others.

In a letter to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) Alfred B. Fitt, the special adviser at Yale University, New Haven, Conn., perceptively laid out this problem as follows:

> I write in connection with the pending higher education authorization legislation, and specifically about two of its aspects, one of which affects all colleges and universities and the other a much lesser number.
>
> The first has to do with federal financial aid to institutions. The Senate bill channels that aid through students in the form of a "cost-of-instruction allowance" for each federally aided student enrolled, while the House version for the most part bases institutional aid on the total number enrolled.
>
> While the Senate version is clearly superior, both involve an assumption which I think plainly incorrect, namely, that there is a federal responsibility to help preserve all colleges and universities, no matter their actual financial condition or how wretched their programs, how limited their appeal to students or how wastefully they are managed.
>
> Once such a responsibility is assumed, I do not see how it can be gotten rid of. It would be far better if the Congress enacted no institutional aid proposal at this session and took another year to think through how best the federal government can bring rationality and fairness and adequate resources to the financing of higher education. The delay can do no harm, since there is no reasonable prospect that general institutional aid, even if authorized, will be funded this fiscal year.

I think the statement of Mr. Fitt is an important ingredient in the consideration by this Congress of the whole concept of the financial stress faced by the institutions of higher education, but those crises in higher education do not fall uniformly upon the institutions. I think this House ought to take into consideration the availability of alternate sources of financing for those institutions that are in serious financial trouble.

That is specifically related to title XVIII of the committee-reported bill. Let me call attention of the committee to some of the evidence which has been compiled about why this particular approach ought to be considered and favorably enacted by the committee in its consideration of this bill.

For example, Ben Lawrence, Director of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, in a letter in June wrote:

> Ideally . . . I would like (1) legislation to be devised that would take emergency short term steps to forestall, to the extent possible, any worsening of the fiscal situation in higher education and (2) concurrent with that legislation immediate initiation of steps to study intensely the problem of providing general assistance to higher education as I have previously described in my testimony before the subcommittee.

In addition, the District of Columbia Commission on Academic Facilities submitted a paper to the subcomittee of the Committee on Education and Labor and in that said the following:

We believe that emergency assistance may indeed be imperative to save a significant number of private colleges and universities. The issues involved in alternative approaches to direct institutional assistance appear quite complex at this time. Even if the current session of the Congress is able to authorize and fund a program of direct institutional asssistance, the provisions of Section 123—

Which is in the bill of the other body and is similar to title XVIII of this bill—

Would still be needed to assist some institutions in meeting their responsibilities to the Nation. If the current session of the Congress should fail to enact direct institutional assistance, then emergency assistance as provided in section 123 becomes a critical imperative.

There was in addition, Mr. Chairman, an extraordinarily good statement that was submitted by a number of individuals in higher education which I believe also deserves attention and consideration by the Members of the committee. This is a memorandum submitted on June 21 to the Members of the House Special Subcommittee on Education, and reads as follows:

We would like to express our concern about the general aid to higher education institutions' provisions of the committee in markup on the higher education bill.

We fully recognize the emergency condition facing many institutions at the present time. However, we believe that none of the currently proposed formulas for general aid sufficiently take into account or appropriately respond to need differential in terms of performance or potential among institutions.

We believe that real cases of emergency should be met by special discretionary funds with appropriate legislative guidelines for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and also that institutions should be helped with cost of instruction grants for particularly needy students. However, we believe that a more thorough investigation of an appropriate means or formula for funding should be developed before aid on more than an emergency basis is made available.

Dr. Ted Gilbert, Chairman, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association and Executive Director, Council on Public Higher Education, Kentucky;

Dr. Lyman Glenny, Associate Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley;

Dr. Ben Lawrence, Director, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education;

Dr. Robert Mautz, Chancellor, State System of Higher Education, Florida;

Dr. Richard M. Millard, Director, Higher Education Services, Education Commission of the States, Denver; and Dr. Ralph Dungan, Chancellor of Higher Education, State of New Jersey.

It is for these reasons I believe we must consider the concept of providing some form of real emergency assistance on a limited basis, to provide substantial assistance to those institutions facing a significant crisis.

Thus, an across-the-board formula approach to the varying fiscal plights of the colleges and universities will not be sufficient for those institutions in greatest need. Just as the general economic adversities affected them in differing degrees, general aid will be of differing benefit to them. The provisions of title XVIII, therefore, are intended to complement the institutional aid of title VIII, targeting emergency relief to those institutions in the most dire of circumstances, those whose very existence is threatened.

It is clear that some of the most financially threatened institutions are also the ones that contribute greatly to the diversity and equality of opportunity in higher education: black institutions and the small, private liberal arts colleges. The committee report notes the particular effect on the small colleges, and the plight of the predominantly Negro colleges was underlined by the following statement submitted by Herman R. Branson, president of Lincoln University, and president of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education:

We find it difficult to argue, however, that all colleges and universities have the same financial problems. At least they are not of the same intensity or urgency. We respectfully urge, therefore, that in addition to the general support formula of H.R. 7248, that additional aid be granted those schools enrolling large numbers of students from low income families—

The title makes provisions for the necessary human decisionmaking in the determination of severe financial distress. It sets forth certain thresholds which must be crossed before any institution can even apply for the emergency assistance. This will "cull out" great numbers of institutions that are not in severe trouble and allow the decisionmaking to concentrate on a smaller number of institutions.

The Secretary of HEW would be assisted in this task by a Council on Higher Education Relief Assistance. The Council would consist of nine members to be appointed by the Secretary, with particular expertise in the problems of the fiscal and academic management of higher education. They would be able to recommend more specific and detailed eligibility criteria for the analysis and approval of applications for financial assistance.

The committee was clearly handicapped in its consideration of this legislation by the lack of sound data on the financing of higher education. One of the areas that remains unclear is the nature of "deficits" in public universities. The bill provides for the Secretary to undertake an immediate and thorough study of the alternative ways of supporting higher education. The results of the study would be available to the Congress by November 1, 1972, 8 months before the termination of the authority of this title. We would thus be in a much better position to evaluate the long-term needs for institutional support.

The temporary and emergency nature of this title is underlined by the 2-year limitation of its authority, and by the fact that it does not amend the Higher Education Act. It should also be emphasized that the level of funding, $150 million for each of fiscal years 1972 and 1973, is such that its purpose would clearly be limited to relieving the short-term crisis rather than providing for the long-range solution to the financial problems facing institutions of higher education. An institution can receive only one grant under this title, and it must demonstrate its capability to regain its financial self-reliance.

A close parallel can be drawn to the provisions of the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. Whereas all units of general local government were eligible to apply for financial assistance to hire the unemployed in transitional public service jobs, the law provides for a special employment assistance program targeted specifically at areas of greatest need. The recognition was clearly made that the general problem of unemployment was particularly acute in certain areas and thus could be best attacked by a supplemental and targeted program.

In my judgment, no State formula, categorical program, student aid program or general aid provision will rescue those institutions who—often through no real fault of their own—are in serious financial distress. Many can make a viable contribution to our higher education system, and only need a specific grant of a specific size to get over a temporary financial hump.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that there is an important distinction between relief assistance and recovery assistance, something akin to the difference between giving someone an aspirin or a real curative. Recovery assistance implies not only a more careful selection of eligibles, but considerable attention to specific reforms, followup monitoring, provisions of technical and managerial assistance, and so on—an expectation, in short, that the grant itself will and should lead to recovery. This might be objective of the Foundation or another Office of Education program, but was not the proper objective of title 18 which is directed at buying additional time until other factors—for example, self help, or a new Federal program in a few years—come into play.

At the same time, even in a relief program, there is a need to decide whether everyone in distress should receive relief or just those who might have a chance of making it. Since our aspirins are expensive, and I don't believe that the Federal Government has a legitimate interest in bailing out every institution per se, I have established recovery capability as a condition for receiving a grant under this title.

In addition there are, I believe, some questions which must be asked about dire conditions under which an institution should receive aid:

First, what steps has the institution taken to control its budget? What steps has it taken to economize, to consolidate or clear programs, better utilize facilities, reduce costs of programs, apply cost-benefit analysis?

Second, what steps has it taken toward planning its future on a sound basis and what movement toward that plan?

Has it identified the institution's role, assets, potential income, et cetera?

Third, what efforts have been made to share resources with other institutions or consortia, or to use other available facilities—stadium, theaters, et cetera?

Fourth, have they analyzed the use of resources to see how much is actually spent on instruction, vis-a-vis administration or other activities and then weighed the values of these other activities?

Fifth, is there a commitment of the institution as a whole to accomplish these charges or just of a few people in the administration?

To what extent has information been shared with the various whole components of the campus?

Is there evidence from the departments of action?

What evidence is there that the governing board has exercised effective control?

Sixth, has the institution adequate financial data and accounting systems?

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) referred to the testimony of Dr. Alice Ridlin. Her statement is excellent and I want at this point to include a part of her statement as it relates to the need for some type of emergency assistance:

It is certainly not obvious that a program of general support for higher education is the appropriate answer to all or even most of these varied financial problems.

Where the major problem is adjustments of the institution to a cut in federal research or some other temporary reversal of fortunes (perhaps associated with recession and inflation or just poor planning), some more specific emergency assistance should be considered. Emergency loan programs for institutions in trouble, a moratorium on debts to the federal government or some kind of transitional assistance to ease the phasing out of federal programs would be far more desirable than the enactment of a general support program to meet these temporary crises. The general aid funds would quickly become expected and permanent parts of all institutional budgets. There is no reason to think that future temporary crises would be lessened by the existence of this type of aid

Where the problem is the inability of private institutions to compete for students with cheaper public institutions, general aid of the type suggested in H.R. 7248 will not alleviate the problem. Aid will go equally to public and private institutions and any differentials between them will tend to be maintained. A more adequate student aid program which would enable public institutions to increase their tuition without fear of closing opportunities to low-income students would do far more to improve the competitive position of private institutions vis-a-vis public competitors. Where the problem is simply lack of demand for the product or student dissatisfaction with the type of institution, federal aid will probably not help, or not for long. There is nothing in the proposed program to induce changes in the way institutions are run or greater responsiveness to student desires.

Where the problem is attributable to increases in enrollment, especially enrollment of low-income students, under federal student aid programs, a different type of institutional aid would seem to be in order. If the federal government is to continue and increase its commitment to equalizing opportunity for low-income young people, it will be bringing large numbers of these students on to campuses without increasing the resources of these institutions to meet the needs. A strong case can certainly be made for giving aid to institutions in the form of cost-of-education allowances to help defray the additional costs of educating a federally aided student. Such a proposal is embodied in Senator Mondale's bill (S. 1161). The case for the cost-of-education allowance seems to me far stronger than that for general institutiona' aid. The cost-of-education allowance program would channel institutional aid to those institutions bearing the heaviest burden of educating low-income students and helping to meet a federally determined need.

By all of this, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee understands the compelling reasons for maintaining title 18 in the bill.

There are a number of other features in this bill to which I could refer but time does not permit that. May I express my thanks to the subcommittee for their kindness in allowing me to offer amendments which relate specifically to problems in Wisconsin's programs. The modifications made will enable the State Historical Society Library to share in resources heretofore denied to them as well as the Wisconsin loan program to offer greater opportunities for our State's students through its new eligibility to participate fully in Federal programs.

There is one further aspect of this bill to which I would like to now turn and that is title XVI.

I support title XVI of the bill—the Occupational Education Act of 1971—which I had the honor to cosponsor when it was first introduced as H.R. 7429 on April 7 of this year. This bill, was cosponsored by most of the ranking members of our committee on both sides of the aisle, and enjoys the support not only of the American Vocational Association and the American Association of Junior Colleges, but virtually of the entire educational community. Its enactment as title XVI would mark a long step forward toward the goal of providing every American with a real opportunity for education designed to help him get a decent job in a worthwhile occupation.

I am particularly concerned that one feature of the title be retained— and be retained intact. That is section 1612 which establishes by law a Bureau of Occupational Education in the U.S. Office of Education, and mandates the assignment of not less than 11 supergrades to the new Bureau; headed by a Deputy Commissioner at GS–18 and having not less than three GS–17 and not less than seven GS–16 positions to support him.

I understand that there may be offered an amendment to eliminate the designation of these supergrade positions. Because of very exceptional circumstances, I hope the amendment will not be offered or that it will be soundly defeated if it is offered. The simple fact is that over a long period of years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, vocational and occupational education has been systematically downgraded in the U.S. Office of Education despite great and continued congressional pressure to put in on the same basis as higher education.

Recently Commissioner Marland has made some moves to correct this matter, although they are not nearly sufficient in my judgment. For example, he obtained one of the most able vocational educators in the Nation, Dr. Robert Worthington of New Jersey, to head up the existing Bureau. Dr. Worthington was formerly State director of vocational-technical education in his State and is nationally and internationally recognized for his work in this field. Yet he is accorded only the rating of GS–17 and the title "Associate" rather than "Deputy" Commissioner. This means that he does not sit in on the twice weekly policy meetings with Commissioner Marland and it also means that vocational and occupational education does not have the same voice in the U.S. Office of Education as does, for example, higher education.

Let me relate some other elemental facts about the condition title XVI is designed to correct. In the existing Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education—as of January of 1971—there were 188 positions, of whom only 69 were assigned to administer the Vocational Education Act with its $500 million annual appropriations. By comparison: there were 393 employees in the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education and 102 assigned to compensatory education alone; there were 447 employees in the Bureau of Higher Education with 129 assigned to the Institute for International Studies; there were 365 positions assigned to the Bureau of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, with 141 of these working on educational statistics. Even the Office of Administration had 341 employees.

The assignment of supergrade positions within the office is even more shocking. There is one GS–16 to head up the division having responsibility for making the Vocational Education Act work as Congress hoped it might and as the national interest requires. In the entire Bureau there are five positions at the GS–16 and 17 levels—one of which is vacant—none at GS–18. In the U.S. Office of Education there currently are 55 supergrade positions, including five at the GS–18 level. So it is easy enough to see how vocational-technical, occupational and adult education rates on the pecking order of the U.S. Office. The provisions of title XVI—if retained intact in this bill—will correct this situation. It will give to an expanded Bureau of Occupational Education the place in the U.S. Office which the great majority of the Congress, I am convinced, would like to see it occupy.

Mr. Chairman, in testimony before Mr. PUCINSKI's subcommittee on September 20 of this year Mr. Lowell A. Burkett fully documented the deplorable position of occupational education in the Office of Education hierarchy. He also made this cogent summary statement of the reason why we must enact title XVI as it is in the bill. He said:

The national leadership and accountability role for vocational education has consistently declined over the last decade while during the same period of time Congress has enacted major legislation to expand and improve the Nation's capability for providing vocational education opportunities "for persons of all ages of all communities." The weakest link in the chain of leadership necessary for implementing the goals and purposes of the 1968—Vocational Education—amendments is without doubt at the Federal level.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of

our committee's consideration of the historic 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments, I seriously considered offering an amendment to create a bureau by law, much as is done in section 1612 of this bill. I was dissuaded from that course then and I regret it now, because subsequent events have aptly demonstrated that the only way the Congress can guarantee the leadership necessary for occupational education in the Federal bureaucracy is to legislate it. That is what title XVI does and I shall fight to keep it intact.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7248, the Higher Education Act of 1971 as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

This bill is one of the most complex measures to come before the House in a number of years. It is the product of long months of deliberations involving many compromises. As such, the bill falls short of expectations in some areas but, overall, it is legislation which represents a constructive approach to support for higher education and deserves the support of this body.

The legislation provides a 5-year extension with certain modifications of existing categorical aid programs for higher education. These include the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the International Education Act of 1963, the National Defense Student Loan Program, the College Work-Study Program, the Educational Opportunity Grants Program, and the College Library Program.

In addition, H.R. 7248 would establish a number of new programs including the first general institutional aid program, a National Institute of Education, an ethnic heritage studies program, and a youth camp safety program.

While all these new programs are worthwhile and deserving of support, by far the most important of them is the general institutional aid provided for higher education in the bill. This section, title VIII, authorizes the first program of general assistance to public and private institutions of higher education. Two-thirds of the funds to be awarded would be determined on the basis of the number of fulltime enrolled students in a college or university. The remaining one-third would be distributed on a cost-of-education basis related to the amount institutions receive in Educational Opportunity Grants, Work-Study, and National Defense student loan funds. Appropriations of $955 million for fiscal year 1972 up to $1.3 billion for fiscal year 1976 are authorized under title VIII.

An April 1971 survey by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges indicates that in recent years university budgets must increase 10 percent annually in order to maintain their same level of services. Forty-four of the 78 State universities reported fiscal year 1971 budget increases of less than the required 10 percent; three actually experienced budget decreases.

Studies made by the Association of American Colleges indicate that, unless immediate aid is forthcoming, 365 of the Nation's private colleges may be closed in this decade and 200 of them will have exhausted their liquid assets with a year.

Pressure from inflation and rising costs has been aggravated by a spectacular increase in enrollment. In fiscal year 1940, college enrollment was only 1.5 million. In 1959, those enrolled for degree credit were 3.38 million; in 1969, 7.30 million. The figure projected for 1979 is 11.08 million.

This obvious financial crisis in American higher education manifests itself in deficit operation, curtailed services that adversely affect the quality of education, and efforts to increase income that adversely affect the educational mission, such as raising tuition beyond the reach of low and middle income families.

Average costs this year for tuition, room and board at public colleges have reached almost $1,500. At private schools, the annual cost now is well over $3,000. Moreover, the U.S. Office of Education estimates that tuition alone will increase by 25 percent at public institutions of higher learning and by 38 percent at private institutions in the next 10 years.

General aid to higher education is necessary to alleviate the financial strain on both parents of students and on our State governments which have been compelled to increase the tax burden on their citizens in order to support State universities and colleges.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the overwhelming approval of the Higher Education Act of 1971. Education is the best investment we can make in our Nation's future. It is an investment we must make at all levels of government. It is a commitment we must never let slip, for education is indispensable to a free society.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, today we are called upon to consider one of the most important and complex education bills that has been brought before Congress in recent years. The Higher Education Act of 1971, H.R. 72481, would extend existing aid for 5 years for the following Federal higher education acts: the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and the International Education Act of 1966. The bill also creates a number of new and urgently needed programs including the first Federal general assistance program for higher education.

This college level education act would provide a 5-year extension of current student assistance loan plans including the national defense student loan program. Nearly every student attending colleges and universities in recent times has availed himself to this necessary and useful loan. The national defense student loan program has given many of our college level students the money to continue their education. Extension of this loan program does more than give all students an equal opportunity to attend college, its continuance is a guaranteed investment in America's most valuable resource—education. The proposed legislation which we are considering today is also significant in that it would increase the authorized annual appropriation from $19 million to $120 million for developing educational institutions.

Other major features of higher education act includes a 2-year authorization for emergency relief to institutions in great financial distress. This relief would total $150 million for each of the 2 years. Without this emergency relief many colleges throughout the Nation will be forced to close because of the seriousness of expenses exceeding revenues, inflation and unforseen changes in admissions. The primary expense of our colleges is faculty salaries and not an overbuilding of dorms. Colleges are faced with salary expenses which cannot effectively be changed downward by extending this emergency relief to institutions the crisis of possible colleges closings will not occur. Judicious and responsible action on the part of our colleges, universities and the Federal Government will avert this crisis.

In terms of general institutional aid, the bill authorizes a program of general assistance to both public and private institutions of higher learning. This aspect of the higher education act would authorize appropriations from $955 million in fiscal year 1972 up to $1.3 billion for fiscal year 1976. At the same time, a commission would be established whose responsibility would be to examine the financial crises facing higher educational institutions.

The bill includes a provision of special importance to parents dealing with youth camp safety. Each year almost 8 million children go off to camp, yet in 19 States there are no regulations governing camping at all, and in many other States only some areas of camping are covered by law. Now this obvious deficiency in protecting our children will be eliminated by requiring Federal standards for the protection and safety of our youths who attend day camp, resident camp, or travel camp. Stiff monetary penalties would be assessed for violations of these Federal standards. The past failure to establish adequate standards for many camps has caused tragic consequences, now we can extend some protection to our children at camp.

Mr. Chairman, to provide a program meeting the needs of education is a challenging task, and the challenge has been partially met by this bill, The Higher Education Act of 1971. The strength of America's educational enterprise springs from a variety of sources, but one principle is a main source of that strength: the right of every individual to have an equal opportunity for an education. This bill directly supports that very principle by giving aid to individuals and institutions and prohibiting sex discrimination.

We cannot compromise, or give halfway when it comes to the education of our youth. All of us are aware that an underfunded school can easily become a poor or mediocre one. A poor school is almost worse than no school. Every dollar spent on the education of our youth is a dollar wisely spent. The cornerstone of America's greatness is the continual emphasis on the quality of her youths' education.

We are constantly improving our educational programs and practices, not as a matter of national pride, but as a necessity for the survival and advancement Higher Educational Act of 1971 we are

of all civilization. By passage of the continuing the forward movement of education by strengthing those principles which are the foundation of America's educational system.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7248 now pending before the Congress. The plight of small private colleges and universities in America is very grave at this moment in our history. So desperate is their plight that it is predicted that more than half will cease to exist within the next 5 or 10 years unless this Congress accepts the responsibility for their survival.

Many of my colleagues in the Congress are alumni of small, private colleges and universities. In fact, our Nation would be much poorer in leadership had these noble institutions gone down the drain prior to this time.

America can ill afford taking lightly the role of importance that the small college will play in the future of this great Nation. Most small colleges and universities are located in the small cities in nonurban regions of our heartland. They are out there close to the people who are the grassroots of the real stalwart America.

They are serving a constituency which may be characterized as the backbone of America—a core of hard-working and dedicated people.

From these homes and these institutions will be graduated a dependable supply of the best citizens of our land. It is said by leading educators of the Nation that small colleges turn out a leadership product that is far out of proportion to their resources and enrollments. Although the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may cast aspersions toward some of these institutions as being inefficient, there are some of us who feel that efficiency should be measured by the graduated product rather than the cold impersonal point of view that is reflected by computer accounting methods.

The standard of measurement must be the student and the quality of this student that is produced by the small colleges and universities in America. If we use the student point of view, these institutions will be found to be the most efficient social institutions we have in our Nation today. Giant universities or mega-versities, may turn out their thousands by the assembly line method in vogue today, but it is from these small, private colleges that we expect to find unique combinations of education and character development so vital to our national destiny.

We must keep these institutions strong and viable if we are to avoid mental tyranny in America. If we follow the present course without concern for the small college, we will find in a few years only two segments of our higher education existent: the State-controlled system, and a few of the giant privately endowed universities. It cannot be said with any stretch of the imagination that this will be good for the mind of America. I fear the insensitivity of such a system to the major needs of our people. This could well be called a tyranny because the average American would be helpless to change the situation and would be forced to take what was offered in the field of education.

In the past, large groups of our people have felt dedicated to perpetuate a culture or persuasion by the establishment of colleges top reserve and pass on their ideals. We appear to be rapidly approaching a time when this nobility of purpose may be economically impossible. I abhor this thought.

It should also be pointed out that these small, private colleges carry a major burden in the education of people from low income families. At one time it was true that the rich sent their children to the private schools. This is no longer typical. There are thousands of young people from low income and even poverty level families attending the small, private colleges and universities. By the ingenuity and the benevolence of their supporters, millions of dollars in scholarships and grants are made annually to the economically underprivileged students in the private sector of higher education. The rich families are now sending more and more of their sons and daughters to the State universities and Ivy League colleges. This results in a growing burden for the fewer rich benefactors who help the smaller private institutions.

The Congress must include the preservation of the small, private American colleges and universities in its commitment to all of our educational programs. Without them, the whole nation loses. With them, an indispensable part of our American heritage is preserved.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, Thomas Jefferson, who wished to be remembered as the founder of the University of Virginia, knew that the destiny of America was inseparable from education—that in the fulfillment of the promise of this new Nation, education would be the key.

We have tried hard to hold to Jefferson's ideal. We have seen our schools and colleges flourish and grow, ever enriching our heritage.

Now, almost two centuries after Jefferson, we also know a sterner truth. The philosopher and educator, Alfred North Whitehead, warned:

> In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed.

This bill that we are debating here today is a clear indication that we do value education and that we have acknowledged and are ready to meet the financial crisis which besets our institutions of higher learning.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7248 because, in my opinion, it recognizes the combined success and strength of the student loan program of the NDEA, work-study, the educational opportunity grants, and the guaranteed student loan programs. It adds a much needed Student Loan Marketing Association creating a Government sponsored private corporation which will facilitate the liquidity of more resources for students in the middle family income sector who need to borrow money for their higher education. Moreover, while improving these student aid measures, adequate attention is given to the dire need to extend other highly essential assistance, such as the program of community service and continuing education which has encouraged the campuses to reach out to the local community and try to help solve problems of poverty, housing, unemployment, youth opportunity, recreation, land use and transportation. This program has challenged thousands of students and as many as 3.5 million citizens with the day-to-day work efforts of trying to solve the knotty problems of modern urban, rural and suburban communities. Problems not necessarily dealt with in the academic setting or textbooks. Moreover, H.R. 7248 underscores the importance of assistance to college libraries recognizing the breadth of the knowledge explosion. The vast extent and variety of information sources requires that institutions of higher education, both students and faculty, have access to adequate library materials, services, and other media. Authorities have confirmed the fact that rising costs coupled with stationary or decreasing revenues from State sources or from private donors squeeze the financial resources of most of the Nation's higher education libraries. Campus libraries are among the first casualties of institution budget cuts. Furthermore, the extension of programs to strengthen developing institutions is of equal necessity. Serving institutions with student bodies composed mainly of minority students, this program provides the largest single source of Federal funds directly available to these institutions. It grants assistance to encourage cooperative arrangements among institutions, and bolsters the faculty through programs of national teaching fellowships and professors emeritus grants.

All of these programs and those which H.R. 7248 would improve and strengthen such as the NDEA equipment grant program, the graduate fellowship and language and area studies program of the NDEA; the programs of assistance to institutions for the improvement of undergraduate instruction and for the improvement of graduate programs of the higher education act, to mention only a few, are significantly successful and are vital to particularly important parts of our whole American education structure.

Today, however, there is a far broader, in fact, an all encompassing problem, to which H.R. 7248 addresses itself—that is the financial crisis which besets the Nation's institutions of higher education. This crisis has been mounting steadily over the past 10 years, and as one scholar stated "higher education has come upon hard times." Although today this Nation's campuses are more comprehensive and productive than any other in the world, our campuses do not have sufficient funds to adequately finance their growing needs. Scores of authoritative studies have spotlighted these financial problems which are caused by spiraling costs, inflation and enrollments.

As Dr. Earl Cheit pointed out in his 1971 study, "The New Depression in Higher Education":

> Inflation has also afflicted government appropriations at the State level and it has contributed to the taxpayers' revolt against bond issues. In June 1970, in California, a

bond proposal for capital support of medical schools and health sciences was voted down in 55 of the State's 58 counties.

Private institutions are plagued with financial problems too. The Association of American Colleges has reported that 365 private colleges and universities may be closed in the next decade because of the cost-price squeeze. Two hundred of these institutions will have depleted their liquid assets within a year.

On the other hand, of 278 State colleges and universities, 75 percent report that financial difficulty is their major problem.

Throughout the whole mosaic of higher education in this Nation's institutions, campuses have had to curtail services, drop essential new programs which would serve the country, operate at a deficit, and some have even gone bankrupt. In this, the most prosperous country in the world, which can spend trillions of dollars on defense and billions in space exploration, we should be capable of establishing a program of assistance to undergird those institutions of higher education that supply the talent and skills which make these other programs possible.

The extent and diversity of the Nation's institutions of higher education, unique to this country, and clearly responsible for our strength, requires the type of two-part program of financial assistance proposed in the measure before us.

H.R. 7248 offers a new and dramatic program of general assistance to institutions of higher education as well as much needed temporary relief for campuses which are in immediate serious financial distress.

These programs will serve to strengthen the relevancy of American higher education which has served the Nation so vigorously in many areas of exploration, invention, and experimentation.

Our colleges and universities are developing and refining the talent of our most valuable resource the untapped potential of our young men and women. To experience even a slight diminution of this resource would court disaster with the Nation's future greatness.

The urgency for financial assistance to institutions of higher education is clear. The immediate need defined. Enact this proposal and let the national commission on the financing of post secondary education report to the Congress the impact of past and present support and what the necessary levels of all sources of support to postsecondary education should be.

To ignore the scores of studies which have been made on the colleges' plight would be negligent and could be an impediment to the Nation's future.

Mr. Chairman, I would further like to express my approval and support of our program for student aid as it would be improved and strengthened by H.R. 7248. No doubt all but a few agree with the President in the wish that no qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money. This is a fine aim, and a practical one for its contribution to the individual and to the whole Nation. It is the means and methods of accomplishing this goal which bring differences and divergencies to the fore. Consider that it is only in the last 25 years that other than the sons and daughters of well-to-do families have hoped to acquire higher education. During that time the higher education community has faced extraordinary changes not only in having had to accommodate an increased number of students but also in having had to modify instruction and introduce new courses in adjustment to unusual changes in technological development and in society. The Federal Government has helped in this readjustment particularly in the field of student aid. The present program—as you know, consisting of three college-based forms of student aid, educational opportunity grants, work-study, and national defense student loans, and one federally supported but privately financed form, guaranteed student loans—has been built up gradually over the years as particular needs became apparent. First, in 1958, the National Defense Student Loan program was inaugurated. This provides low interest Federal loans to students in need of assistance through the institutions of higher education. In 1964 the work-study program was initiated to provide employment opportunities for those students needing still more assistance. The present program of aid was completed with the Higher Education Act of 1965 which added educational opportunity grants for students with exceptional need for whom national defense student loans and work-study were insufficient aid, and qualifying under need standards but still finding financing of their education guaranteed student loans for those not difficult.

What has evolved is a well balanced and nicely flexible program of student aid adjustable to different situations and needs. Now this is very important if we want to maintain our diversity and opportunity for a choice in our colleges and universities. We have been justly proud of this diversity. It has in no small measure contributed to the richness of our educational system. Some have suggested that a monetary standard of need be set for all student aid to insure taking care of the truly needy. However, this would not make allowances for the differing costs at colleges and universities. Students would not be able to consider more expensive institutions even if these alone offered the desired instruction. Nor would this monetary standard take into consideration various factors affecting each individual's resources, factors such as a catastrophic illness or business failure. At present the question of need is determined on a personal basis by a college administrator who considers the complete picture of the student's financial situation. He then can use all three college-based kinds of aid to form a combination best suited to the particular student's need or he may advise the guaranteed student loan program as most appropriate. This seems to me to be an exceptionally fair and practical method of solving the dilemma of how much aid and to whom. Testimony from administrators in the academic community indicates basic satisfaction with the program as is, except for inadequate funding and some inequities.

H.R. 7248 improves the flexibility of these present programs by liberalizing the definition of need and increasing the yearly limits on grants and loans. In addition 10 percent of funds available for EOG and for work-study are interchangeable and can be used for either program depending on the need in each institution. To correct possible inequities in allocation to the States, funds would be allotted in proportion not only to the number of college students but also in proportion to the number of high school graduates, the potential college students, and in proportion to the number of young people in low-income families in each State. This should correct the few defects now found in the overall program. Now this is not a time or area for experimentation and delay. Instead of plunging into a whole new setup, untried and therefore undoubtedly inefficient, wouldn't it be better to stay with a program which has been tried and found serviceable, especially now that we are getting the bugs and kinks out of it. Let us endorse these amendments as contained in H.R. 7248.

Mr. Chairman, title IV of H.R. 7248 increases the availability of student financial aid. It is generally an improvement over the existing system of student aid because:

First. It makes part-time students eligible for educational opportunity grants and college work study.

Second. It increases the annual grant limit and the number of years a student may receive an educational opportunity grant.

Third. It provides special treatment for veterans in all student aid programs, and particularly in the work study for community service learning program.

However, one area where I recommend a modification in the bill is title IV, section 465, Allotment of Funds to States. According to this section, moneys for college work study, educational opportunity grants and national defense student loans would be allocated among the States based on a formula of one-third fulltime enrollment in institutions of higher education, one-third high school graduates and one-third the number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000. New York State has 8.4 percent of the national fulltime enrollment in institutions of higher education, 8.6 percent of the national high school graduates and 4.9 percent of the children in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000. If the formula in section 465 were adopted, New York State would thus receive 7.3 percent of the national Federal student assistance. This is considerably less than New York State now receives under the educational opportunity grant and the national defense student loan programs. Its share of educational opportunity grants, college work study and national defense student loans is considerably deflated by the inclusion of the number of children in families with less than $3,000 annual income. The wording of the formula, as it now exists in section 465, would exclude children from welfare families in New York

State with an income in excess of $3,000. In New York State, a family of four on welfare is eligible for $6,156 per year, including medical payments. This same factor also reduces the share of Federal student assistance for other large urban States with major welfare programs.

As an addition to section 465, we would favor the inclusion of related children under 18 years of age living in welfare families, even though their welfare payments may exceed $3,000 per year. A secondary option would be to base the formula for allocation of Federal student assistance among the States on full-time enrollment in institutions of higher education and high school graduates, and eliminate that portion of the formula that apportions money based on the number of children in families whose income is $3,000 or less. New York State and other large urban States will lose money unless some provision is made to change the formula. Hold harmless provisions are losses.

I support title VIII—"General Assistance"—and title XVIII—"Temporary Relief for Institutions of Higher Education in Financial Distress"—of H.R. 7248 as the most viable compromise to be drafted to date. However, I recognize the complexities that were considered and must be considered in a formula that distributes aid to institutions of higher education, and therefore deem it essential that the National Commission on Financing of Post Secondary Education be established to further analyze this formula and additional factors for the Congress. I base our support of the general institutional aid provisions in H.R. 7248 on the following reasons:

First. New York State would receive close to $1 million more under the formula contained in H.R. 7248, assuming a $100 million appropriation, than it would under a formula that was based only on a percentage of total Federal student assistance. The following table illustrates the differences in institutional aid for New York State based upon four different formulas for the public, private, and 2-year and community college sector.

VARIATION IN NEW YORK STATE SHARE USING 4 DIFFERENT FORMULAS (BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION) ASSUMING A $100,000,000 APPROPRIATION

	H.R. 7248	½ enrollment ½ Federal student assistance	⅓ enrollment ⅔ Federal student assistance	100 percent Federal student assistance
Public	$4,627,124	$4,620,513	$4,612,545	$4,596,786
Private	4,182,445	3,959,807	3,736,146	3,289,032
2 year and community college	(1,181,279)	(1,062,442)	(943,313)	(705,158)
Total New York State	8,809,569	8,580,320	8,348,691	7,885,818

Mr. Chairman, it is appropriate to point out at this section that H.R. 7248 will have a very favorable impact on Erie County and the area. There are 13 institutions of higher learning in the area surrounding Buffalo. We can easily see that the potential $1 million increase for the State will have a significant impact on my congressional district.

Second. Any formula that bases institutional aid on the percentage of Federal student assistance is particularly prejudicial to the community colleges because of their small share of Federal student assistance. There are several reasons for this. The college work study program and the national defense student loan program have been difficult programs for the community colleges. Each of these programs require that the institution match the Federal grant—in the college work study program the institution must provide 20 percent of the money and in the national defense student loan program the institution must provide 10 percent of the money. Community colleges, with limited financial resources at their disposal, experience financial difficulties in providing these matching funds. In New York State, all community colleges participate in the college work study program because it offers experiences in keeping with the curriculum of the institution, but 10 of the State University of New York community colleges find it financially impossible to participate in the national defense student loan program.

The educational opportunity grant program is of only limited effectiveness with community college students. If a student receives an educational opportunity grant of $1,000, the institution must provide $1,000 from other sources. Since the community colleges find it difficult to receive moneys from the college work study program and the national defense student loan program and have only limited financial aid of their own, they are often unable to participate in the educational opportunity grant program to the extent that is necessary.

Under existing legislation, part-time students are ineligible for educational opportunity grants and college work study. The only Federal student assistance program they are eligible for is the national defense student loan program, and this is the smallest student aid program at the community college level. In the community colleges of the State University of New York and the City University of New York, 46 percent of the students are part time. Thus, a very significant group of students are eliminated from receiving any Federal financial aid at all.

Third. The formula in H.R. 7248 takes into consideration the graduate student by allotting $200 per full-time graduate student enrolled. New York State has the largest number of post-baccalaureate students enrolled in degree programs in the United States—152,481 students or 14.7 percent of the national total. Since graduate students, by and large, are ineligible for the educational opportunity grant college work study, and national defense student loan programs, the Quie formula would provide no assistance to the institutions for these students.

Fourth. The formula in H.R. 7248 would be of greater benefit to small institutions than a formula based upon a percentage of student financial assistance. In New York State, there are 103 institutions with an enrollment of 1,000 or under. Many of these institutions are the ones that are presently experiencing the most serious financial problems.

Fifth. According to a formula based upon Federal student assistance, 12 institutions of higher education in New York State would receive no general institutional aid at all. Some of the institutions receive funds under a general institutional aid program of New York State.

Mr. Chairman, New York State has been doing its share in providing student and institutional aid. This fiscal year, New York State will be expending in excess of $70 million in scholar incentive and scholarship grants There are additional State programs designed to assist minority and disadvantaged students. Two major public institutions in the Buffalo area with a large percentage of minority and disadvantaged students receive $3.5 million in Federal student assistance while New York State, from its own sources, is providing $6.7 million in student assistance or almost twice the Federal amount. Similar examples may be drawn for private institutions in New York State. This large State and institutional effort for student assistance is not taken into consideration in an institutional aid program based on a percentage of Federal student assistance.

New York State will be expending this fiscal year approximately $27 million for institutional aid under the so-called Bundy Plan—see appendix B. In addition to this general institutional aid, New York State will provide $9.5 million in emergency relief to an institution in severe financial distress as it reorganizes its program. It is our understanding that full funding of institutional aid, using a percentage of Federal student assistance, would be approximately $250 million. This would mean that New York State's current effort exceeds 10 percent of a fully-funded program based on Federal student assistance for institutional aid.

In the analysis that had been done for the various institutional aid programs, a separate category of analysis was made of its effect on predominantly black institutions. New York State is shown as having no predominantly black institutions, but in excess of 6 percent of the enrollment in institutions of higher education in New York State is black students. This does not include the Puerto Rican and other minority students enrolled in institutions of higher education in New York State.

We understand that there will be a colloquy to clarify the inclusion of students in the occupational and vocational curriculum in 2-year and community colleges. This clarification will be of benefit to New York State.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The allotment provisions for occupational education, title XVI, provide in the second year of this program that each

State would receive a minimum of $1 million. We feel that this is unrealistic in terms of past experience appropriations for new programs. Our suggestion would be to maintain through the life of the program a minimum allotment to each State of $100,000 as provided for the first year of operation of the program.

The provision for youth camp safety, title XIX, contained in H.R. 7248 will provide additional assistance to New York State in expanding its current program. New York State is among the leaders with a program in this area.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the many institutions of higher learning in my District and the diversity of educational opportunity they present to those seeking a higher education.

From my position on Education and Labor Committee I fully support the Green bill and its approach to meeting the crisis in higher education.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, the significant new feature in H.R. 7248 is the provision for direct aid to institutions. Over the last several years most of the Nation's colleges and universities have suffered significant financial setbacks. The Carnegie Commission has called today's dilemma "the New Depression in Higher Education." This situation is partly attributable to the Vietnam war—that is, the impact of the draft both on enrollments and on student morale, and partly attributable to cutbacks in Federal support for research and training.

In my State the large universities which serve as national instruments for the training of scientists, doctors, dentists, teachers, and researchers have suffered most notably. The combined deficits of Columbia, Cornell, New York University, Rochester, and Syracuse were approximately $30 million last year. State and city resources are also heavily taxed to maintain our social commitments in the public institutions. If this situation is not alleviated many of the most vital institutions of higher learning will be severely crippled and the great progress we have made in recent years to really achieve equality of educational opportunity will be reversed.

The institutional aid provisions of H.R. 7248 provide an incentive for those institutions which continue to take the lead in serving the disadvantaged. In my district New York University has what is probably the largest budget for scholarship aid to the disadvantaged of any single institution in the country, and has for 30 years been among the several leading institutions in the Nation in the number of minority students enrolled. With the commitment today of both the city and State universities to open admissions for all qualified high school graduates, the provisions of H.R. 7248 will be a significant step forward in helping to share these burdens.

I urge passage of this landmark bill which is a major step to insure the continued health and vigor at our colleges and universities.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, as we prepare to resume consideration of H.R. 7248, the Higher Education Act of 1971, I believe it appropriate to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a recent address by Dr. G. Bruce Dearing, vice chancellor for academic programs of the State University of New York.

Dr. Dearing was the principal speaker at the centennial convocation of the State University College at Buffalo, the 100-year "young" college with a proud history and an impressive future.

In his wide-ranging remarks which he titled "Academic Dogmas and Necessary Heresies," Dr. Dearing dug into the basic problems facing higher education today.

I commend to my colleagues the text of Dr. Dearing's address, which follows:

ACADEMIC DOGMAS AND NECESSARY HERESIES

(By Dr. G. Bruce Dearing)

A centennial celebration is so rare and special an occasion that any speaker with proper humility recognizes at once that his favorite cliches will appear more than usually shabby, and that he really ought to find a way to say something genuinely fresh and crisp about the last hundred years so gloriously concluded and the next hundred of promise, and despite the grandeur of the time frame, stay within his allotted twenty minutes.

In candor I can only promise to deliver the latter, though I sufficiently appreciate the honor of participating in this centennial celebration to take seriously the opportunity of sharing thoughts with this audience.

I have little doubt that the founders of this institution one hundred years ago experienced a sense both of crisis and of promise.

In a nation recovering from the dislocations and ravages of a fierce and prolonged Civil War, suffering from exhaustion and from tarnished idealism, indignant at corruption and ineptitude in high places, a new institution for the education of teachers must have been a very bright candle in the darkness.

The mood must have been rather more cheerful on the fiftieth anniversary, with what had been for this country at least a briefer and apparently successfully concluded war to make the world safe for democracy, and college attendance well established as a gay and carefree lark for those lucky enough to afford the privilege.

ATTITUDE OF NONSTUDENTS

I was too young at the time to trust my direct observations, but I am assured by students of the period that those for whom college attendance was out of the question were sufficiently preoccupied or submerged to prevent their questioning the system very sharply.

Still, I should be surprised if the speakers on that occasion did not point out that Coue was perhaps overstating the case in his assurance that every day in every way things were getting better and better.

I shall not attempt here a full account of the anxieties and distresses which hedge us about at this moment in history.

You are as well aware as I of the uneasy economy, an unpopular war from which we have not yet extricated ourselves, persistent and resurgent social injustices, and the insults still being heaped upon our beleaguered earth.

Let me dwell only upon one element in what can reasonably be called the current crisis in higher education.

CANNOT IGNORE ATTACKS

Our colleges and universities, of whatever age and degree of distinction, are being attacked from without and from within in ways that cannot be shrugged off.

Academicians are trying to adjust to the change from being recently elevated heroes of an admiring society to having suddenly become exploitative villains undeserving of their advantages, and drones incapable of putting their academic houses in order.

Alma Mater, the university, is accused in a welter of new books and articles of having sold her birthright for a mess of potage, of having prostituted herself in an ill-starred venture in being all things to all men.

Professors and administrators stand accused of having, like Faust or Jabez Stone, sold their souls to Satan for the tawdry and temporary worldly benefits which lie within the devil's gift.

It is alleged that too many non-students or semi-students who have no real business in college are glutting the campuses, that the campus has become what never was intended, an instrument for revolution and a playground for the irresponsible.

Formerly generous donors among the Alumni threaten to withhold their support; budget officers and other public officials scrutinize with added rigor the sources of support for public institutions across the nation.

ALL NOT WELL IN ACADEME

It is clear that all is not well in the groves of academe, and that even a properly joyous celebration must take some account of the encircling gloom.

However, any person, or any institution which has attained the age of one hundred, clearly has staying power, reasons for optimism, and entitlement to some rights, privileges and immunities.

I was recently delighted to learn that an uncle of mine in California who has passed his hundredth birthday and was taking his annual physical examination prior to taking off on a trip to Alaska was told by his physician that hereafter his examinations will be free of charge.

Following this cue, I am prepared to offer the State University College at Buffalo a free examination, complete with diagnosis and prescription.

We can start with the circulatory system, following the medical analogy. Any institution of the age of yours inescapably suffers somewhat from sclerosis of the curriculum.

This College seems to me to be in better condition than most in this regard, in consequence of recent reforms and modifications in requirements, prerequisites and additional options. Nevertheless, there are still some clogged arteries which need to be cleared or bypassed if the College is to maintain the resiliency and vigor of youth.

NEED FOR SETTING PRIORITIES

In a time of budget crunch, the most promising immediate reaction of a vital institution is to arrest and reverse the proliferation of course offerings, to require strong justification for continuing courses and programs with persistently low enrollments, and to set priorities by analysis and judgment rather than by historical accident or vested interest.

Heart function seems to me good. The College at Buffalo has a long-established and well-earned reputation for responsiveness to community needs, and it is significant that its SEEK, Special Admissions and Full Opportunity programs are among the best in the State University.

Service to students and to the wider community will depend upon humane and alert responsiveness to emergent needs of new constituencies, and while it is still proper that the university should be thought of as the citadel of the intellect, head and heart must operate in concert and not in subordination.

And, speaking of heads, any institution in our time is something of a hydra. Its titular head is its president, and here the College at Buffalo is in splendid condition.

I shall forbear speaking of the hotheads, cool heads, pot heads, dunderheads and other types of which this campus must have, like

others, at least a sprinkling, and refer only to the administrative head.

IF YOU'VE GOT IT, FLAUNT IT!

Shakespeare's fat knight, Sir John Falstaff, was accustomed to excusing his behavior on the ground that he had more flesh than other people, and therefore more frailty.

Your President, having more altitude than other people, has therefore the advantage of longer vision, wider horizons, a less cluttered view of the general landscape, greater leverage and more speed.

I learn from the current issue of *Psychology Today* that our society more admires and favors height than any other characteristic.

It is undoubtedly an unfair advantage, but my personal and professional advice to my long-time friend, E. K. Fretwell, continues to be "If you've got it, flaunt it!" in developing your new kind of college.

Rather than running entirely into the ground the diagnostic fancy, let me shift to advice and prescription. I hold with those who propose a rigorous regimen of exercise, and oppose the shrinking into oneself of self-protective, anxious preoccupation with mere survival and avoidance of pain.

At a time when many prescriptions for the current ills of higher education (some of them from distinguished educators) insist upon a return to monasticism, a retreat into the ivory tower and the abandonment of most of the efforts which are now causing travail as well as vital extension of university services, I believe institutions like the College at Buffalo must steadfastly resist the siren song.

RE: RETURN OF MONASTICISM

The cry for restoring the advantages and privileges of the credentialed and advantaged minority—revaluing college degrees through an economy of scarcity—may be appropriate to an Oxbridge, rooted in the tradition of training an upper class elite for the goverance of an empire, or for a small private college originally established to educate preachers and teachers for a godless and unlettered frontier society.

It is most certainly not appropriate for an institution like this one, in early maturity at age one hundred, founded to serve a burgeoning democracy, located in a populous city, and part of a great public university whose motto "Let each become all he is capable of being" is not merely an adornment of official seals, but is a commitment to action.

It is not needful to be a sprawling, totally unselective university responding mindlessly to every whim and veering wind, of course. But it *is* needful, and in the intrinsic nature of a campus like that of the College at Buffalo, to be *inclusive* rather than *exclusive* in its philosophy of education.

THERE MUST BE BALANCE

Every organism of whatever age, but particularly in its earliest years and as it ages, must give concerted attention to the problem of attaining and maintaining *balance*. As I have suggested, an institution of one hundred years is merely in vigorous maturity, and in no sense a tottering Struldburg. Still, it must attend to the requirements of balance.

In our time we have frequent use of the metaphor of the high-wire artist making his perilous way across nearby Niagara Falls, assisted only by courage, a finely attuned inner ear and a balancing pole. Perhaps most of us can do little about our store of courage or the state of the inner ear, but we can make judicious selections, and train ourselves in the use, of the balancing pole.

These come in all sizes and with appropriate combinations. Some are labeled on opposite ends with such relationships as freedom and responsibility, the individual and society, emotion and reason, sensitivity and rigorous analysis, continuity and change.

For this institution at this time, the pole to pick up is probably the one labeled *continuity* and *change*.

A CLEAR RESPONSIBILITY

Merely because it is an established and mature college, there is here a proper responsibility for setting and maintaining rigorous standards of excellence, for demonstrating respect for objective scholarship and intellectual honesty, for living by the conviction that knowledge is power, and that power implies both responsibility and restraint.

Because the college has an admirable history, and because institutions tend by nature to be conservative, we dare to hope that the claims for continuity will be well met here in the next hundred years.

The requirements for change may be more difficult to meet. Somehow, all of us responsible in any way for the direction of higher education in the immediate future must fully recognize that formerly unaccommodated groups have in a democracy valid claims on higher education.

Ethnic and cultural minorities, the economically unprovided, women, age groups well beyond or significantly short of what has hitherto been considered the "college-age population" clamor to be served, and their needs must not be shrugged aside by self-protective in-groups more comfortable in an exclusive enclave.

We must acknowledge, as I think you have at Buffalo State College, that in the future, the dormitory, the fraternity house—even the classroom, the library or the campus—will be for many students no longer the locus and focus of the college learning experience.

Instead, independent study much more various and more imaginative than at present, field experience, interdisciplinary curricula and new "alliances for learning" among institutions, faculties, students, industry, government and social agencies may become common rather than rare and special features of the college.

MORE OPTIONS NEEDED

I do not suggest that the traditional curricula and procedures for delivering learning experiences have lost effectiveness totally, but only that many more options must be available for the variety of students now to be served.

Provision of more options need not lead, as some fear, to complete fragmentation and dissolution of the traditional campus, although this danger is not to be lightly dismissed.

A further aspect of change we should foresee and embrace, is the acceptance of a new time schedule for the baccalaureate degree, with live options for a three-year, four-year and five-year curriculum provided. Another is the provision for a new range of professional and para-professional programs in two-year and four-year colleges, in new alliances and partnerships.

For too many of the best students of the past decade or so, either the senior year in high school or the freshman year in college has been largely a wasteful and boring duplication, which should not be countenanced, and in these times of strained budgets, cannot be afforded.

FIVE YEARS MORE REASONABLE

For some, though by no means all, of our students admitted with other than the usual secondary school preparation, five years is a more normal and reasonable period than four to attain the skills and knowledge associated with the baccalaureate.

Many young men and some young women could profit by a delay in beginning the college experience, or by interrupting it for significant periods to live and work in quite another part of the forest.

Parental pressures, selective service, and the deferred job market have often had more effect than internal motivation on educational timing, and these pressures may be losing force.

Within the State University at this time, most of us in administrative posts are cudgeling our wits as to how we may make virtues of our necessities, and in the accommodations which must be made to new circumstances of budgets, enrollment pressures, building slowdowns and space constraints, assuring that unavoidable changes result in improvements, or at least not in deterioration, in the educational experience.

One of the most promising opportunities lies in at last turning technology to account in delivering educational and learning services, rather than looking askance at programmed learning techniques, media presentations and repetitions and other alternatives to classroom lecture and discussion as fit only for dark Satanic mills.

I am told that some of our colleagues here are well advanced in experimentation and essay in these directions, and I hope that more will follow their lead.

CENTENNIAL NOTES

If I were to be permitted to inscribe a birthday card for the College at Buffalo, then the notes would be something as follows:

To President E. K. Fretwell: continue to look above and beyond, taking full advantage of formidable vision, reach and leverage in guiding the College into its next hundred years.

To the faculty: continue to preserve and transmit, but also to discover and apply knowledge in a college oriented toward the twenty-first century rather than toward the nineteenth century. May you resist stoutly the temptations of resurgent elitism, or the new monasticism and self-serving exclusiveness in higher education. May you remember and act on the fact that you are not only professionals in a vast and honorable enterprise which touches the lives of almost every citizen, but very influential citizens in an overlapping series of communities—campus, city, state, nation, family of nations and planet. To withdraw defensively into a campus enclave in our times would seem to me not the salvation of the university, but the betrayal of the society which nurtures it.

To the students: may you continue to be more various, more expectant, more questioning and more participative than any previous student generation, and may you play an increasing role in the democratization of education and the extension of its benefits to all who honestly seek them.

To the community: may you continue to treasure the resource of the State University College at Buffalo and do your full part in providing the moral, political, and economic support it will require to perform its functions most effectively.

And to the friends gathered here for this celebration, whatever their connection with the College: join me in paying this one hundred year old institution the compliment of continuing to expect only the best from and for the State University College at Buffalo.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am proud and pleased to rise in support of the Higher Education Act of 1971. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee I know that the financial problems of our colleges and universities are real and I appreciate the fact that there are no simple solutions. But I am also convinced after many days of hearings by the Special Subcommittee on Education and many pages of testimony that the Federal Government has the greatest ability and responsibility to insure the survival of some

institutions of higher learning and hopefully the health of many others.

For years educators, administrators, and legislators have been debating the proper role of the Federal Government in higher education and the most effective form of Federal assistance. I believe that the role of the Federal Government has evolved greatly since the Morrill Act of 1862, and most dramatically since the National Defense Education Act. That role has been shaped by many events and circumstances.

The agricultural needs of the country and the near absence of college level courses in agriculture and the mechanical arts prompted passage of the Land-Grant College Act. The second Morrill Act, and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, broadened this legislation. By 1957 additional impetus was given to the evolving role of the Federal Government by the Russian space feat in launching sputnik. Congress responded to what was then considered to be a critical national objective in education. It was determined to be in the national interest to identify and counsel young potential scientists and engineers; to improve elementary and secondary education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; to provide institutes in modern foreign languages and area studies for elementary and secondary school teachers; to enable more qualified students to pursue college educations with the aid of student loans; and to provide fellowships for graduate study. The National Defense Education Act was passed to achieve these goals.

By 1965 it had become clear that our colleges and universities in struggling to accommodate the "baby boom" had overextended their resources and were seriously deficient in a number of areas. Congress decide that it was in the national interest to respond to those specific needs and to take additional steps to equalize educational opportunity. The resulting legislation was the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Since then college enrollments have risen steadily as have costs. Unfortunately, higher education's revenues have not risen as rapidly. We discover now that in order to continue in operation our colleges have resorted to a number of short-range budget savers such as, raising tuitions, cutting back on positions, courses, and programs, enlarging classes, postponing needed additions and repairs, and the like. None of these devices has helped the colleges to come to grips with their financial situation. Nor will any of them provide for long-range stability. Furthermore, the money crisis in higher education is making college a financial impossibility for more and more students—not just those from low-income families but from middle-income families as well. I would say that we are losing ground in the battle to achieve equal educational opportunity.

The States have steadily increased expenditures for higher education and they may be able to increase their outlays even further, but because State taxing power is limited I do not expect to see vast new sums available for higher education from the States in the near future. The private sector too can and must do more to translate their concern for higher education into dollars and cents support.

But the heaviest responsibility for meeting the immediate financial crush lies with the Federal Government because only the Federal Government has the resources to meet a national emergency in higher education. Is it in the national interest that we have college educated men and women and trained professionals? Is it in the national interest that our institutions conduct scientific and social research? Does the Nation benefit when our colleges use their resources to help solve community problems?

Our institutions of higher learning are an integral part of this country's economic, intellectual and social progress. Of course it is in the national interest that they survive and remain healthy. If it is in the national interest and if it is a Federal responsibility to save Lockheed from bankruptcy how can our responsibility be less with regard to our colleges and universities?

I do not believe that it is. The real question is how can we best fulfill our responsibility. This is the question with which the Special Subcommittee on Education and we on the full committee have been wrestling. Our response is contained in H.R. 7248. First of all, we believe that those programs under the Higher Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act which have been assisting colleges and universities in specific areas of need should be extended. We also believe that aid to students is crucial. Therefore, H.R. 7248 would extend and expand the educational opportunity grant program, the work-study program, the insured loan program, and the NDEA student loan program. A number of changes would be made in the programs, most significant I believe is the increase in the amount of an educational opportunity grant from $1,000 to $1,500 a year, the new eligibility of part-time students, and the broader determination of student need.

H.R. 7248 would refine the criteria used in awarding educational opportunity grants to include, in addition to family income, such factors as number of dependent children, the number of dependents attending schools and colleges, family illnesses, business failures, and any other circumstances affecting the student's financial need. These criteria are intended to assist the student financial aid officer in awarding grants. I do not favor the application of some national standard of need to applicants for educational opportunity grants. Frankly I think that our student aid officers in Massachusetts are a lot better qualified to assess student need than the Office of Education.

Need is obviously relative to the specific circumstances of an individual's situation. I do not believe that it is in the best interests of our student aid efforts to attempt to devise some national standard of need which removes this determination from the institutional officer and places it in the hands of the Federal Government.

H.R. 7248 also addresses itself to what the colleges themselves call the need of highest priority—the need for institutional assistance. A 2-year program of interim emergency aid would be authorized by H.R. 7248 to help those colleges and universities closest to the brink of financial disaster. The bill would also initiate a program of grants to institutions to help them cover current operating expenses. The formula is based partly on enrollment and partly on the number of Federal student aid recipients enrolled at an institution.

I cannot agree with the suggestion that such assistance should be based solely on the number of Federal student aid recipients. Such a limitation would defeat the primary purpose of the assistance which is to preserve our system of public, private, large and small, 2- and 4-year institutions of higher learning. This is the responsibility of the Federal Government given the national interest in higher education and the financial needs of the institutions. I believe that H.R. 7248 is the most promising proposal to fulfill this responsibility and I lend the bill my most vigorous support.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7248) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other acts dealing with higher education, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be marked present on quorum call No. 324. I was in the chamber but failed to answer the rollcall.

The SPEAKER. Since the gentleman did not respond, he was not listed as present, but the gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 320, a quorum call, I was in the Chamber after the call of the roll was completed but before it was announced and was not

recorded as being present. I wish to have the RECORD show this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

"THE VANTAGE POINT"

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD today the review of former President Lyndon Johnson's book "The Vantage Point" from the Book of the Month Club News. The Book of the Month Club has chosen this new book as a special fall selection and the review is by John P. Roche.

I would like to quote a couple of sentences from it.

It says:

For about three years now—ever since he left the White House—the decisions of President Lyndon Baines Johnson have been the subject of intensive amateur research and polemical dispute. The focus has, of course, been Vietnam, and the purpose has been to make it possible for liberal Democrats to escape responsibility for an unpopular, protracted war. The main theme, especially since the publication in various newspapers of the so-called Pentagon Papers, has been that Lyndon Johnson, with superhuman cunning and diabolical design, tricked everybody.

Listen to this one:

It is hard to go anywhere in Washington these days without encountering a Senator announcing to all and sundry that he was just a poor, barefoot innocent who was gulled by that Machiavelli in the White House.

Those of us who respect the wisdom of the American voter may wonder how the electorate will respond to these advertisements of alleged incompetence by its spokesmen.

I commend this review to everyone who has any responsibility for Government as well as all citizens who would like to know the truth about what really went on, as I would also recommend the President's book.

The article is as follows:

REPORT BY JOHN P. ROCHE

(I have not written these chapters to say, "This is how it was," but to say, "This is how I saw it from my vantage point." Lyndon B. Johnson)

For about three years now—ever since he left the White House—the decisions of President Lyndon Baines Johnson have been the subject of intensive amateur research and polemical dispute. The focus has, of course, been Vietnam, and the purpose has been to make it possible for liberal Democrats to escape responsibility for an unpopular, protracted war. The main theme, especially since the publication in various newspapers of the so-called Pentagon Papers, has been that Lyndon Johnson, with superhuman cunning and diabolical design, tricked everybody. It is hard to go anywhere in Washington these days without encountering a Senator announcing to all and sundry that he was just a poor, barefoot innocent who was gulled by that Machiavelli in the White House.

Those of us who respect the wisdom of the American voter may wonder how the electorate will respond to these advertisements of alleged incompetence by its spokesmen, but far more important for our purposes here is the fact that there have been three huge gaps in all the published accounts to date: the views of the President, of the Secretary of State and of the Secretary of Defense. The publication thus resembles a performance of *Hamlet* without the Prince, Laertes and King Claudius. The Pentagon Papers under close analysis turn out to be mostly the memoranda of lower-echelon advisors and bureaucrats. A number of bureaucrats have on occasion thought they were President of the United States, but the cold truth is that there is only one President in town. And nobody makes his decisions for him.

This was particularly true of Lyndon Johnson. As one who watched him at close range for more than two years, I never ceased to wonder at his mastery of intricate detail. Indeed, much of his reputation for imperiousness arose, in my judgment, from the fact that he knew too much. Watching him go through a budget briefing with a Cabinet Secretary was an amazing experience. One striking instance comes to mind: a Secretary was due to testify before the Senate Appropriations Sub-Committee in charge of his budget, and Johnson had him over to discuss the presentation.

After half an hour it was clear that the Secretary had only the vaguest notion of what was in the budget, who was on the Sub-Committee and, perhaps most important, what hobbies the latter cherished. For three hours the President led his Cabinet members through the budget, pointing out which Senators were particularly concerned about various sections, what bean-balls might be thrown, and how to take a polite dive on unresolved controversies. The Secretary went back to his barony and denounced the President as a bully. The President sadly suggested to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the Secretary's next budget include a Seeing-Eye Dog.

Fortunately for posterity President Johnson had a strong sense of history and a profound distrust of memory as a source of fact. From the outset of his Congressional career he therefore saved everything—documents, transcripts of meetings, records of vital phone conversations and a wide array of less useful materials. This aroused a certain amount of genial amusement among his staff (one wit mounted and sent to the archives a toothpick the President used to spear an hors d'oeuvre), but in overall terms Johnson's passion for the record will provide an invaluable source for historians attempting to make sense out of the turbulent 1960s.

The first installment of Lyndon Johnson's commentary on his political world certainly confirms his wisdom as a collector of primary sources. *The Vantage Point: Perspectives of the Presidency, 1963–69* provides a remarkable, if not unique, inside view of the work, the joys, the complexities and the frustrations of the man in the Oval Office. As the title indicates, it does not pretend to be a definitive history of the period, but it will be indispensable for anyone who tries to come to grips in a clear-eyed, systematic fashion with the Era of Dissensus. If one looks at the 1960s in a clinical fashion, he finds that the United States was shaken by three simultaneous, major political earthquakes: the civil rights movement, the upsurge of youth and antiwar militance. The fault-lines of these three quakes intersected under the White House.

To put it another way, it was Lyndon Johnson's fate to be President at a time when the remarkable consensus that dominated American politics from the end of World War II through the Eisenhower years began to come apart at the seams. To say this is not to suggest that one should feel sorry for him—the Presidency, after all, is a job limited to volunteers. It is rather to indicate that Johnson became President just as the principles that had dominated American political life for a generation began to be challenged. And the conditions under which he assumed the job were hardly auspicious—one of the most gripping chapters in *The Vantage Point* deals simply and movingly with that baleful day in Dallas.

Now the time has perhaps come to make a critical distinction. What the former President has done in this book is set out with convincing documentation his responses to the crises of his Administration. It is a book by a strong man with vigorous convictions who tried to do, as he would put it, "what was right." Obviously one may disagree with any number of his conclusions: segregationists will denounce his civil rights initiatives; the new isolationists will scorn his opposition to aggression in Vietnam; conservatives will deplore his war on poverty, aid to education, and Medicare; and pro-Arabs will excoriate his support for the Israelis.

But before the critics get too far into their act (and it might be noted that this is the only volume in history that had seven adverse reviews before the first chapter was written) they had better do their homework. It is one thing to attack Johnson for what he did; it is quite a different matter when he is assaulted for fictitious offenses. One hates to dwell on Vietnam—particularly when there are so many other fascinating topics in the book—but it does present the classic example of historical misrepresentation confronted by mere facts. There are five chapters in *The Vantage Point* on the course of our intervention in Southeast Asia, and it is fair to say that they make mincemeat out of the demonologists who have dominated the bookstalls these last few years.

Ironically, in the light of later events, Johnson's problem was that in 1964–65 he refused to fly with the hawks, while in 1967–68 he would not coo with the doves. At a time when all hands were gung-ho (in 1965 David Halberstam of *The New York Times*, later an ardent dove, wrote that South Vietnam was "pehaps one of only five or six nations in the world that are truly vital to U.S. interests," and Neil Sheehan, also of *The New York Times*, had already announced that the "fall of Southeast Asia because of an American defeat in Vietnam would amount to a strategic disaster of the first magnitude"), the President was extremely cautious. As *The Vantage Point* amply documents, he, Dean Rusk and Robert McNamara were trying to maintain a low silhouette, doing everything in their power to avoid a great power confrontation.

However, by 1967, partly because the President had never built Vietnam into a major crisis, the American people and a number of their elected spokesmen began to tire of a long march. Johnson, who had been preparing his defenses against a right-wing attack for what they called his "No Win" strategy—Goldwater had received 27 million votes in 1964—suddenly found himself flanked on the left by a weird combination of authentic pacifists, Hanoi hawks (who were rooting for the Communists), liberal isolationists who wanted to save the ghettos at the cost of abandoning the world, upper middle-class college students who felt that the authority principle was a violation of their uniqueness, and a few Southern Democrats who simply extrapolated their view of the Negro upon the non-whites of Southeast Asia.

What did the great "wheeler-dealer" do? Find out where the crowd was going so he could lead it? No. In a way that would be described as doggedly idealistic in another man, and which certainly can be designated non-political in the usual sense of the term, Lyndon Johnson stuck to his convictions. He was not going to start a general war; he was not going to "tuck tail and run." Between these two polar positions he labored—and anguished—day and night trying to end a war he never wanted in such a way that he could still look at himself in the mirror. He

failed to find the solution—perhaps because it never existed.

Like most of us, President Lyndon Johnson could not walk on the water. Unlike his critics, who specialize in 20-20 hindsight, he was approaching history head-on in search of decisions, not footnotes. *The Vantage Point* is the narrative of his journey, the candid analysis of a trip through the rapids by one of the most complex, most intelligent men I have ever known. The ultimate historical verdict on Johnson's stewardship is hidden in the future, but his book provides intriguing insight into the decisions and policies of a decade. At the fundamental level it is, paradoxically enough, the autobiography of a man who would rather be right than President.

MAIL IN THE SWAMP

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers have been taken for a gigantic and tragically costly ride by the Postal Service in connection with a bulk mail processing plant in New Jersey.

I call attention to some of the elements of this situation today because I understand the General Accounting Office is almost ready to issue a report on this boondoggle and because it will be explored shortly by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this bulk mail project in Jersey City, N.J., is shot through with blunders that border on criminal negligence, nonfeasance or malfeasance, or all three.

It contains one glaring conflict of interest and enough downright stupid mistakes to raise serious questions as to the capabilities of a number of high Postal Service officials.

Let me give you, as briefly as possible, an outline of what has gone on:

Postmaster General Winton Blount had barely taken his seat in 1969 when a crash program was ordered to build a gigantic bulk mail plant outside New York City. It was a crash program in the best sense of the word because the motto, as I will demonstrate, was damn the cost full speed ahead.

I understand, too, that the General Accounting Office investigation has been greatly hampered because there is no documentation of any sort concerning some important aspects of this matter.

It is known, however, that several sites around Jersey City were investigated. Indicative of the carelessness and worse that pervades this whole affair, the Postal Service never asked the price on a site that was originally recommended as the best available.

Before a site was chosen, former Assistant Postmaster General during the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Ormonde A. Kieb, was hired as a consultant. It is interesting to note that, after he left the Post Office Department in 1959, Mr. Kieb worked for the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad as a broker disposing of excess company property.

Shortly after Mr. Kieb was hired on September 19, 1969, the Postal Service field officer in New Jersey was ordered to meet with him to inspect two new sites not previously considered.

Subsequently, Mr. Kieb notified the owners of one of the potential sites that the Postal Service was no longer interested in the property, and he accompanied Postal Service officials in negotiations with the Penn Central for purchase of its property.

Now there was a basic flaw in this arrangement and perhaps that was why Penn Central, which owned most of this land, was willing to get rid of it. It is a swamp.

Of course, when you are hellbent to build a bulk mail plant which will demonstrate how efficient an operation you have, and when you are spending the public's money and not your own, building a plant on a swamp is not much of an obstacle. Permit me to demonstrate.

On March 11, 1970, the Government deposited $2,167,500 with the U.S. district court in Newark for the 144.5-acre tract. That was the appraised price, but the court will determine the final price to be paid.

The Postal Service then proceeded to pay $3.1 million for a fill on the property—$1 million more than the land cost.

It was then discovered that piling to support the planned building would cost $6.2 million.

Thus, before the Postal Service could even begin construction of the bulk mail plant, it had to spend $9.3 million to prepare the $2.1 million tract—which gives a true cost of this land of over $93,000 per acre.

That, Mr. Speaker, was just the beginning.

I understand that this picture is so clouded—perhaps deliberately so—that the General Accounting Office has not been able to discover who picked out the railroad property—the swamp—as the most desirable site.

At any rate, the number of pilings thought to be necessary were insufficient because the Postal Service did not bother to make sufficient tests to find out the depth of the swamp. When they did find out, the design of the piles had to be changed. The cost overrun here was $2.1 million, or more than 50 percent.

Moreover, the soil tests that were made were conducted before the precise location of the planned building was known, and some of the test borings were made outside the actual area of the building.

The Postal Service's excuse is that additional soil tests would not have been economical.

Having bought a swamp, Postmaster General Blount's handpicked efficiency experts proceeded to hire a firm of architects and engineers. They chose the firms of Lester B. Knight & Associates, Inc., and A. T. Kearney & Co. to compete for the job, but it is my understanding that they have been unable to satisfy the GAO as to why they deviated from normal procedure.

The Postal Service officials claimed they used an earlier survey which ranked 21 such firms according to their industrial engineering qualifications. Knight ranked No. 7 and Kearney ranked 12th, but the GAO understandably says that the industrial engineering improvement program involved in the survey was far more limited and significantly different than work calling for developing plans and designs for a totally new mail processing system.

I have it on reliable authority that, just as it could not discover who picked out the railroad-owned swamp, the GAO cannot determine why the Postal Service strayed so significantly from its normal procedures in selecting the architect-engineering firms for competition on this project.

At any rate, Kearney was paid $640,000 for its preliminary design work and the Knight firm was given a contract for $4.2 million for the final design and specifications.

Knight estimated the building itself would cost $42,605,300 but when the bids were opened a year ago this month the low bid was for $105 million.

This shocked even the Postal Service's experts so they rejected the bids and did what all bureaucrats love to do—hired a firm to make a study of what was wrong. Cost: $30,000.

Seven months later, in May of this year, new bids were accepted, calling for a general construction cost of $84.5 million and a mechanization contract in the amount of $997,775—a total of about $85.5 million.

This does not mean the cost was reduced from $105 million to $85.5 million, however, because the two amounts do not provide for the same things.

The new contracts extend the construction period by 9 months and sets back the completion date from November of this year to June of 1973. It also provides that the Corps of Engineers is to administer and coordinate the work of the contractors instead of the general contractor and this will cost an estimated $4.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, there is yet another aspect to this mess that must be brought out:

A key element in the success of this bulk mail plant and others like it being planned by the postal wizards, is the use of parcel sorting machines.

The Postal Service awarded a contract in the amount of $8.4 million to Speaker Sortation Systems, a division of A-T-O, Inc., for these machines.

It was awarded on a sole-source basis on the excuse that Speaker was the only company that could produce these machines without further development work and with only minor improvements.

This simply was not true, and Postal Service officials, I am advised, knew it was not true. As late as last month, according to the GAO, development and testing work on the machines was still going on.

The Speaker firm was recommended by Knight, the architectural firm that produced the $42.6 million building cost estimate. Knight supposedly made a survey of Speaker's capabilities, but the Postal Service has not been able to produce the survey.

The Postal Service itself made no effort whatsoever to find out whether the Speaker company could handle the contract before it awarded it and made no effort to determine whether the price quoted by Speaker was reasonable. The Postal Service's own auditors discovered later that the amount of the contract

was about 2.5 times the total sales of the company in each of the past 2 years.

This sudden windfall to Speaker can, perhaps, be explained by the presence in the hiearchy of the Postal Service of one George R. Cavell, Program Director of the Bulk Mail Processing Department.

Mr. Cavell was responsible for recommending that Speaker be given this lucrative, sole source contract.

It is highly interesting to note that just before Mr. Cavell came to the Postal Service he was employed by Speaker Sortation Systems as a management consultant.

It seems clear to me that certain persons in this Government, including Postmaster General Blount, should be interested in this obvious and blatant conflict of interest situation, especially when it is remembered that the Postal Service plans a network of 21 bulk mail plants, which would require large quantities of mail sorting equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the total cost of this swamp project was originally estimated to be $62.3 million—site, design, construction and mechanization. It now stands at $130.1 million. That is an increase of $67.8 million or approximately 109 percent.

In my opinion the public has been very badly used by Postmaster General Blount. There can be no excuse for such an incredible series of mistakes and worse.

The Congress and the American people were assured that by supporting the creation of the Postal Service we would be achieving real efficiency—true postal reform that would result in a business-like operation.

If this New Jersey project is an example of efficiency—and I fear that it is—then the citizens of the United States cannot afford it.

PEKING CAN BE BARRED FROM U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Peking's victory in the General Assembly may not have the same result in the United Nations Security Council. Nationalist China continues to be a member of the Security Council, Monday's action by the General Assembly not withstanding. A careful study of the U.N. Charter indicates Nationalist China cannot be driven out of the Security Council if it elects to use its own veto against any changes in the Council.

This may be the reason why Peking is withholding any announcement on when it will send a delegation to New York.

Unless the United Nations turns the world organization into mob rule and discards all principles of civilized behavior, the present U.N. rules will make it literally impossible to remove Nationalist China from the Security Council unless it leaves voluntarily. I invite my colleagues to read page 37466 of today's RECORD for further details.

The five charter members of the Security Council—and Nationalist China is one of them—need not be members of the General Assembly to serve in the Security Council.

Nationalist China has a "double veto" power and if she chooses to use it—according to U.N. experts—her ouster is literally impossible.

I have been told by international experts that Nationalist China can refuse to agree to consider the proposed switch in representatives as a procedural matter. If such a switch were to be treated as a procedural matter, the presiding chairman would need only nine votes in the Security Council to make the switch.

But once Nationalist China refuses to ratify the question as a procedural matter, it becomes a question of substance. In that case, Nationalist China, as one of the five permanent members in the Security Council, can exercise her veto under any proposed changes.

It appears then that Peking's hopes to assume a seat on the Security Council will be a good deal more difficult than the apparently easy victory Red China scored in the General Assembly.

At best, it appears that unless the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the entire body of the United Nations throw all laws and regulations to the wind and resort to mob rule, the legal thicket regarding the seating of Red China in the Security Council may be postponed for an indefinite period until the World Court at The Hague has handed down an opinion.

I believe it is incumbent upon the United States to insist that the provisions of the charter be strictly followed, and any departure from the charter should invoke a veto by the United States itself.

I know this is an extremely complicated matter and there will be those who will urge that we bypass and ignore U.N. regulations, but to do this will set a precedent which will make the U.N. a thoroughly paper organization with absolutely no standing in law.

The Nationalist Chinese Government has not as yet indicated whether it will exercise its rights in the Security Council, but if it does, it occurs to me that it will be sometime before Peking joins the United Nations.

CONSTITUTIONAL DOCTRINE OF SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decisions of 1962 and 1963 have quite obviously failed to quiet the perennial confusion over our constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state. This was evidenced by the extended debate in the Congress in 1964 and the renewal of this debate over the past few years on proposals for a constitutional amendment regarding prayers in public schools. The House will soon be confronted with this issue in the form of House Joint Resolution 191 which has recently been discharged from the House Judiciary Committee by petition.

In preparation for the final debate of this issue, I have researched both this amendment and its predecessors in the 88th Congress and have been singularly impressed by a rather surprising constant throughout the debate—the substantial opposition to any such amendment expressed by many of the recognized and responsible religious organizations across the country. The hearings before the House Judiciary Committee in April, May, and June of 1964 reads almost as a "Who's Who" in organized religion. And, today, with some sort of House action imminent, we again see a similar opposition force allied against passage of House Joint Resolution 191.

In addition to these noteworthy factors, there have been presented, by various sources, some rather enlightening analyses of the potential impact of the amendment, as currently worded—and I hasten to point out that no modifications of the amendment will be permitted on the floor. The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs has prepared a succinct view of the amendment in this light, and I here present it to this body for consideration:

The proposed amendment: "Nothing in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer." (H.J. Res. 191)

This Amendment would not be merely an addition to the First Amendment. It would be a serious alteration of the basic constitutional provision for "no establishment" and "free exercise" of religion.

The amendment prescribes the kind of prayer the people in public buildings have a right to pray—nondenominational prayers.

The amendment by indirection authorizes the government (a school board, principal, teacher, or some other official) to determine what is "nondenominational" prayer. This makes government a judge of theology and of prayer.

The amendment restricts the rights of the people it is supposed to protect. It could prescribe "nondenominational prayer" for hospitals, homes for the aged, other buildings supported in whole or in part through public funds, or even the chaplaincy.

This committee has also compared what the ruling of the Supreme Court did and did not say on the issue of prayer in public schools.

The Supreme Court did say this:

State composed and governmentally required prayers are a violation of the Constitution.

In this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government.

Governmentally sponsored or required devotions, such as Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer are unconstitutional.

The Bible and religion may be taught in public schools when presented objectively as part of the regular program of education.

The Supreme Court did not do this:

The Court did not prohibit school children from praying in school. It prohibited government from writing their prayers and sponsoring their devotions.

The Court did not put God out of the schools or out of public life in America. God is greater than either a Supreme Court decision or a constitutional amendment. He is not moved about like a chessman.

The Court did not express hostility to reli-

gion. "Nothing, of course, could be more wrong," the Court declared.

The Court did not establish a religion of secularism. It specifically said, "The state may not establish a 'religion of secularism' in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion."

The Court did not eliminate all religious expressions from public life. It said that the Declaration of Independence, patriotic hymns, and religious expressions in patriotic or ceremonial occasions are not prohibited by the ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize to this body the importance of broad public exposure in particular to the above analysis. My research and my mail reveal that the public at large may well be victims of misinformation on the particulars so precisely spelled out by this committee.

Other Members of this body have, as I have, given deep and thoughtful consideration to the issues raised in House Joint Resolution 191. To my mind, one of the more constructive groups formed has been the Congressional Committee To Preserve Religious Freedom. A rather revealing insight into the future we may face should this amendment be approved was placed in the RECORD by my good friend and colleague from California, Congressman CORMAN. In a word-by-word consideration, this group observes:

Representative Wylie's resolution reads as follows: "Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer."

We, as Americans, are already guaranteed the right to participate in prayer—nondenominational or denominational, and in buildings, public or private, and whether or not lawfully assembled. All this is now guaranteed to us under the free exercise clause of the First Amendment and none of it has been diminished by any opinions of the Supreme Court. Thus, the proposed amendment might actually serve to lessen our religious liberty rather than broaden it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and, as I noted earlier, I think most significant, the overwhelming opposition of major religious organizations has singularly impressed me. I close my remarks to this body today with a publication prepared by the National Council of Churches.

The publication follows:

WHY DO RELIGIOUS BODIES OPPOSE "PRAYER" AMENDMENT?

THREE BASIC REASONS

Most of the major religious bodies in the United States oppose any amendment to the Bill of Rights that would permit state-supervised prayers in public schools.

They oppose such an amendment for three basic reasons:

1. They are concerned about real, meaningful prayer. Prayer is the single, most direct expression of religious devotion. As such, it must be voluntary. Proposed amendments would subject prayer to government sponsorship and regulation, and this the churches cannot concede.

2. They are concerned about the rights of all—including minorities and non-theists—in a pluralistic society. Proposed amendments would infringe those rights by authorizing civil devotions that would inevitably be shaped by majority pressures. They would impose objectionable religious practices and expression on public schools which are already the center of community conflict and controversy. They would make religion the subject of divisiveness and antagonism rather than harmony and peace.

3. They are concerned about amending the Bill of Rights for the first time in the nation's history. The First Amendment has safeguarded religious liberty and other basic religious freedoms for nearly two centuries. If it can be amended now for this purpose without profound and careful consideration it may be easier to amend for other purposes.

National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

"The Supreme Court of the United States in the Regents' Prayer case has ruled that 'in this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the government.' We recognize the wisdom as well as the authority of this ruling. . . ."

"We express the conviction that the First Amendment to our Constitution in its present wording has provided the framework within which responsible citizens and our courts have been able to afford maximum protection for the religious liberty of all our citizens."

"The Churches and the Public Schools," adopted by the General Board, June 7, 1963.

The United Methodist Church

"Public schools may not properly establish any preferred form of religion for common exercises of worship or religious observances or study. . . ."

"A Statement Concerning Church-Government Relations and Education," adopted by the General Conference, May 1968.

"We . . . request the Congress of the United States to retain the historic relation between Church and State and to oppose H.J. Res. 191 and any other proposed prayer amendment to the Constitution."

Statement by the General Board of Christian Social Concerns, October, 1971.

The Episcopal Church

". . . Whereas, We believe that worship and religious education are the responsibility of Church and home, and not of the public schools or governmental institutions . . ., therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church record its considered opinion that amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America which seek to permit devotional exercises in our public schools should be opposed."

The National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, May 27, 1964.

The Lutheran Church in America

"The Constitution should not be amended except to achieve large and important public needs and purposes consistent with the basic nature of our constitutional system. The current proposals for constitutional amendment do not meet these standards. Parents, churches and school authorities would be better advised to direct their efforts to programs for study of religion and the Bible in the public schools . . . rather than to seek constitutional sanctions for devotional exercises in public schools that have at most a minimal religious value, which invite the intrusion of sectarian influences into the public school system, risk the violation of the rights of religious freedom and are a potential source of conflict in the community."

Second Biennial Convention, July 1964.

American Lutheran Church

"Proposals are now pending before the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution in order to give constitutional sanction to certain types of religious practices in public institutions and in the public life. . . .

"We believe that it would be unwise for the Congress to give its approval to any such amendment . . . We . . . recognize . . . that in the end religion suffers and religious liberty in its fullness is threatened when government uses the power of its laws and the public school program to prescribe an official faith. . . ."

—From "A Statement Commended by the Church" by the Second General Convention, Oct. 26, 1964.

The Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod

"The Board of Parish Education of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, feels that the Dirksen (prayer) Amendment fails to recognize fully the religious pluralism of the American scene. We believe that Christians cannot join with non-Christians in addressing God in circumstances that deny Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. We believe likewise that non-Christians should neither be expected to participate in Christian prayer nor should they expect Christians to join them in prayers that deny Christ."

"The concept of voluntary participation in prayer provides either a coercive force or an embarrassing situation for both Christians and non-Christians. Under these circumstances we believe that it is best for the public school not to engage in prayer or other religious worship exercises."

—The Board of Parish Education, July 29, 1966.

The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

"Religious observances (should) never be held in a public school or introduced into the public school as part of its program . . . Bible reading and prayers as devotional acts (in public schools) tend toward indoctrination or meaningless ritual and should be omitted for both reasons."

—"Relations between Church and State in the United States of America," adopted by the 175th General Assembly, May 1963.

The Southern Baptist Convention

"Baptists had much to do with the writing of the First Amendment into the Constitution of the United States and have been in the forefront of preserving the religious liberty that our nation has enjoyed.

"We appeal to the Congress of the United States to allow the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States to stand as our guarantee of religious liberty, and we oppose the adoption of any further amendment to that Constitution respecting an establishment of religion or respecting free exercise thereof.

—Resolution adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention, May 22, 1964, reaffirmed June 2, 1971.

The United Church of Christ

The Executive Council of the United Church of Christ supports the Supreme Court decision banning prescribed prayers and prescribed Bible reading in the public schools, calls attention to the aspect of the Supreme Court decision which affirmed the freedom of the schools to engage in the study of religion and opposes House Joint Resolution 191 which seeks to amend the United States Constitution.

—Resolution by the Executive Council of the United Church of Christ, Oct. 12, 1971.

Christianity today

"We think that passage of this amendment would be a mistake. For one thing, persons already can and do voluntarily assemble for prayer in public buildings. . . .

"Secondly, this amendment is hardly the way to promote a revival of true religion. . . . Genuine piety is fostered not by government. . . but by families and individuals who practice reverence for God and obedience to him in all their activities and associations. . . .

"Finally, this amendment leaves open the possibility for some to assert that denominational prayer should not be permitted in public buildings. . . . Youth groups such as Campus Life or Inter-Varsity should be able to meet in schools for explicitly Christian prayers without fear that misguided authority

will say only groups praying in a way that is acceptable to all religions are now constitutional."

—Editorial, Oct. 8, 1971, page 32.

The American Baptist convention

"An amendment to permit compulsory Bible reading and prayer in the public schools is not only a danger to the freedom of nonbelievers, it is also a threat to the religious well-being of the believer. It is because of a deep respect for worship, and the recognition that prayer is essential and should be a vital encounter between man and God, that Baptists oppose devotional exercises that are more rote than worship. Therefore we affirm our belief in the separation of church and state as written in the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States."

—Resolution adopted by the American Baptist Convention, May 22, 1964.

The Roman Catholic Church

On June 16, 1964, the then National Catholic Welfare Conference issued a press release which stated:

"The Legal Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is very cautious toward the present interest of some in amending the Constitution in the manners now proposed to overcome recent judicial decisions precluding prayer and Bible reading in public schools. . . .

"The Department continues to believe that the present clauses in the Constitution are of incalculable benefit to religion. . . . In combination, the 'free exercise' and 'no establishment' clauses are guarantees too vital to be tampered with lightly. . . ."

America Magazine, Jesuit Weekly

"Reconciling the rights of all parents and students with respect to religion in public schools is a serious, difficult problem. It should not be trifled with by passage of this . . . ill-written, mischievous, and misconceived . . . amendment."

—Editorial, Oct. 23, 1971

The Christian Century

"The proposed amendment would be a step toward a lowest-common-denominator culture-religion . . . which would endanger true religion as well as civil liberties by equating religious ideas and practices with national culture and patriotism.

"Prayer is an act of worship, not a gimmick for cranking up the academic or civic machinery. . . . Acts of worship cannot be divorced from real historical commitments without endangering the vitality of the religion or religions involved."

—Editorial, Oct. 20, 1971.

Synagogue Council of America, and National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council

"Our Constitution can, of course, be amended . . . but . . . if the Constitution is amended . . . then let no one who supports this measure delude himself or his countrymen that he has rendered religion or liberty a service. In a plural society, it is not and should not be the business of government to aid religion and if it does assume that role, then, in the very process and precedent it establishes, it does religion a harm and disservice that will far outweigh the intended benevolence. For it will have compromised that free and unfettered exercise of religious liberty without which religious faith cannot for long retain its integrity and independence.

"Our profound respect for the role of our legislature and for the sacrificial desire of its members to serve the common good leads us to say to members of this Committee: Your business is not the promotion of religion. It is rather the preservation of a free and just society, for that, and nothing other and nothing less, offers the surest safeguard for the preservation and strengthening of our religious heritage."

—Statement before Senate Judiciary Committee, August 8, 1966 by the Synagogue Council of America and the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council. (Approved and adopted joint testimony by all of the constituent organizations of both bodies.)

STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CONSTITUTINAL PRAYER AMENDMENTS

The undersigned national religious organizations and leaders express their united opposition to S.J. Res. 191, now pending in the House of Representatives, and to other similar proposals for constitutional amendments to authorize "nondenominational" prayer in public buildings. We express the long-standing official positions of the nation's religious faiths which affirm the adequacy of the First Amendment to protect religious interests and to ensure religious rights.

The major faiths themselves have never been able to achieve consensus on a definition of prayer, much less a definition of "nondenominational" prayer. We deny that any elected body or governmental authority has the right to determine either the place or the content of prayer, as is implied in the proposed constitutional prayer amendment. To authorize government by a constitutional amendment to intervene in the sacred privilege of prayer, long enshrined in the character and tradition of our nation, is to make of government a judge of theology and an administrator of religious practice. If such a proposed amendment should become a part of the Constitution of the United States, a new religion of "nondenominationalism" would in a measure become established which could destroy the integrity of both church and state.

The proposed constitutional amendment would introduce divisiveness into our national life and among the institutions of religion. Ostensibly proposed in behalf of religion, it would paradoxically proscribe and distort freedom of religious expression.

If the proposed prayer amendment should become a part of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights would have been amended for the first time in our nation's history. Such an amendment would open the doors for governmental intrusion into the religious affairs of the people. This we protest.

On the other hand, we affirm the right of school children or any other segment of the population to engage voluntarily in their own prayers without government authorization or supervision. This right is adequately protected by the First Amendment as it now stands. For this reason we also affirm the wisdom of the Supreme Court decisions in 1962 and 1963 which properly prohibited government intrusion into the religious activity of school children.

We therefore respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to preserve the religion clauses of the First Amendment intact and to oppose any and all prayer amendments to the Constitution.

Dr. W. Hubert Porter, Associate General Secretary, American Baptist Convention, American Ethical Union, American Humanist Association.

Rev. Warren R. Magnuson, General Secretary, Baptist General Conference, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, The Church of the Brethren, Executive Council of the Episcopal Church, Friends Committee on National Legislation, General Board of Christian Social Concerns, The United Methodist Church, Mennonite Central Committee—Peace Section.

Dr. Joseph H. Jackson, President, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Rev. G. K. Zimmerman, Executive Secretary, North American Baptist General Conference, Joint Advisory Committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, consisting of: American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith—Anti-Defamation League, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans of the USA, National Council of Jewish Women, Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbinical Council of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, and 85 state, county, and local Jewish Community Councils.

Rev. Richard J. Niebanck, Secretary for Social Concerns, Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America, Office of Church and Society, Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Dr. S. S. Hodges, Executive Secretary, Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

Rev. Alton L. Wheeler, General Secretary, Seventh Day Baptist General Conference.

Dr. Carl E. Bates, President, Southern Baptist Convention, Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ, Unitarian Universalist Association.

Dr. William P. Thompson, Stated Clerk, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Mrs. Marcus Rohlfs, President, American Baptist Convention.

CRONKITE INTERVIEW OF YUGOSLAV PRESIDENT TITO—MISREPRESENTATION SHOULD BE CORRECTED

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 26, 1971 at 10:30 p.m., I had occasion to view an interview between Walter Cronkite and Yugoslav President Josip Broz Tito. This interview left me perplexed as well as disturbed.

At the beginning of the interview, Mr. Cronkite introduced President Tito as the last leader alive among those who helped bring about the allied victory in World War II. He—Mr. Cronkite—stated that Tito and his partisans were instrumental in fighting the Germans during this period. Such a misrepresentation of the truth seems totally inconceivable to me.

The average American would accept this statement as fact. However, the news media has an obligation to clarify this abstraction. Certainly, Tito's partisans fought the Nazis, but why? It is obvious that he would because their objectives were at opposite poles. However, this action does not make him any less of a Communist. His efforts were aimed at the Nazis, but his purpose was to establish his own regime, a Communist controlled state.

The United States today is making great overtures to Yugoslavia because of its so-called nonalined status. But how nonalined is it in reality? Certainly, Tito did buck Moscow's control and his years in power have brought some measure of prosperity to Yugoslavia. But, does this excuse his bloody rise to power? Can his present status enable him to number himself among those who struggled against oppression? No, I do not think so.

We must remember that whether or

not he is alined with Moscow, he is and remains a Communist leader and to picture him as anything else is so far from the truth as to appear hypocritical.

Thousands of anti-Fascist, anti-Communist Yugoslavs were massacred to put Tito in power. What of them? Are they to be forgotten and their former foe pictured as a champion against German atrocity? One of the main reasons why Tito's partisans were able to succeed in Yugoslavia during the war was due to a lack of proper information concerning the facts as they were, and here we are more than 25 years later still misrepresenting what occurred.

The media bears a responsibility here to present the facts as they are and we Americans need to be cognizant of the situation. We pour aid into Yugoslavia and we seem to court its favors, but the time has come to ask ourselves, why?

PROMISES, PROMISES—IT IS TIME TO PERFORM

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the farm vote was crucial to candidate Richard Nixon in 1968, and he got it, partially because he went to Des Moines, Iowa, in September of that year and declared that 74 percent of parity prices for farm products was "intolerable."

He promised that his administration would do better.

It has not. It has done much worse. The parity index is now running below 70—considerably under 74.

Now another election is approaching when the farm vote will be crucial. The administration's set-aside farm program has already failed miserably. We have a harvest so bountiful that Thanksgiving Day, 1971, instead of being a day of rejoicing for the Lord's bounty, will be a day of worry and distress in thousands upon thousands of farm homes where this year's grain crop has brought on huge surpluses and low farm prices are forcing them into tough times, increasing debt—or off the land entirely.

What is the administration's response?

The response is an even more cynical performance than the unkept promise of 1968 to "do better" than 74 percent of parity.

Farmers need help right now. But the administration apparently feels that that is unnecessary; that something for farmers in election year will suffice. So they have told grain farmers:

> Next year we have a better deal for you.
>
> We've earmarked another $600 million to $800 million of Treasury money to dole out to you somewhere around August, 1972, 90 days before the next Presidential election.

They did not say that they are doing anything this year—they have opposed an increase in price support loans on the 1971 crop now selling at disastrous prices.

Nor did they say that they would amend or abandon the tragic set-aside law, or make their extra payments on a permanent basis. Their proposal is for election year only—1972.

I have called the suggestion cynical for it is typical of the "Hey, Rube" view of farmers—throw them a little extra something at election time and they are in the bag.

If the administration believes that it can buy the farm vote by ameliorating the effect of their disastrous farm program for just 1 year—ignoring the hardships now, paying out the major part of an extra billion dollars next year, and then letting the set-aside resume its economic destruction in 1973—I believe Mr. Nixon needs a whole complement of new farm advisers.

The administration feed grain program for 1972 is like prescribing a delayed action aspirin tablet for pernicious economic anemia; it will not keep the patient from dying; it will only relieve his suffering just long enough in 1972 to get to the polls.

The "Hey, Rube" concept is of a foolish, gullible character who bites on the same MO—method of operation—every time.

But American farmers do not do it. They need relief now, and they are going to remember in 1972 whether or not they got it.

The tragedy for the corn and other grain farmers of America is not that they are going to be offered a bribe in 1972. The tragedy is that the Department of Agriculture refuses to move now to bolster sagging grain markets, and that it refuses to consider a permanent cure.

The Department proposes to spend an extra $600 to $800 million next year to reduce the corn crop to around 4.6 billion bushels. The cost runs about dollar for dollar cost/benefit.

I have a bill before the House Agriculture Committee that the Department itself estimates to cost $242 million in additional loan funds, and $39 million in additional net cash outlay for export payments.

It would raise the price support level 20 cents per bushel on our 5.4-billion-bushel corn crop and put $1,080,000,000 more into farmers' pockets from this year's corn crop alone. It would also—for the same sum of money—increase the price support level on our 1.6-billion-bushel wheat crop 26 cents a bushel and increase farm return thereby by more than $400 million. It would mean another $200 million return to producers of grain sorghum.

For $39 million cash and $241 in loans, we would get nearly $1¾ billion more farm income. The cost/benefit ratio is far more than 6 to 1; measured against the net cash outlay—which omits the loan money—it is almost 40 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point a memorandum prepared for me, from figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture, on the cost of getting grain farmers some substantial relief now—not in the 1972 election year, but now.

It would help the whole economy for it would be real income that would be spent for goods and services, supplies and machinery, creating business opportunities and jobs all along the line into our industrial cities.

Instead of proposing an increase in 1971 price support loans, the Secretary of Agriculture on October 18 proposed to increase direct payments in 1972 to try to bolster up his broken-down, set-aside scheme and get money to producers just before the 1972 election—none before then, and none in the years after 1972.

COSTS OF 25 PERCENT PRICE SUPPORT LOAN BOOST*

The Department of Agriculture calculates the cost of increasing price support loans on wheat and feed grains at $281 million, of which $242 million would be loan money by 25% and $39 million would be additional export subsidy money.

Figures go like this:

[In millions]

Grain Sorghum, additional loan on portion put under loan	$29
Corn, additional loan on portion put under loan (about 10% only)	113
Wheat, additional loan on portion put under loan	100
Total added loans	242
Wheat, additional export subsidies	199
Savings on certificates	160
Net cash outlay	39
Total additional outlay	281

The administration's 1972 feed grain program will require a complying farmer to put 25 percent of his base acres into a conserving practice such as soil building crops or grass. For doing that he will receive a payment in the case of corn amounting to 40 cents times one-half the number of bushels of his production. This payment was 32 cents in 1971. He can receive another payment, not offered in 1971, if he agrees to "set aside" another 10 percent of his base acres. This payment would be 52 cents multiplied by the average bushel yield for each of these additional acres kept out of crop production and again put into a conservation plan.

The Secretary is leaving himself a third option, to be decided by mid-March, to offer yet an additional "set aside" acreage payment based on the 52 cents per bushel figure in order to bring total acreage diversion to 38 million acres.

These additional payments are estimated by the Department to total somewhere between $600 and $800 million. For those farmers who comply, their checks will be issued, the Secretary says, shortly after next July 1. Their "set aside" goal is 38 million acres, but if there is a normal feed grain crop pro-

* This data assumes that the price of corn will not go below $1.03 national average and that the 32¢ advance payment on corn already made will be the full and final payment.

National average corn price was reported as $1.11 per bu. on Sept. 15. It was $1.02 in Iowa. H.R. 8290 *could* mean further savings to USDA *if* corn goes under $1.03 and they have to make more payment. The higher loan would keep the price over $1.03 for sure.

duction year in 1972 the best the Department can hope for is total year end stocks that only add slightly to the surplus. Corn stocks in particular would continue to be in surplus, possibly as high as 800 million bushels.

The Secretary's big payments plan is the most expensive possible means of "buying" compliance.

The time has come when there must be new, higher price support loan levels established for grain farmers. Other major grain producing countries support prices for their grain farmers and it is time that we revise our sights in line with the increased costs that farmers have experienced. There is adequate indication that not only is this necessary for the sake of the agricultural economy but it would likely save tax money as compared to Secretary Hardin's recent announcement of his 1972 plans. That, it seems to me, would be better politics than the game the administration is playing by allowing the sharp grain market drops to occur and then proposing to heavily augment payments after next July. The drop in the market price for this year and subsequent crops will be a much greater loss for the farmers than the "sweetener" being offered in the increased payments.

A review of some of the pertinent facts about our farm programs is now in order.

Thirty months ago Secretary Hardin began to approach Congress on the farm program to be enacted in 1970. He candidly testified to the Agriculture Committee in 1969 that 300,000 to 400,000 farmers could quit farming and join the welfare rolls under the President's new welfare plan. That plan is still not adopted but the decline in numbers of farmers has continued.

At the Monday evening meetings with the House Agriculture Committee the Secretary and members of his staff badgered for a cheap-grain farm program, allegedly to sell more American grain in world trade. They got that kind of a bill. A world-wide shortage of grain during 1970 did allow for an expansion of our grain sales abroad—but at considerably higher prices than the administration's farm experts had estimated.

This year, with world grain supplies high, American grain farmers are facing depressed prices in what could lead to a serious farm depression.

The administration's "set aside program," the slogan for their 1970 Farm Act, has not only failed to protect the income of American grain farmers, it has resulted in excess production which has ruined prices. At every stage during the lengthy procedures in writing and passing the 1970 act, the administration opposed protective grain price floors. They were successful to the point that the bill, when finally approved, allowed for loan rates at the discretion of the Secretary down to $1.00 per bushel on corn and $1.25 per bushel on wheat.

Historically, the loan rates on grains provide a floor under the market. Secretary Hardin chose to establish the loan rates at minimal figures paid a decade or two ago, although costs have mounted steadily.

Rather than coolly proposing a weak but expensive plan for next year the administration should accept the need to bolster the grain markets now.

In the absence of such action, Congress must take the initiative. We have bills in the House Agriculture Committee to create a strategic reserve which will take some of the supply pressure off the market, and to increase price support loan levels of 25 percent above minimum this year.

The Senate Agriculture Committee starts hearings on the same bills on November 10.

Unless the administration—which has so far opposed them—reverses its position and acts under existing authority to do the same things before Congress can direct it, then we should enact the measures without delay.

Unkept promises and election year payoffs are not enough.

Farmers must have improved incomes now, and assurance that they will be permanent, not just 1-year vote-bait.

ON SPAIN IN NATO

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent that the people of Spain deserve more recognition and appreciation from the United States than they are receiving. This Congress should take especial note of the role of this fine nation in the defense posture of the United States, and of the free world.

It is a matter of particular concern that since the birth of NATO following World War II, Spain has been denied membership in that body largely because of a conflict of ideology and animosities of long standing expressed by some of the Scandinavian nations.

Despite this, however, Spain has stood alongside the United States and other NATO nations and has shouldered a massive share of the burden for the defense of Europe and the security of the Mediterranean. It is significant that the presence of Spain has served as an important balance against the growing Soviet presence in Africa and the Mediterranean.

Without hesitation, the Spanish Government has, by its positive position helped to safeguard the vital Straits of Gibraltar, the western end of the Mediterranean Sea, and the Atlantic sealanes providing oil and minerals for Europe and the United States.

Now, with the obvious effort on the part of the Soviets to extend their influence into the northern tier of African nations, Spain's position—strategically located some 8 miles from Africa itself—is an irreplaceable link in the security of that important area of the world.

The United States has negotiated agreements with Spain for the use of air and naval bases. But this falls far short of what could be accomplished if Spain were to become a member of NATO.

A glance at the map points up the importance of Spain to the defense of Europe. NATO is, in fact, a loose alliance of nations divided by geography.

Along the north are those nations most commonly thought of as being a part of NATO—Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, and Great Britain. These are the countries which would bear the thrust of a Russian advance and from the days of World War II, it has been the Russian threat to northern Europe that preoccupied most observers.

In recent years, it has become increasingly apparent that the critical area for the defense of the free world may be in southern Europe, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Turkey loom large in any calculations about the future defense of the free world. Spain is the anchor of this line and Spain, with its strategic location, is not a member of NATO.

Spain is capable of contributing significantly to NATO. She has a standing armed force of 280,000 seasoned, well-trained men. But, even more, Spain has a willingness to participate in the common defense which is sadly lacking in some of the NATO nations at this time.

Spain has been a good friend to the United States. Four important U.S. military bases there include air bases and one of the most important navy bases available to the United States in the Mediterranean.

But Spain needs more than U.S. agreements to become fully active in her own defense and that of her neighbors. She needs expanded understanding with her neighbor states. Such understanding which can be accomplished through NATO will help provide for the defense of Western Europe at a time when this is becoming increasingly critical. It is more than a little significant that Spain is one of the strongest of the anti-Communist nations today. Spain simply does not tolerate that kind of "ism."

In short, Mr. Speaker, Spain is needed as a partner in NATO to help carry the burden of mutual defense for the democracies. I believe Spain is willing to help. I believe Spain wants to help.

The United States and other NATO nations should welcome Spain into that organization. Spain should have the opportunity to become a full-fledged NATO partner. The free world needs Spain's invaluable assistance. Time is fleeting. Action should be taken now. The United States should insist that Spain be invited to become a member of NATO.

EXPULSION OF NATIONALIST CHINA FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is in-

deed a sad day, not alone for the United States, but for the forces of freedom and justice in the world in general. The action taken in the United Nations General Assembly on Monday, admitting the Communist Chinese Government in Peking to full membership, and expelling the free Republic of China, was a slap in the face of the United States. That slap was administered not merely by the forces of communism, but by many of our friends who have received vast economic, military, and moral support from us in the past and continue to do so to this very day.

Many are saying that this tells us something about our position on the China question—that, if even our best friends oppose us, perhaps we should consider whether or not we have been wrong in seeking to keep Red China out, and maintaining the position of the Republic of China as the true Government of China. When I hear such talk, I am reminded of the deep wisdom of a snatch of familiar poetry, which goes, "If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs—you'll be a man my son."

When the principles of the United Nations are flouted, and the procedural rules twisted or ignored in order to bring into the United Nations a criminal government—one with a long record of political annihilations and atrocities against its neighbors, a nation whose leaders have expressed their contempt for the organization, and the principles it represents, and who have never even made an official request to be admitted—when such a nation is seated, and a charter member of the organization, which has always conducted its affairs peacefully and honorably is thrown out, then it is clear that men and nations have, indeed, lost their heads.

If this action tells us anything, it tells us that we cannot buy friends and we should reassess, not only our support of the United Nations, but our foreign aid programs as well.

The really tragic thing about this action is that, in my opinion, we should have been able to see it coming. I pointed out in a speech shortly before the vote was taken how our State Department had, by its interpretation of the legal and procedural status of the matter, permitted the issue to be taken up in the General Assembly, where we were most likely to lose, rather than keeping it in the Security Council, where it belonged, and where we not only had a better chance to win, but the right to exercise our veto.

We knew full well that the Peking regime was unwilling to accept membership so long as Taiwan was represented in the U.N. And every delegation from every other member nation knew Peking's position.

In view of the fact that we had opposed seating Peking every year since the U.N. was founded, it should have been clear to anyone, that as soon as we changed our stance in favor of admitting Peking, we were signalling our willingness to see Taiwan ousted, since dual membership was known to be unacceptable to Peking, and thus a vote to seat her without expelling Taiwan would be a futile gesture, and one which would be politically costly to many small, nonalined nations. Our position was doomed from the moment it was announced, and all the official statements to the contrary, notwithstanding, I find it difficult to understand how anyone could have believed otherwise.

I agree with Secretary of State Rogers that the United Nations "will be damaged" by this action. I believe the United Nations has made some useful contributions to world peace in the past and has provided valuable services to the poor, the sick and the refugees of our world. But its potential for good will be seriously undermined by the presence of a new disruptive force like Red China.

More importantly, this action results in a potential for serious danger to the United States, for we are now in the position of having to accept into our country a mission from this dedicatedly communist nation. I find it difficult to believe that the members of such a mission will not be trained propagandists and revolutionaries, or that they will confine their operations to the United Nations. To put it bluntly, we have invited Communist spies inside our borders, cloaked in the respectability and immunity of "diplomats."

I agree, too, with Secretary Rogers, that we have spent too much money on the U.N. in the past—that "we have probably contributed more than our share." But I cannot agree with his view that we should not cut back our support to the United Nations. A very great deal has been said in this country about "one man, one vote." Not only is representation in the United Nations outrageously unfair, in terms of the one-man, one-vote philosophy, but it has been equally unfair in terms of one man, $1. There may be nothing we can do about achieving fairer representation, but there is no reason why we should continue our grossly disproportionate share of the financial support for an organization in which we are inadequately represented, and which consistently acts against our best interest and defies the principles of freedom, peace and honor among nations, on which it is supposed to be based.

Two-thirds of the countries represented in the United Nations have less population than Taiwan—indeed, many have less population than my own congressional district. Yet they all have one vote. The U.S.S.R., which is more comparable to the United States in population, has, for all practical purposes, three votes. Nevertheless, many countries, both large and small, are woefully in arrears in paying their share of the cost of the organization while we regularly bail it out by paying more than our share. For example, the United States currently pays 31.52 percent of the U.N.'s regular budget—and an even larger percent of the budget of the U.N. specialized agencies such as UNESCO and WHO—while the U.S.S.R. pays only 14.18 percent. The entire European Communist bloc, in fact, pays only 19.28 percent. Albania, which sponsored the motion expelling Taiwan, pays only 0.04 percent while Taiwan, the expellee, pays 4 percent, or 100 times as much.

It is my firm belief that we must make it emphatically clear that we will not stand by and be walked over, in the fashion the majority of the U.N.'s members apparently—and justifiably—assume we will, on the basis of our past and present behavior. We owe it to ourselves to do so. But more importantly, we owe it to our allies, like Japan, Australia, the Philippines and others who have stood by us at great political cost to themselves. This action by the U.N. may well bring down the government of Premier Sato in Japan, and the present conservative government in Australia. If it does, they will be replaced with socialist governments that will unquestionably be less favorable toward the United States.

There is no honor, there is no justice, there is no wisdom and there is, to be perfectly blunt, no sense in our assuming a posture of weakness, a posture which undercuts our friends and rewards our enemies, merely for the sake of perpetuating a world organization which goes out of its way to insure its own increasing ineffectiveness.

It is on this basis, and for these reasons, that I have joined in sponsoring H.R. 11166, calling for a reduction of our financial support of the U.N., to a level proportionate to our relative population. This would reduce our support to approximately 10 percent. If the U.N. is to survive such action on our part it would require nations like the U.S.S.R., who are greatly in arrears, to pay up. It would also require Red China, with its population of 800 million people, to pay rather well for its recent success.

I do not view this as retaliation. I view it as a long overdue action, and one which the General Assembly's most recent insult more than justifies. It is far past time for the irresponsible members of this world body to shape up or ship out. A reduction in U.S. support, to our fair share, will require a conscious decision by such members as to whether they will give the U.N. the support and cooperation it needs to be effective, or whether they prefer to continue playing silly games, and trading insults at someone else's expense, and thereby bring about the demise of the United Nations. Either way, I cannot conceive but that the result would be preferable to the situation as it presently exists.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in its vote to expel Taiwan from the United Nations, that organization has rejected both of the bases upon which it might successfully have existed in the world. On the one hand, it rejected the mandates of its own charter by admitting into membership a government which has, ever since it illegally assumed power in 1949, expressed its contempt for the peace-loving mission of the very organization

which has, ever since it illegally assumed power in 1949, expressed its contempt for the peace-loving mission of the very organization which has now admitted it to membership. On the other hand, it has turned its back upon the concept of universality. While universality is not mentioned in the charter, and should be rejected since the United Nations is meant to include only peace-loving nations and not all nations, still this has been the primary argument used by many in this country and elsewhere for the seating of the Peking regime. But if all countries, regardless of their allegiance, are to be members of the United Nations, what justification exists for the expulsion of the government of Taiwan, representing 14 million people, more people than two-thirds of existing United Nations members?

It is clear that in this single vote admitting Peking and expelling Taiwan, the United Nations has rejected both its own charter and the concept of universality. What remains is simply a political body in which power dominates, in which the Soviet Union brazenly casts three votes, with the Ukraine and Byelorussia recognized as sovereign states despite the fact that they are intrinsic parts of the U.S.S.R., and that the United States casts a single vote yet pays for 36 percent of the body's expenses.

The vote in the United Nations is also a disappointment because many countries who are allegedly our allies voted to expel the Taiwan government. Not one member of NATO, supposedly an organization dedicated to fighting Communist aggression, voted to support the mandates of the United Nations Charter. They voted against a government which has observed the dictates of the charter, which has been an honorable member of the community of nations, and which stands ready to assist other free nations in combating Communist expansion and imperialism. Are the members of NATO serious in standing firm against aggression, or do they view this alliance simply as a means by which the United States assumes the burden, financial as well as otherwise, of their defense? If this is the case, the Congress should seriously reassess the nature of our alliances and should discover whether these alliances involve responsibilities and obligations only on the part of the United States, or whether other members, those who are primarily beneficiaries, also have responsibilities and obligations.

In the long run, the vote in the United Nations marks the end of that body as one which can command the respect of those who truly seek a world at peace. To admit Mao Tse-tung and the Peking leadership into the United Nations is as great an act of cynicism as to have permitted Hitler and Mussolini to join the League of Nations at the very moment when they were taking the world to war.

Such acts of cynicism, however, are frequent in man's often ignoble history. The United Nations ideal was a noble, if unrealistic one. The vote to admit Peking and expel Taiwan is proof of its unrealism. The United States, if it is to avoid the naivete of those who had faith in the League of Nations rather than in their own ability to maintain peace and order, must reconsider its relationship with the United Nations on all levels.

There are now 131 United Nations members with a total population of 2,724,000,000. Our own population is 207.1 million, which is 7.6 of the total. The total United Nations budget is $966,500,000 and the total U.S. contribution for 1970 was $300,684,000. The anticipated U.S. contribution for 1971 is $335,443,000. According to the Legislative Reference Service of the Congress this represents a contribution of 36.05 percent. By any standard, our own Government is contributing to the United Nations out of all proportion to its population.

In his annual report for 1969–70 Secretary of State William Rogers notes that—

> For the first time in the history of the United Nations, the United States at the 1970 General Assembly did not vote for the U.S. Budget. We abstained on the 1971 budget of $192.1 million because of its unusually large increase of 14 percent, including an 8 percent pay increase for professionals in the Secretariat, which we considered excessive.

I agree with Secretary of State Rogers that the United Nations budget has increased in an excessive manner. More than this, our own contribution has been far out of proportion to our size, especially when considering the fact that other nations, such as the U.S.S.R. and France, have continually refused to pay for any United Nations actions with which they have disagreed.

Since the United Nations has decided to abandon the mandates of its own charter by admitting Communist China and expelling the Nationalist Chinese Government of Taiwan, our own contribution to this body should reflect its changed nature.

To achieve this end, I have introduced legislation which would limit the U.S. contribution to the United Nations to 7.6 percent of the total, the same percentage of the world's population which we possess. This would make our contribution $77,320,000, a saving of nearly $260 million.

Our country has no obligation to pay 36 percent of the budget of an organization which has abandoned the principles for which it was created. To do so would be working against our own interests and against the interests of peace and freedom, the very interests for which the United Nations was established. Taking the action which my bill calls for thus affirms the traditional goals of the United Nations, goals which too many of its member nations seem to have abandoned and forgotten.

STEIGER OF WISCONSIN INTRODUCES 4-DAY, 40-HOUR-WEEK BILL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Walsh-Healey Act of 1936 and the Contract Works Hours Standards Act of 1962. The purpose of this legislation is to permit companies to switch to a 4-day, 40-hour workweek without having to compensate workers for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in 1 day.

The concept of the 4-day workweek is still in its infancy stage. However, companies that have undertaken such a schedule have indicated that employee morale, absenteeism, and productivity have improved since the introduction of the 4-day workweek. It is still too early to tell how much such factors as productivity would be improved by such a program, but further experimentation should be encouraged in order to determine if this scheme can assist in the effort to revitalize our economy.

Specifically, the bill would allow firms with Government contracts exceeding $10,000 to restructure their workweek to a 4-day schedule while avoiding the increased cost of a longer workday. Senator MARLOW COOK has taken the initiative on this legislation in the Senate, and I am pleased that I have been joined in cosponsoring this legislation by the following members of the Education and Labor Committee: Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. QUIE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ERLENBORN, and Mr. ESCH. I am including several articles for the RECORD which describe some of the problems and benefits which the 4-day workweek poses:

CAN THE 4-DAY WEEK WORK?

Is the four-day week inevitable? To find out what the nation's business leaders think about a subject that is being much bandied about these days, Dun's went to some of the men who will have to make the actual decision: the 300 corporate presidents and chairmen who make up its President's Panel.

The majority of Dun's panelists agree that some kind of shortened workweek is the wave of the future for Americans. As President Richard L. Gelb of Bristol-Myers Co. puts it: " 'Inevitable' seems somewhat strong. But we predict that more and more companies will experiment with variations of the four-day week."

But this does not mean the chief executives are ready to see their companies change over to a ten-hour, four-day work schedule. Their overwhelming warning to industry: Go slow. For the implications of such change in work habits throughout industry, they say, are a lot more serious and far-reaching than either labor or business has bothered to think about, at least so far. And right now, at least, they are doubtful of the economic benefits of the four-day week for both their companies and employees.

Some of their questions: Can employees be as productive and efficient working ten hours a day rather than eight? Will companies be penalized in terms of overtime pay and other such employee benefits? Will labor allow management flexibility in work schedules to insure optimum production? What will be the overall effect on the economy?

For the most part, top management points out, research into the subject has been limited to the effects of the four-day week on small, independent firms. By now, employees in more than 100 such companies are working four ten-hour days.

But even in these companies, it is agreed, a tremendous amount of planning was nec-

essary to incorporate the shorter workweek without upsetting operations. Can it be done at a U.S. Steel, General Motors or AT&T? "For most of the companies who have tried the four-day week thus far," points out President James W. McSwiney of the Mead Corp., "each had a particular set of circumstances or reason for adopting it; that is, recruiting problems, excessive absenteeism, elimination of undesirable work practices. Where such conditions exist and the composition of the work force is adaptable to it, we think it worth trying on at least a pilot-plant basis. But we are not prepared, at least at this juncture, to endorse it as a universal panacea."

In general, the panelists agree that the four-day week would be most difficult to incorporate into the large, capital-intensive manufacturing companies, particularly those that operate around the clock. "It seems to me," says President Richard J. Stockham of Stockham Valves, "that the inevitability, if such there be, depends on whether the company is a sales organization, a white-collar organization or an industrial products organization. I doubt its inevitably in the latter case."

In fact, Chairman Joseph T. Simpson of Harsco Corp. believes that "continuous operations requiring 24-hour coverage per day, seven days per week, would be impossible" with a four-day week.

Industry's big worry here, of course, is productivity. One of the major benefits of a four-day week, argue its proponents, is that it cuts down absenteeism and improves worker output. But to DUN'S panelists, increased productivity is doubtful at best. Chairman Robert B. Pamplin of Georgia-Pacific Corp. bluntly states: "I think industry would be making a terrible mistake if it went to a four-day week. It would merely make us more non-competitive in world markets, for I am sure productivity would decrease."

THE 32-HOUR WEEK?

Not all the top executives are that pessimistic. But most of them believe that increased productivity would be exceedingly difficult to obtain under a shortened work week, particularly since they expect it would eventually mean fewer hours worked. The panelists are almost unanimous in their belief that if the four-day week were to become a reality, the 32-hour week would not be far behind. Since labor is pushing the shorter workweek largely to gain higher employment, they say, that would be its next step. "The unions," says Chairman Marvin Chandler of Northern Illinois Gas Co., "would quickly want the four-day week to become a 32-hour week, with severe overtime penalties."

The greater-productivity thesis is based on the belief that Friday is traditionally a low-productivity day and that workers will increase output during the other four days to make up for their added day off. But this is not necessarily so, retort the top executives. Most of them agree with Chairman Rodney Gott of AMF Inc., who says: "I do not believe that lower productivity would be eliminated. It would simply be moved to Thursday."

Others note that studies have shown that three-day weekends usually result in a slower start and lower productivity on the following Monday. "It could be more costly than the Friday letdown," says one manufacturing president.

A number of the panelists, moreover, believe that a ten-hour workday could actually decrease productivity because of employee fatigue. "Elimination of a low-productivity Friday," says President Emerson E. Mead of SCM Corp., "would be offset by increasing fatigue in the ten-hour day."

The fatigue factor, naturally, varies from industry to industry. For example, Richard Stockham says: "In our plant, where the operations involve some manual dexterity and heavy exertion, it seems highly improbable that a forty-hour week based on four days would be practical."

Further points out Harsco's Joseph Simpson: "Fatigue is a significant factor where heat, weight, noise and so forth are an integral part of the job. It may also be a factor the next morning due to the decrease in time off between work days. Fatigue as a major factor in accidents," Simpson adds, "is not to be overlooked."

Even administrative and office personnel, some feel, would become tired or less efficient with a longer working day. One banking executive reports: "We have found that accuracy is unreliable as overtime hours become excessive."

Some of the panelists, to be sure, do not believe that the ten-hour day would necessarily increase fatigue. Chairman William F. May of American Can Co., for instance, thinks it depends largely on the type and nature of the work and the surroundings. "When the work is challenging and not repetitive, and the surroundings attractive," says May, "we have found ten-hour days acceptable."

Adds Bristol-Myers' Richard Gelb: "Our preliminary research indicates that except for manual work requiring a high level of physical activity, employees can adjust to a ten-hour day."

At the very least, cautions Chairman Willard F. Rockwell Jr. of North American Rockwell Corp., "The problem of employee fatigue would need to be examined closely if a four-day schedule were contemplated. The employee mix (male vs. female), average age, marital status, availability of transportation and other such diverse factors would all have to be carefully reviewed against the production schedules that would be required."

Another concern of the chief executives is the impact of the four-day week would have on customer relations. For a company that goes to a shorter week may well find that many of its customers are still working—and expecting service—on Friday. "Until our customers were attuned to the four-day week," explains President Wendell Sell of Hoffman Electronics Corp, "a major problem would result in communications and possibly deliveries."

The difficulties could be even more severe in the service industries. Would the public accept less service from the banking industry, for example? "The trend," says the chief executive of one major bank, "is just the other way around, toward more service. The public will rebel against a structure where services are further curtailed."

Northern Illinois Gas' Marvin Chandler points out that the four-day week may even increase customer pressure on the service industries. "Friday might become a favorite day to request service from us," he notes, "since the wage earner or earners would be home." The result: "Eventually, the customer pays for higher costs such as overtime."

THE LABOR PROBLEM

For top management, of course, the main bout in the four-day-week issue will be the ultimate confrontation with labor at the bargaining table. For all DUN'S panelists *agree* that if the shorter workweek is ever to be granted, the unions have to give companies some sort of guarantee that productivity in four ten-hour days would be at least as great as in five eight-hour days—at no higher cost to industry. "As a general proposition," says North American's Rockwell, "If a company were in a position to grant a four-day week, it should insist upon, as a minimum prerequisite, the identical productivity and efficiency at no increase in cost, as it had prior to the four-day schedule."

This would mean, according to the panelists, that a number of changes must be made in present worker benefits. Number One on the list is overtime rules. "Before industry can truly grant labor a four-day week," says Hoffman Electronics' Wendell Sell, "The present law [which calls for giving overtime pay after eight hours of work a day] should be changed. If this is accomplished, then industry should ask for a total revision in policies related to holiday, vacation, sick leave and other wage-related benefit plans."

Echoing the business leaders' concern about productivity, Sell adds, "Industry must have complete freedom without penalty to establish various shifts during a workweek. And Chairman Leon Alpert of Loral Corp. calls for setting up "definite productivity controls and goals."

Further warns Chairman Robert S. Ingersoll of Borg-Warner Corp: "Because the four-day, forty-hour week would inevitably lead to a four-day, 32-hour week, industry should insist upon increased productivity and resist efforts of unions to obtain forty-hour pay for 32 hours's work."

Although the push for the four-day week is largely based on the belief that people living in an affluent society such as ours should have more leisure time, a number of the panelists see quite another result: a sharp increase in moonlighting. And it is among the moonlighters in particular that the panelists see fatigue as a serious problem. "Increased opportunity for moonlighting," says SCM's Emerson Mead, "would increase low productivity on the part of those doing the moonlighting."

Nor do most of the panelists believe that more leisure time will increase the average worker's participation in outside activities. People who are interested in such things as politics, charities and cultural organizations, they say, find time for them no matter how long their workweek. And those who are not interested will not be, no matter how much time they have on their hands. In Willard Rockwell's view, "As a nation, we really are not geared up to use leisure time wisely, and the proper uses of leisure (aside from mere recreation and a long weekend) in political, charitable and cultural activities would need to become a part of the educational process."

Adds Northern Illinois Gas' Marvin Chandler: "I think it is naive to believe that the average worker will increase his participation in politics, charities and cultural organizations as a result of a four-day week."

So for now, at least, the chief executive feels that workers will spend their extra leisure time primarily in recreational pursuits—sports, travel and so forth—or in just "loafing," as one puts it. And, of course, an increase in recreation would, they note, be a boon for the leisure-type industries.

MEASURING THE IMPACT

But what about the impact on the rest of the economy? Here, the top executives' views are mixed. Some believe the effect would be definitely negative. Others feel it would not hurt overall—if it were implemented properly, with industry getting the necessary adjustments in labor practices, and if it were not done too hastily. Says Harsco's Simpson: "There is a possible overall gain *if* industry is not tied to expected overtime requirements and use of additional people." Adds Leon Alpert of Loral Corp.: "I don't believe it would hurt. Costs might go up, but so would prices. It might add to inflation; on the other hand, I think it might require additional overall employment."

On the other hand, Borg-Warner's Ingersoll believes that while the effect on the national economy would probably be minimal

initially, "When the workweek dropped to 32 hours at the same weekly pay for employees (which would be inevitable), the effect would be highly inflationary."

Marvin Chandler warns, "It could decrease job opportunities for students, minority groups, and women, thereby increase unemployment levels." And another chief executive says, "It would spread employment and the skills stemming from employment so thinly that productivity would decrease even greater than it has over the past few years, particularly hindering companies in areas of tight labor supply."

Moreover, business leaders are naturally concerned about anything that could further adversely affect the U.S. already weakening position in world trade. And several of the panelists feel the four-day week would aggravate the problem if productivity were not maintained. Says Chairman A. Lightfoot Walker of City Investing's Rheem Manufacturing Co.: "The back-breaking muscular effort has in high degree been eliminated from most jobs by investment in power and automatic equipment. Unless we can use that investment to its optimum, we shall be noncompetitive in world markets."

Adds President Harry F. Pearson of Congoleum Industries, Inc.: "It would be disastrous for this country to give up the productivity that would result from the four-day week and further weaken our ability to solve our problems within the United States and to compete in world markets."

So if the four-day week is indeed inevitable, the men who run U.S. industry believe it will not happen until a host of problems are ironed out. And they are obviously prepared to go the mat with labor to get the kinds of concessions they consider necessary. Sums up Mead's McSwiney: "We regard the four-day week as one facet in the probably inevitable trend toward more leisure time and less time at work in a steadily increasing affluent society. But we had better look before we leap into a blanket endorsement and adoption of the four-day week for all American industry."

THE GREAT 4-DAY WEEK RACE

Few industrial labor trends have gained as much momentum in such a short time as the four-day workweek. Workers favor it; it means a day less at work and an extra one at home. But some managements are seriously questioning the long term implications and finding there are problems, too.

Conversions to it are racing along close to 60 per month. The present total is possibly 500 companies, but most of these have under 500 workers. About 15% who have started have given up, often because of poor preparation. Almost half would do it another way if they could afford to change again. And the plan's biggest advantage, recruiting, is now one of management's lesser concerns.

MOONLIGHTING DEVELOPS

Other problems are developing, also. For one, supervisors work longer because of the multiple shifts. Sales, service, and other customer-oriented departments must stay open five days since customers' problems aren't scheduled to four. And, three free days a week for workers leads to moonlighting—which can hurt productivity instead of improving it.

The Personnel & Labor Relations Dept. of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce recently added up the possible problems in its newsletter:

"A 'fading factor' may show up when the novelty has worn off; fatigue will develop on the third and fourth day after several 10-hour stints.

"Federal government contract work requires time and a half pay after 8 hours per day under the Walsh-Healey Act; so 8 hours of the 40-hour, four-day week is overtime.

"More rest periods will be required for 10 hours than for 8.

"Where the plan is adopted after employee referendum, it is almost impossible to go back to five days—even if the company should want to.

"Saturday work could become a 'second Sunday' and require double or triple time payment.

"Production efficiency curves on routine jobs show a drop after only 6 hours of work. A 10-hour shift could merely add low efficiency hours.

"A one-day absence is 25% of a four-day week but only 20% of a five-day week.

"Working hours for key groups of management employees, salesmen, officeworkers, and foremen require close examination to avoid upsetting routine."

The newsletter also listed nitty-gritty details which must be settled beforehand. For example, should pay for military leaves, sick leaves, or holiday be computed on an 8- or 10-hour day? Should paid holidays be on an 8- or 10-hour basis? At plants that prorate vacations by days earned, is a week's vacation pay computed for five 10-hour days when five such days have been earned.

TOO MUCH LEISURE?

Others voice objections to giving workers too much leisure time. The issue divides spokesmen into two camps: those who believe workers will devote the extra time to constructive ends and those who predict idle hands will make mischief.

"The U.S. public doesn't show much readiness to handle that amount of leisure," says Roy W. Walters, president of Roy W. Walters & Associates, management consultants, Ridgewood, N.J. "There is a limit to how much beer and TV can be consumed and how much fun can be found. History already offers too many examples of societies that faltered or died by growing slothful with too much poorly utilized leisure.

"Workers will embrace the four-day week eagerly . . . in order to spend more time away from 'stupid' jobs," he points out. "Who wouldn't? It would certainly make more economic sense to improve productivity on a five-day basis—by improving the jobs given to people—rather than restricting production to four days to avert absence. And after the four-day week, what do you do for an encore?"

Despite these reservations, the four-day workweek has caught fire.

Mrs. Riva Poor, Boston sociologist and author who has become "high priestess" of the movement, could find only three dozen companies on a four-day week when she wrote her book, 4 Days, 40 Hours,[1] just a year ago. The book is being translated into Japanese, and publishing rights are being negotiated for Australia, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy. Mrs. Poor is in constant demand for lectures and has started a newsletter.

"I think most of the trend is simply a sign of the times," Mrs. Poor says. "We are breaking out of the mold. We have student revolts, civil rights movements, and other massive changes.

"We are also in an era of rapid communication, so word spreads fast," she adds. "When the five-day week came in in the thirties, some people didn't even have radios. Our book and the survey material in it has made much useful information broadly available. People in companies converting to it have made themselves available. Many seminars have been held. New research is confirming the original studies. We have not found many sharply contradictory conclusions."

Mrs. Poor feels most objections, like those of the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, are largely invalid. She maintains the fading factor theory is largely unsupported. She concedes there could be letdown but it would be preceded by an initial spurt in output, she says. So there would still be a net gain, Mrs. Poor insists.

WALSH-HEALEY EXCEPTIONS

Walsh-Healey overtime pay provisions are an obstacle to converting government contract work to the four-day week, Mrs. Poor concedes. And many state laws prohibit women working more than 8 hours daily. But plants wishing to convert to four-day weeks can get exception status fairly easily, she says. Strict rules such as those governing the number and duration of rest periods usually are relaxed in 10-hour days, she believes.

Mrs. Poor's studies also indicate that rather than pushing for double or triple time pay for Sunday work, employees appreciate three days per week off and will work for straight time on Sunday. Her studies also show that absenteeism is reduced because a single day missed means 25% of a weekly paycheck instead of 20%.

The overtime issue, Mrs. Poor feels, is grossly misleading. "You can't just look at overtime as a negative because just as often it is a positive," she says. "Large numbers of companies need more overtime work, especially where they have peaks and valleys of production. Some plants are setting up four-day week plans with overtime as a major objective."

Research supports the positives in the new system far more than the negatives, claims Mrs. Poor.

"Most companies that have gone into it are the smaller ones, because it isn't so complicated for them," she maintains. "Some people have rushed into it too fast in an attempt to cure another disease. A few who got into trouble have done such things as deciding on a Friday to start on Monday morning. There will always be some workers who will quit when something changes. And many who leave may well be those you don't want anyway. Run a survey beforehand to get an idea of how many will quit."

OPINIONS VARY

Most conspicuous holdouts are big process industries like metals, chemicals, and mass production industries, notably autos.

Chrysler Corp. as part of the labor negotiations in January agreed to a joint study with the United Auto Workers. UAW President Leonard Woodcock notes the four-day week is a popular subject with autoworkers.

"It may be an answer to the growing problem of absenteeism in this industry; we are delighted that Chrysler is willing to make this experiment," he says. "The joint study committee will be empowered to experiment with it in a few plants that do not have three-shift or seven-day per week operations. We are interested in testing its acceptability to workers since it has not been used in mass production."

An employers' association official, however, dubs the study as "frosting on the cake for public consumption rather than implementation."

"The usefulness of the four-day, 40-hour week can't be established without a great deal of research," says William Lloyd, executive director of Associated Industries of Cleveland. "In my opinion, it is ten years away for mass production industries.

"The idea that it reduces absenteeism is nonsense," Mr. Lloyd states. "Human nature

---

[1] Poor, Riva, 4 Days, 40 Hours, $5.50 by mail. Bursk & Poor Publishing Co., 66 Martin St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138 (1970).

is human nature. It's just as tough getting back to work after a three-day weekend as a two-day weekend."

"The companies that now utilize the four-day, 40-hour week are mostly small and usually have no union or a weak one," adds Richard T. MacCracken, Ford Motor Co. manager of labor affairs. "But there is no evidence that the concept would be workable for a large, multiplant company, especially where the production process is highly integrated.

"Furthermore, major unions are showing little or no interest in the four-day, 40-week," he says. "Labor's emphasis seems to be on reducing the workyear by means of longer vacations and more holidays. I don't expect to see the four-day week in our industry."

ABOUT 15 PERCENT DISCONTINUE

Mrs. Poor's statistics indicate that roughly 15% of companies which start four-day week schedules of variations discontinue them. Most officials concede that the fault is not in the system but in planning, implementation, setting of unrealistic goals or a changing situation. The bulk of those which start it are happy with it.

The shining example in Mrs. Poor's book is **Lawrence Mfg. Co.**, Lowell, Mass., a textile mill which faced moving to the South or liquidating because of difficulty in hiring women workers. Turnover rate was 11% per month and absenteeism more than 6%. In December 1969, the shop switched to a four-day week.

The plant is still operating in Lowell. Production is up 15% and absenteeism is down to 3%, although turnover is unchanged.

General Manager Lewis C. Doggett says it is too early to pronounce it a success. But the final decision will be in the marketplace, not the plant.

SUCCESS AT NORGREN

One of the most publicized converts, C. A. Norgren Co., Littleton, Colo., started the four-day week Aug. 31 last year after several months of committee study and visits with a half-dozen companies experienced with four-day schedules. Norgren is a builder of plastic air and liquid filters, regulator valves, and other fluid devices.

"Our productivity on a manhour basis has gone up 4% at last count over what it was on the five-day week," says Albert Lewis, industrial relations director ."Our absenteeism is now less than half the national average of 7% and turnover is 1% compared with a Colorado average of 3.6%," he notes. "We have not found the supervisory problems others have encountered. Our shop foremen get in 15 minutes before the work crews and stay 15 minutes after to coordinate shifts. While management is on call around the clock, as always, I find myself going to the mountains for the three-day weekend, tightening up a little on Wednesday and Thursday to be sure I can go. I have been in only two Fridays since the four-day schedule started."

Since national publicity in *Life* magazine, Mr. Lewis has had 1,200 inquiries from plants across the country. Fifteen companies have sent delegations to study the operation. Mr. Lewis has visited ten plant managements at their request.

In 1968, an Indiana foundryman, W. Matt Dalton, realized his dream of designing and building his own modern, air-conditioned foundry. The market dictated locating it in Cushing, Okla., between Tulsa and Oklahoma City. This is dairy farming and oil country with few foundrymen available.

After considerable investigation at other plants, the four-day week, with a few twists, was decided on as a recruiting device and as a way to get the greatest utilization of equipment.

Kenneth Davidson, industrial relations director at the parent foundry, Dalton Foundries Inc., Warsaw, Ind., reports that while business at the Cushing plant is admittedly slow, absenteeism is under 3%. There is a waiting list of job seekers. Turnover is a fraction of 1%. And there were 70 outside applications for a management position several months ago. The plant employs 75 AFL–CIO production workers and 15 salaried and clerical people.

YES, BUTS

President Eugene E. Paul of Dalton has a few reservations about the effect on management, and does not see the four-day week in the immediate future for the parent plant at Warsaw.

"This is more of a burden on supervision," Mr. Paul says. "If a man is running a 10-hour shift, he must get in early and stay late to coordinate with other operations. It also cuts into maintenance time. If all departments are running in balance, it is fine, but this rarely happens. And when one department falls behind, it is hard to catch up. It is also difficult to get people to work overtime if they have already put in 10 hours.

"If you call 10-acre farming moonlighting, then this exists all through the farm belt," Mr. Paul explains. "It is mostly casual type farming, but there are many others working second jobs."

Charles Zimmerman, production supervisor at the Cushing plant, is one of the few transfers there from the home plant.

"All the workers like the system," he observes. "Women use the extra weekday off to do their washing and housecleaning, see school teachers and doctors, and take care of other personal business. In many cases, the husband works the farm and the wife works in the foundry."

COSTLY SHOP IN SOUTH BEND

Cromwell Corp., South Bend, Ind., is an unusual job machine shop. It has only 20 employees but it has spent more than $250,000 for turret lathes since 1966.

The high investment made high utilization a "must," so John L. Schohl, founder and now an independent consultant, installed a four-day work-week with two 10-hour shifts daily, seven days per week. Each group works on straight time four days on and four days off. Utilization time is about 7,000 hours per year out of the 8,766 available. He reports this nearly doubles the return on investment compared with conventional five-day, 40-hour week shifts.

A Pittsburgh foundry, McConway & Torley Corp., doesn't have a four-day week because the United Steelworkers of America local didn't want it. It was offered in a vain attempt to avert a strike.

"The international union representative was for the plan but was not present when I talked to the workers in the union hall about it," says President Donald Y. Clem. "The workers felt there had to be a hooker in it and voted it down.

"It might still be appropriate for us," Mr. Clem feels. "We average 10% absenteeism, and 15% on Mondays.

THREE AND A HALF DAY WEEK

American Oil Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), has successfully put in both a four-day week and a 3½-day week at its continuous plastic pipe and extrusion plants. The most recent is at Stow, Ohio, near Akron, and others are at Monroe, Ga.; Magnolia, Ark.; and Denver.

"Because our extrusion machines take so long to heat up and clean out for weekends, we pick up an extra day's production a week if we keep them running," says Leo Haynes, production manager at Stow. "Our production workers put in 12-hour shifts for three successive days and then a regular half-day on the fourth," he says.

"We have been on it since May and it is a complicated scheduling system," he observes, "but most of the anticipated problems never developed. Our turnover has probably dropped as much as 30%, but absenteeism has not been noticeably cut."

PROS AND CONS OF 4-DAY WEEK

Company advantages:

Attracts workers, frequently the most skilled.

Less time lost weekly on washup, lunch, and relief.

Significant production increases where longer day permits another "batch."

Less exploitation of sick leave system.

Built-in publicity value.

Usually far less labor turnover.

Higher equipment utilization.

Company disadvantages:

Principal advantage, recruiting, is now a small management concern.

Thorough preparation needed.

Moonlighting increases.

Salesmen remain on five-days.

Managers, shipping, receiving, and office excluded.

State waivers for women often necessary.

Paycheck policy must be continually re-explained.

Difficult scheduling.

Supervisory and union problems.

Nonuniformities between departments and managers on different schedules.

Some employees will quit.

Pioneering is always difficult.

Employee advantages:

Three-day weekend at no pay loss.

Babysitter savings.

Buying a vacation home more practical.

Can travel medium distances oftener instead of waiting for holiday.

Easier and cheaper commuting.

Employee disadvantages:

Long hours. Result: tired, grouchy.

Regular schedules upset.

Difficulties for women with families and especially those with school age children.

Car pool problems.

More spending on long weekends.

WHO IS DOING IT?

The following is a sampling of larger manufacturing companies in the U.S. and Canada which have or have had a workweek of four days or less. The list is adapted from one published in June this year by Bursk & Poor Publishing Co., Cambridge, Mass., which contained 108 active and discontinued four-day manufacturing plants plus 27 service establishments. First number refers to employees in the plan and the second is total employment. Eighty-nine percent of these active four-day operations were in-plant with less than 500 employees.

Four-day active

Arkansas:

Ft. Smith: Fort Smith Table & Furniture, folding tables, 128/128.

Magnolia: American Oil Co., Div., Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), plastics.

California:

Anaheim: Fluorocarbon Co., teflon pumps, etc., 185/200.

El Cajon: Jet Air Engineering Inc., subassemblies, rockets, 120/120.

Los Angeles: Brewmatic Western Urn Mfg., coffeemakers, 75/90.

Redondo Beach: Tridair Industries (corp. hq.), air cargo handlers, 46/46.

Torrance: Tridair Industries, Fastener Div., fasteners, 400/535.

Whittier: Stoody Co., metal fabrication, 350/350.

Colorado:

Denver: American Oil Co. Div., Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

Denver: Wright-McGill Co., fishing tackle, 515/515.
Littleton: Norgren Co., fluid components, 450/450.
Florida:
Lakeland: Florida Tile, ceramic tiles, 150/600.
St. Petersburg: Morgan Yacht Co., yachts, 575/575.
Georgia:
Atlanta: Meisel Photochrome, photoprinters, 154/457.
Indiana:
New Albany: Wellcor Co., organs and cabinets, 143/150.
Middlebury: Coachmen Industries Inc., campers, 165/165.
Iowa:
Council Bluffs: General Woodworks Co., furniture, 100/100.
Kentucky:
Lawrenceburg: Florida Tile, ceramic tiles, 110/150.
Louisville: Boone Box Co., corrugated boxes 125/155.
Maryland:
Baltimore: Levi-Ottenheimer Co., girls' sportswear, 55/65.
Massachusetts:
Everett: Kyanize Paints Inc., paint and chemicals, 115/115.
Springfield: Kyanize Paints Inc., paints and chemicals, 30/30.
Holliston: Fillfast Corp., packing foam, 8/30.
Orange: Leavitt Machine Co., metal tools, 25/40.
Woburn: Chomerics Inc., computer components, 35/45.
Michigan:
Jackson: Plastigage, fiberglass products, 70/75.
Lansing: Lundberg-Screw Products, screw products, 95/100.
Pentwater: Pentwater Wire Products Co., wire containers, 90/100.
Minnesota:
Chaska: Anderson Machine & Tool Works Inc. (4½-day week).
Fairmont: Armour & Co., frozen foods, 250/250.
Missouri:
Kansas City: Western Container Co., folding cartons, 57/65.
St. Louis: Measuregraph Co., precision machine parts, 70/270.
New Jersey:
Carlstadt: Tac Torch, welding torches, etc., 42/42.
Cedar Knolls: Charles Marti Corp., precision components, 65/70.
Lebanon: Consolidated Ceramics & Metallizing, for aerospace ind., 9/23.
Trenton: Atlantic Products, luggage, golf bags, 350/700.
New York:
Plainview: Preco Chemical Corp. chemical coatings, 55/55.
North Carolina:
Charlotte: Carolina Ruling & Binding, Co., bookbinders, etc., 30/50.
Charlotte: Craftsman Printing Co., printing, 60/80.
Charlotte: Observer Printing House, printing, 55/70.
Charlotte: Pargo Inc., fiberglass boat parts, 130/130.
Greensboro: Adastra Knitting Mills, knit fabrics, 50/79.
Kenly:Overton Container Corp., industrial containers, 125/140.
Kinston: Wall Mfg. Co., soldering irons.
Lexington: Edgewood Textiles Inc., shirts, 150/150, (4½-day week).
Lincolnville: Vermont American Corp., cutting tools, 119/154.
Marion: Armored Garment Co., work clothes, 140/140.
Salisbury: Lyon-Shaw Inc., summer furniture, 65/74.
Ohio:
Stow: American Oil Co. Div., Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).
Cleveland: Tube Craft Inc., auto tube products, 30/30.
Oklahoma:
Tulsa: Redman Industries Inc., mobile homes, 54/71.
Oregon:
Portland: Kirkman Laboratories, pharmaceuticals, 50/50.
Pennsylvania:
Ephrata: Redman Industries Inc., mobile homes, 62/81.
Honey Brook: Redman Industries Inc., mobile homes, 80/110.
Mars: Woodings Industry, blast furnace parts, 55/83.
Union City: Cherry Hill Furniture, furniture, 140/175 (4½-day week).
Tennessee:
Johnson City: Harris Mfg. Co., wood flooring, 145/160.
Murfreesboro: Samsonite Corp., metal furniture, 800/800.
Sparta Spoke Co., wood parts for furniture, 88/95.
Texas:
Dallas: Forney Engineering, combustion controls, 132/375.
Ft. Worth: Pressure Vessels Inc., water heating equipment, 43/50.
Garland: Intercontinental Mfg. Co., bombs, trailers, etc., 600/700.
San Antonio: Barkel Inc., furniture, 250/250.
Virginia:
Roanoke: Harris Hardwood Co., wood flooring, 110/125.
Washington:
Enumclaw: Line Check Systems Inc., check printing, 23/25.
Wisconsin:
Clintonville: Utility Tool & Body Co., tools for derricks, etc., 36/47.
Grafton: Great Lakes Die Casting, foundry, 34/40.
Racine: Printing Developments Inc., printing plates and chemicals, 60/107.

Three-day active

Georgia:
Atlanta: Meisel Photochrome, photoprinters, 302/456.
Ohio:
Stow: American Oil Co. Div. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), (3½-day week).
Texas:
Houston: Marcham Resources Inc., seals and coatings, 45/70.

Four-day discontinued

Indiana:
South Bend: Cromwell Corp., machine shop 20/20 (temporarily).
Maryland:
Baltimore: Noxell, cosmetics, 200/500.
Massachusetts:
Boston: Samuel Ward Mfg. Inc., bookbinding, 30/90.
Lowell: Nathan Solomon, ladies' sleepwear, 120/150.
Malden: New England Metal Spinning Co., metal fabrication, 20/26.
Michigan:
Birmingham: Intercontinental Steel Corp., steel coils, 18/22.
Ohio:
Cleveland: Bonne Bell Inc., cosmetics, 250/325.
Oregon:
Portland: Stenna Carbon Co., carbon paper products, 29/30.
Pennsylvania:
Duncannon: Eileen Hope Dress Co., dresses, 90/90.
Wisconsin.
Sturgeon Bay: Dorco Mfg. Co., wire forms, 50/50.

A Look at the 4-Day Workweek

(By Janice Neipert Hedges)

Do recent switches from the standard 5-day week presage a nationwide trend?

The 4-day workweek has caught the imagination of the public. It has intrigued management and is winning guarded support from labor organizations. But the big question is unanswered: Is a break-through from a 5-day to a 4-day week imminent? The current standard is not immutable. But neither is a shift to some new standard inevitable.

Today, the standard workweek is 5 days and 40 hours.[1] These figures are the historical result of (1) a long term trend in practice and in law toward an 8-hour day, and (2) the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which fixed the 40-hour weekly standard [2] for workers in firms engaged in interstate commerce.

This article examines the 4-day week at present and arrives at some tentative conclusions about its future.

Prevalence of the 4-Day Week

In mid-1971, about 600 firms offered some form of the 4-day week for at least part of their work force and for at least some weeks of the year.[3] The variations ranged from 10-hour days to 9 hours or less, and included 4½-day weeks. The firms were largely on the Eastern seaboard and in the Central States. They were predominantly engaged in manufacturing, but also included a variety of service and other firms. Generally they were nonunion; a few had contracts with small unions or locals of large national unions. The number of workers on a 4-day week was estimated roughly at 75,000, or about one in every 1,000 workers in the United States.

On the basis of numbers alone, the workers and firms involved in the 4-day week are thus too few to assert that a major change is in the making. Nor are the firms sufficiently representative to indicate whether a short week is feasible on a national scale. Few are capital-intensive, few compete in world markets, few employ more than 500 workers. Moreover, in numerous instances, the 4-day week is on trial with both workers and management, and in more than a dozen firms it has been tried and discontinued.

At this time, prospects for the 4-day week may be better judged by its consistency with prevailing trends in work time than by its relatively small and tentative beginning.

Trends in Work Time

Where the 4-day week is coupled with a 10-hour day, it reverses the almost unbroken trend of a century toward shorter workdays. The 8-hour day was won after a long struggle, with which the union movement is so closely identified that it has been said that the unions owe as much to the 8-hour fight, for their form and direction, as the 8-hour fight owed to the unions for its success.[4] But the 4-day week is not necessarily a 40-hour week. Limited data available to the Bureau of Labor Statistics on firms employing 50 workers or more indicate that in these firms the "shorter workweek" is 4½ days as often as 4 days and ranges from over 40 hours a week to less than 30.[5]

The movement toward a 4-day week is in accord with two other trends that have dominated recent changes in work time. The first is the preference for "blocks of leisure," extended vacations, for example, rather than small reductions in daily and weekly hours. The second is the increasing diversity in work schedules.

A growing preference for blocks of leisure

Footnotes at end of article.

is manifested in the rapid extension of paid vacations. During the 1960's the average number of vacation weeks per employed person increased from 1.3 to over 1.7 weeks, while for many long-service employees the length of vacation grew to 4 weeks or more. Paid vacations and holidays together constituted a record two-fifths of the estimated 50-hour total reduction in annual worktime in the decade of the 1960.[6]

The legal rearrangement of national holidays in order to increase the number of 3-day weekends, beginning in 1971, is another manifestation of the interest in blocks of leisure.

The apparent willingness of many workers to maintain the same weekly hours (and extend the workday) in order to achieve longer weekends[7] suggests that the preference for larger blocks of leisure instead of reductions in the workweek may be at least as strong now as in the 1960's.[8]

The 4-day week, as it is developing, also seems consistent with the trend toward a multiplicity of work schedules. This trend traces back more than a half a century to the beginning of the growth of part-time schedules. Its future may lie in the "gliding workday," in which workers set their own arrival and departure time within a 12-hour working day, restricted only by the total weekly hours required.[9]

For the present, the 4-day week has given the trend toward variety a big push forward. In addition to substantial variations in the weekly hours of 4-day schedules, the selection of workdays is not uniform, either from firm to firm or within a firm (some of which operate 7 days a week with two or more work forces), or even necessarily for the same workers week after week. "Weekends" may be Friday through Sunday, Saturday through Monday, or even in midweek.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST

In further evaluating the prospects for the 4-day week, let us turn now to the arguments put forward by its supporters and its detractors.

Pro. The 4-day week was introduced by management. This represented a departure from the past, for initiatives in proposing new work schedules have come more often from labor.

Greater productivity and lower unit cost are the most telling arguments put forward by management. Higher output per man-hour is ascribed largely to improved morale that results in reduced absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover. Higher weekly output also is attributed to the reduction in start-up and close down time relative to operating time, and the keying of work schedules to processing time for a specific operation rather than to a standard workweek. In addition, in some firms that have shifted to 4-day weeks of less than 40 hours, coffee breaks have been discontinued (although workers may have coffee at their machines or desks).

Productivity gain is a persuasive argument on two counts. First, increases in productivity yield benefits that include potential increases in the standard of living and reductions in worktime.[10] Second, growth in productivity has lagged in recent years, with the annual rate of increase in output per man-hour averaging only 2.1 percent from 1966 to 1970, in comparison with 3.0 for the preceding 20 years.[11]

An increase in "usable leisure" sums up the major appeal of the 4-day week to workers. Even when a reduction in workdays is not accompanied by a reduction in weekly hours, the compression of worktime into 4 days extends the weekend by 50 percent.

A reduction in commuting time adds further appeal. Travel time between home and workplace—viewed as "lost time" by most commuters—has been increasing for city dwellers as well as for those who live in the suburbs.[12] For 4-day-a-week workers commuter trips are reduced by 20 percent. Traffic congestion might be reduced as well, as the smaller trip total would be spread out over more than 4 days.

Working costs such as commuting fares, restaurant lunches, and child care are reduced in many cases.

These arguments sound compelling. But as the Secretary of Labor observed recently, ". . . the verdict is far from in. Against those employers who report . . . benefits are those who foresee almost insuperable obstacles related to three-shift operation needs and other production requirements. Many union leaders regard the 10-hour day as retrogressive. . . . Nor, in spite of flowing testimonials, is it clear how the average worker feels about it."

Con. Arguments against the 4-day week center on the possible adverse effect on the health and welfare of workers and, in the long run, on productivity and on costs. (If the 4-day week evolves into fewer hours in the workweek, the first concern would be removed.)

The health and safety of workers was a major rationale for the shortening of the workday from 10 hours to 8 hours or less. Improvements in technology have decreased the physical strain of work, but in many work situations mental and emotional strain has increased. On the other hand, a 3-day weekend may provide sufficient rest and relaxation to sustain the worker through a 4-day week of 10-hour days. More experience with 4-day weeks should indicate whether working conditions, attitudes, and values now prevalent lead to new conclusions about the most desirable combination of workdays and hours.

Meanwhile, Federal and State statutes and many union contracts embody the concern that long days have a deleterious effect on a worker's health and well-being (and on his employment opportunities). Most of these reflect this concern by providing for overtime pay at premium rates after 8 hours of work. Collective bargaining agreements can, of course, be renegotiated and laws can be amended.[13] But unless they are, workers covered by such provisions are unlikely to be put on 4-day 40-hour schedules, or on any 4-day schedule that increases their employer's liability for overtime payments.

The largest group of workers covered by statutes providing for overtime pay in excess of an 8-hour day are those directly employed by the Federal Government.[14] An additional 3.7 million workers employed by Government contractors have similar coverage under the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act or the Walsh-Healey Act.[15]

A number of State wage and hour laws impede the adoption of the 4-day week in one way or another. For example, State restrictions on maximum daily hours for women mean that a 4-day week would necessitate a reduction in weekly hours. Restrictions on night work for women encumber the flexible scheduling that is vital to adapt the 4-day week to round-the-clock operations. State restrictions pertaining to women workers are easing, however, in the wake of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent court decisions.

The second argument raised against the 4-day week—that productivity cannot be sustained in the long run, let alone increased—cannot be answered definitively on the basis of available experience.

It is apparent, however, that short-term productivity gains experienced by the limited number of firms now on 4-day weeks are not necessarily indicative of long term results on a large scale. For example, the increased productivity currently reported by 4-day firms is attributed in substantial part to their ability to hold experienced workers and recruit superior workers. Their advantage in these respects would of course be lost if the 4-day week were adopted by other firms that compete for the same labor. Some of the improvement may be a short-lived "Hawthorne effect." It is possible also that the low productivity now associated with the last day of the workweek would move in time to the 4th day of a 4-day workweek or to the 9th or 10th hour of the day.

THE PATH AHEAD

What then seem to be the prospects for the 4-day week, in view of basic trends in worktime and the major arguments pro and con? Some observations may be useful.

1. The 4-day week can be expected to spread, but it is unlikely ever to dominate work schedules to the same extent that the 5-day week has for almost a generation.

The 5-day, 40-hour week represented a national standard based on worker health and efficiency and on the sharing of jobs. The impetus now is for work schedules designed to fit the technological and other requirements of an individual firm and the needs and preferences of its workforce. Rationalization rather than standardization is the guideline.

In some firms, technological requirements such as continuous operations, heavy capital investments, or other special situations may indeed create insurmountable obstacles for the 4-day week. Nor is a short workweek likely to prove popular with all workers, especially if it is combined with longer days or fewer breaks in the day. Some with family responsibilities may find it too difficult to adjust child care and home maintenance to a long workday: And some, who are highly work-oriented, may miss the challenge of a full week of work (some of these, of course, may try to fill out the week with a second job).

2. Support for the 4-day week may shift. Although management gave the 4-day week its first push, this came primarily from small, independent firms.[16] Large corporations are expressing serious reservations.[17] On the other hand, the initial negative reaction of union organizations—caused largely by the short workweek's association with 10-hour days—could be modified if the 4-day week proves a likely vehicle for reducing weekly hours.

Labor organizations are not likely to accede to 10-hour days without overtime pay. The AFL–CIO Executive Council in early August 1971, for example, while going on record in favor of collective bargaining efforts to reduce working hours and to reschedule workweek arrangements to the mutual satisfaction of unions and management, urged the rejection of proposals to drop the requirement of time-and-one-half pay for over 8 hours of work a day on government contracts.[18]

Management generally has envisaged increased utilization of plant and equipment through 4 days of 10 hours, with a portion of the work force on hand each day, covering 5 to 7 days a week. Labor's attention is directed toward the 3-day weekend and the possibility of shorter weekly hours. These differences may be difficult to reconcile.[19]

3. Although the 4-day work week has been associated with "compressed" rather than fewer weekly hours, in the long run it probably will be shorter in hours as well.

How much the reduction in weekly hours will be, and how fast, cannot be forecast. In the long term, it will be limited by the growth of productivity, by the distribution of productivity gains between reductions in worktime and increases in goods, and by the

---

Footnotes at end of article.

allocation of reductions in worktime to other areas, including paid vacations.

An average gain of approximately 3 percent a year in output per man-hour is expected during the 1970's.[20] If all these were channeled into reducing weekly hours, a 4-day 32-hour week could be achieved by 1980. This is highly improbable; still, the reduction in weekly hours in the 1970's could be larger than in previous years. Other possible applications of productivity gains—such as increases in years of schooling and paid vacation weeks for the average worker—have shown substantial gain since 1940 and may have reduced somewhat the pressure for further advances along these lines, thus increasing the prospects for reducing the workweek. Moreover, for many workers, basic needs for goods and basic needs for time, for rest and relaxation both have been met. In the 1970's, more than ever before, the choice between more goods and more leisure will be a matter of opting for a particular life style.

IMPACT OF SHORT WORKWEEK

As the 4-day week spreads, its wider effects will become evident. Among these are its possible impact on the total supply of and demand for labor, on the part-time labor market, and on workers with family responsibilities, especially women.

Some increase in employment can be anticipated as a result of larger markets for leisure goods and services—as Henry Ford recognized in 1922, when he pioneered the 5-day week with a view to increasing the demand for automobiles. Recreation, transportation, and construction are among the industries where employment may increase.

On the supply side, the effects of the 4-day week are less certain. A 4-day week accompanied by a reduction in weekly hours probably would attract more married women to the labor force and might also encourage some older workers to postpone retirement. A 10-hour day, however, might present an additional hurdle to full-time employment of women with family responsibilities, since child care—and to a lesser extent the preparation of meals—cannot be relegated to the weekend, however long. On the other hand, some might prefer long workdays that permitted them to be home one more day a week. The effect of the 4-day week on the entry of mothers into the labor force and its implications for additional demands for child care facilities is particularly important, since current needs for day care already far outstrip the resources available.[21]

Demand for part-time workers also might be expected to increase. For example, in service, manufacturing, or other industries that require round-the-clock operation, one part-time shift could be used to supplement two 10-hour shifts. Capital-intensive firms, in particular, would be likely to make heavy use of part-time shifts, in moving to a 4-day week of 10-hour days. In addition, some firms probably would use some workers for only 1 to 3 days a week, in order to extend their operations beyond 4 days.

On the other hand, the regular part-time work force (traditionally made up of women, students, and older workers) might experience strong competition as some full-time workers on 4-day schedules search for additional hours of work. The proportion of workers who hold more than one job—the moonlighters—has ranged between 4.5 percent and 5.7 percent over the past 15 years.[22] This proportion could increase, although limited experience of firms that have shifted to the 4-day week in the past year suggests that their workers are more interested in a longer weekend than in a second job.[23]

The 4-day week raises other questions, both social and economic, to which no definitive answers are available. And not all the questions have been raised yet. It is still true, as one observer wrote in 1957: "What is most needed today is greater experience with the 4-day week. . . . Nothing could be more welcome than the development in a number of major areas and industries of a 4-day week so that the country can profit by this experience." [24]

FOOTNOTES

[1] In 1969–70, about four-fifths of the 14 million plant workers surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics were on a 40-hour schedule, and nine-tenths of the total were on a 5-day schedule.

[2] Effective in 1940.

[3] *Poor's Workweek Letter*, September 1, 1971.

[4] George Brooks, "Historical Background," *The Shorter Work Week* (Washington, D.C., Public Affairs Press, 1957).

[5] Data for a new Bureau of Labor Statistics series—scheduled weekly hours by scheduled days in the workweek for workers covered in the area wage surveys—are being collected and will be published for single metropolitan areas as they are completed. The first report will be published this winter. Over a 2-year period, these data will be available for all 90 metropolitan areas covered by the area wage surveys, as well as for the regional and national estimated totals of all metropolitan areas.

[6] Geoffrey H. Moore and Janice N. Hedges, "Trends in labor and leisure," *Monthly Labor Review*, February 1971, pp. 3–11.

[7] Gallup Poll, March 1971.

[8] Something roughly analogous to economies of scale may explain the appeal of larger blocks of leisure to workers and the appeal of longer workdays to their firms.

[9] See the *New York Times*, July 12, 1971, p. 1.

[10] More and Hedges, op. cit.

[11] *Productivity and the Economy* (BLS Bulletin 1710, 1971).

[12] *Factors and Trends in Trip Lengths* (Washington, D.C., National Academy of Science, Highway Research Board, 1968). National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Report 48.

[13] The U.S. Department of Labor held public hearings in Washington, D.C., in September 1971 to determine possible courses of action the Department may wish to recommend with respect to the adoption of a 4-day 40-hour workweek without the requirement of paying time-and-one-half for work in excess of 8 hours a day by contractors subject to the overtime provisions of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act. See p. 2, this issue.

[14] U.S. Code, Sec. 5542 and 5544 (1970 edition).

[15] The Fair Labor Standards Act, covering 45 million workers engaged in interstate commerce, does not affect daily schedules. Its overtime pay provisions refer only to a maximum 40-hour week.

[16] Kenneth E. Wheeler, "Small Business Eyes the Four-Day Workweek," *Harvard Business Review*, May–June 1970, pp. 142–147.

[17] Neil A. Martin, "Can the Four-Day Week Work? Dun's President's Panel," *Dun's*, July 1971, pp. 39–40, 45.

[18] Statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council on The National Economy, San Francisco, Calif., August 9, 1971.

[19] Herbert R. Northrup, "Reflections on the Ten-Hour Day, Four-Day Week" remarks delivered at a conference July 23, 1971, sponsored by Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc., Princeton, N.J., published in The Bureau of National Affairs *Daily Labor Report*, July 27, 1971, pp. D–1/4.

[20] See "The U.S. Economy in 1980: a preview of BLS Projections," *Monthly Labor Review*, April 1970, p. 7.

[21] In 1970, licensed day care centers and family day care homes had an estimated capacity of about 750,000 children; working mothers had 6 million children under 6 years of age.

[22] See Howard V. Hayghe and Kopp Michelotti, "Multiple jobholding in 1970 and 1971," p. 38, this issue.

[23] Riva Poor, *4 Days, 40 Hours* (Cambridge, Mass., Bursk and Poor Publishing Co., 1970).

[24] Peter Henle, "Which Way to Greater Leisure?" *The Shorter Work Week*, op. cit.

REPORTING A REVOLUTION IN WORK AND LEISURE, TWENTY-SEVEN 4-DAY FIRMS

(By Riva Poor)

(Riva Poor, partner in Bursk and Poor Publishing with Edward C. Bursk, Editor of The Harvard Business Review, is a management consultant who started one of the first and most successful minority business programs in the country. She has owned and operated several small businesses, has edited several business reports and newsletters, and has a Masters degree in city planning from Massachusetts Institute of Technology where she has 95% completed a Masters in management)

WHAT 4-DAY IS

This book is an objective report about an innovation in work scheduling that affects firms' profits and employees' lives.

The 4-day, 40 hour workweek is a fairly simple reallocation of work hours from 5 days to 4 days begun at over 2 dozen American firms. The original number of work hours is maintained for the most part; but because they are grouped differently, there is a change in the impact of the hours on the performance of the firm and on the usability of the employees' leisure.

Four-day provides advantages for both the firm and its employees. By lengthening the workday, the employee gets a 3-day weekend with no pay loss. The firm gets a wide number of benefits including improvements in output, customer relations, flexibility for overtime, recruitment, absenteeism, turnover, tardiness—and employee relations!

Note that 4 days, 40 hours is not the 4 days, 32 hours that unions are beginning to talk about again, although it is possible that 4–40 could lead to 4–32, and will probably do so in the long run.

VARIETY OF ARRANGEMENTS

Although the book is about 4 days, 40 hours—a rescheduling of total work hours on a 4-day basis—not all 4-day employees work 10 hours a day during the 4 days. Some firms receive such large production boosts from converting to 4-day that they can afford to reduce their total workweek to 36 hours, and still come out ahead. Others do not have a 40-hour week to begin with, so dividing their total workweek by 4 leaves 9 or 9½ hours per day. In several cases, it could be said that the workweek is actually reduced somewhat—but usually not by much, because, generally, such things as foregone coffee breaks and fewer start-up times compensate for the reduction. The fewest total work hours among the firms is 35 hours—at a new division of a company that opened its doors with the 4-day week as part of its plan. Take-home pay is not cut, but in a few cases there is a pay raise incident to normal labor negotiations.

Several of the 4-day firms are open for business only 4 days a week; two have a 4½-day week; and others are open as many as 7. There are many variations, too, on which days the firms are open, on their numbers of shifts, their purposes for being on 4-day, and their results. Sometimes, certain types of employees are not included in 4-day—partic-

ularly, sales and shipping-and-receiving departments.

NEW PRECEDENTS SET

Aside from scheduling workers on a 4-day basis in industries where it had not been tried before, a third of the 4-day firms set the new precedent of being open for business just 4 days a week. Kyanize Paints, Inc., does this in 2 of its 3 branches—in Everett, Massachusetts, and in Springfield, Illinois—and plans to institute 4-day eventually at its newly acquired Houston plant.

The 4-day Tire Stores chain of 8 stores in California is on 4-day at all of the stores. Each is open only Thursday through Sunday, when tire sales are the best.

For Auto City, only the night shift is on 4-day; and it is Monday through Thursday. The manager reports it is difficult to set up a night shift on a 5-day basis, because the men don't like to work Fridays. But he was able to recruit 18 skilled engine rebuilders in 2 weeks by advertising the 4-day, or rather 4-night, shift.

Some firms intend to be open a 4-day week, but wind up doing so much overtime on the fifth day that it is hard to say they are really open just four days a week. Maybe later on they will be.

NUMBER OF 4-DAY FIRMS

This book reports the experiences of all the 4-day firms we could locate in the United States during June, July, and August, 1970,[1] including 5 firms that tried it and abandoned it. We located the firms through Kenneth Wheeler (see Chapter 9), through other 4-day firms, through newspaper and magazine mentions, through trade associations, and so on. We report both the pros and cons, so readers can apply their own judgments to meet their individual needs.

There are undoubtedly many more 4-day firms than we located. (Lately, we hear of a new 4-day firm every day or so.)

We report on 27 firms. I interviewed the management of each of these firms personally, mostly by telephone. Seven of the other authors also interviewed many of the firms; and hundreds of employees gave their opinions in several dozen personal interviews and in scores of written questionnaires.

The facts, therefore, have been analyzed by several professionals; and the book presents their several viewpoints.

WHAT'S SIGNIFICANT ABOUT 4-DAY?

Whatever our current workweek is today, or on any day, it was not handed down to us on Mount Sinai by the Lord Himself. If we find ourselves thinking of the 5-day workweek—or any other kind of workweek—as an immutable fact of life, it can only be because we are simply accustomed to it that way. For about half of the United States population, those people under 35 years old, the workweek is in a sense an immutable thing, because they have always known it one way, 5 days long, all their lives. (In many countries, the workweek is still 6 days long; and in these countries 6-day probably seems an immutable fact of life.) Anyway, I know that I, just short of my 34th birthday, found it amazing to come across a page one article in the May 8, 1970, *Boston Globe*, headed: "A Happy Revolution: The 4-Day Week," by Ken O. Botwright. It seemed so simple an idea, so obviously appropriate to so many problems; yet simple and obvious as it is, so revolutionary to me. (That was the day this book began.)

The other half of the U.S. can remember when the 5-day week was not standard, when there was a 5½-day week, and even a 6-day week. This wasn't so long ago, either. The first known 5-day week appeared in the United States as recently as 1908, and was unique for several years. A decade later, in 1918, there were only a handful of 5-day firms. And in 1929 only 5% of the American labor force was on 5-day.

What was there before these days? Simply this: for centuries the workweek proceeded from sunrise to sunset 6 days a week. And I wouldn't be surprised if some of the religious intensity of pre-twentieth century came from the relief from work provided by a Sabbath Sunday. The cavemen probably hunted 7 days a week.

The point is, the workweek really was immutable for centuries, and probable eons. It is only recently (since the Industrial Revolution) that the workweek has begun to change. The change appears to be an ever more rapidly accelerating one, in part because the technology that makes the changes possible is ever more rapidly improving.

The 4-day workweek is *very* new—whether we're talking about 4 days, 32 hours or 4 days, 40 hours. But new things, if they work well, have a way of catching on very rapidly in today's world. So they are worth looking at when they arrive.

The 4-day, 40-hour workweek has recently arrived. I'm not about to tell you: everyone is going to 4–40 this year, so watch out. And I'm not trying to *sell* you the idea of converting to 4–40. But I am saying this: 4–40 is new; it works fairly well; and the country has a recent history of moving ever more rapidly to shorter and shorter workweeks. The 4–40, 4–32, and even the 3-day workweek will probably be here eventually. So let's look at 4–40 now, to see what we can learn from it. And let's see if there is anything we can use from it today, for today's problems and goals.

DÉJÀ VU

We worked very quickly (but thoroughly) in preparing this book, because we wanted to bring the information to you while it is still timely and useful. Had we worked at the usual pace for research and publication, it seemed conceivable that the whole country could convert to 4-day—or even to 3-day (see Chapter 12)—before you could read it.

Still, a funny thing happened on the way to the printers, so to speak. With all the rush and the remarkable cooperation of the 4-day firms and authors, just 5 days before typesetting, Professor Linda Sprague (see Chapters 4 and 7) brought over a book that says word for word many of the things we had written for you!

Were we scooped? Well, sort of. It was a National Industrial Conference Board book, *The Five-Day Week in Manufacturing Industries*, published in 1929.[2] Reading it was a *déjà vu* experience. Apparently, the same controversy raged then about 5-day as will very probably rage about 4-day. People worried about: Would it work? Is it representative? Who's doing it? How do they work it? Is it too fatiguing? What happens to production? And wages? And morale?

In 1929, the NICB reported that the number of employees on 5-day was "insignificant," "only" about 5% of the work force at the time (500,000 on 5-day). This is far more than the number we know of on 4-day at present. Other contrasts are that there were few continuous process firms going to 5-day, and many of the conversions had been forced by unions. In contrast to early 4-day history, large numbers of the workers were in printing, the garment industry, and the building trades. Also, in 80% of the cases the hours of labor were reduced, because so many firms had been working 54-hours-a-week schedules. Thus, numerous employees suffered income loss.

These factors are the few dissimilarities between the 27 firms we report on here and those in the NICB study. Ours include several continuous process firms; all initiated 4-day through management, not through labor; and none are in printing or the building trades (although one is in garment making). Ours involve metals, textile manufacture, service, retail trade, etc.

Otherwise, the *deja vu* experience is almost complete. Both then and now the firms were predominantly in manufacturing, and with the exception of Ford Motor Company then, the firms were small. NICB reports an average of 155 workers. Our average is 185, excluding Reader's Digest (3,500). (Percentage of female workers is dissimilar, though: 25% for 5-day, and 60% for 4-day.) In both cases many began the new schedule as a summer or temporary experiment. Some firms started and then abandoned 5-day when 5-day was new, just as some firms have started and abandoned 4-day.

Results were also remarkably similar: 70% of the 5-day firms had no loss of production, despite being on reduced hours. But some of the 4-day, 40-hour firms have *increased* production considerably!

4-DAY HISTORY IN THE OIL INDUSTRY

The 4-day week for employees is not so new as it may seem at first glance. Although I, for one, didn't know about this until I started to study 4-day, drivers of fuel oil and gasoline delivery trucks at most of the major oil companies have been on 4-day scheduling for the past 30 years. So, the idea is only new and revolutionary for other industries that are only now beginning to utilize 4-day, or to contemplate it.

At the oil companies, many other variations in scheduling drivers were tried before settling on 4-day. Five 8-hour days left Saturdays hanging. Three 13½-hour days made the men too tired to handle the trucks safely. Alternating the 3 days of work was not efficient for the drivers either. Four-day was settled on as providing the best utilization of equipment on a round-the-clock basis, without undue hazard to the drivers.

Between the 10-hour shifts are two 2-hour periods to service the trucks; so the men are not held up by repairs when their shifts arrive. If a seventh day is needed, as it sometimes is in winter, the men go on overtime. A Gulf Oil Corporation dispatcher said: "The men think it's terrific—they love the 4-day week. It gives them 3 days off. And it's great for vacations, because they can take a whole week, when they want to, by switching their schedule with another driver."

Still, the 4-day week is not universal for the drivers in this industry. As a representative of Mobil Oil Corporation said, 4-day "has met with employee resistance in some geographical locations. Whether drivers work on this schedule, or on the more normal 5-day week, is governed strictly by local conditions." Gulf adds that it is a matter of different traditions in different parts of the country. For example, as to Sunday work, "You won't find the drivers working Sundays below the Mason-Dixon line, east of the Mississippi. But in the north, you've got the bad northern weather which makes Sunday deliveries important."

The major oil companies are also examples of firms that provide *different* schedules in the *same* firm to meet differing needs of production and/or working conditions. According to Gulf, refineries operate three 8-hour shifts a day, 7 days a week; and the men alternate weekend days. For drilling sites, outside contractors may be hired; and these, in turn, hire workers on varied schedules. Some of the drilling sites are in remote places where the men are away from home, and there is nothing to do but work, eat, and sleep. The workers work 12 hours on and

[1] Except one large firm that we heard of through a third party, which did not want to be cited.

[2] This is the source of the 5-day statistics reported in this Chapter.

12 hours off, 7 days a week, for 4 to 6 weeks; and then take 2 to 3 weeks off.

There are other industries too, not only those where the men are away from home and travelling, where the schedules may vary with the work situation. As Professor Sprague points out in her article, we ought to think more often of how to use a break in the mold to suit our needs better. Why be tied to a schedule that is not optimum for your firm—or for a *division* of your firm?

WHAT'S IN THIS BOOK?

What's in the book? The answers to the following questions: Who's doing it? Why? How? With what advantages? What disadvantages? And where might it lead us?

In a later section in this article you'll find the summary statistics on the 27 firms; and at the back of the book, there are short company profiles, in order to give you details on what's going on where.

After the summary data on the 27 firms, L. Erick Kanter provides an in-depth view of a 4 day firm in "An Industrial Pioneer Rescued by the 4-Day Week." Lawrence Manufacturing, the oldest textile mill in Lowell, Massachusetts (one of the oldest continuing firms in New England) had to do something vigorous about recruitment, or face moving out or closing down. Mr. Kanter tells us how they made the decision, how they implemented 4-day, and what the results are to date (positive).

Mr. Kanter then gives us a profile of employee reactions at Lawrence and at several other firms in his "Thank God It's Thursday!" The reactions are, by and large, very positive; but some typical negatives are given. One secretary says: "I am not really involved in the 4-day workweek and I hope it remains that way . . . Isn't the 10-hour day a step backwards?" Another woman, whose office is on 4-day, writes: "I can spend more time with the children and do more sewing, which is my hobby. The disadvantage is getting up on Monday morning, but that has always been a problem with me." Another woman, a factory worker who is very pleased with 4-day, says: "it's less expensive to travel to work 4 days instead of 5; and there is also less money to pay out to babysitters." Many add that commuting is now easier.

In "Fewer Days or Fewer Hours," Professor Linda Sprague points out where the shorter workweek fits into the history of labor-management battles over fewer hours and more pay. Until now, she says management has always fought a rear guard action.

The 4-day schedules have raised legal problems for some firms, particularly where women employees' hours of labor exceed state regulations requiring fewer hours for women than for men. The Assistant Attorney General of Oklahoma, Tim Leonard, gives a clearly thought-out ruling which has the effect of law in Oklahoma. His argument goes something like this: (1) if women are being denied the opportunity to have a 3-day weekend, because the state law doesn't permit them to work the same number of hours as men, then women are being discriminated against; (2) discrimination against women is against the U.S. Constitution; (3) United States law has precedent over state law; (4) therefore, the state law regulating women's hours is null and void; (5) therefore, women can work as long a day in Oklahoma as men can. He cites rulings in other states too. It is worth hearing about because many states restrict women's hours; and the 4-day firms frequently have to deal with these restrictions. Usually, they can get waivers; but getting waivers takes time and money. With Assistant Attorney General Leonard's opinion, the 4-day firm has extra ammunition.

D. Quinn Mills, Professor of Labor Relations at the Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, predicts 4 days, 40 hours, will not catch on. In "Does Organized Labor Want the 4-Day Week?" Professor Mills points out that although the employees at the current 4-day firms are enthusiastic about 4-day, organized labor takes a dim view of the 9-hour or 10-hour day. Unions are pushing for 4–32, and are likely to resist 4–40 with vigor; but, he says, the reactions of the unions at the 4-day firms are positive.

In "Breaking the 5-Day Mold," Professor Sprague spells out a number of methods to use in analyzing your scheduling loads, to determine whether 4-day, or some *other* schedule, would work out better for you. Break the mold, by all means, she advises, if you've got the kind of customer demand that requires it. What have you got to lose?

In "Interface with the Outside World," Grant Doherty, Sales Promotion Manager for Kyanize Paints, tells what some of the pitfalls can be when you change your schedule; and tells how to deal with them so you can "cry all the way to the bank."

Ken Wheeler published one of the very first articles on 4-day (in the May/June issue of *The Harvard Business Review*). A management consultant who specializes in 4-day conversions, he now tells us: "How to handle a 4-day Conversion." The key phrase, he and his associate Dr. Philip Bogdonoff say, is *prior planning*. He also includes a "Decision Track Analysis" that you can use as a quiz to see how much 4-day might or might not do for you.

Jim Steele, a Ph.D. Candidate at the University of Montana, and I report a survey we did of 168 employees at 13 of the 4-day firms, in "Work and Leisure: The Reactions of People at 4-Day Firms." We find 92% of the employees are pleased about 4-day. Of the *new* employees, 34 out of 44 stated that 4-day was an important reason for their joining the firm; and none said it was a disadvantage. We also tell how they spend their leisure. Moonlighting is way up (a fact a number of firms don't mind; some actively encourage it). Such things as camping, travel, movies, shows, and sports are much bigger. Nine out of 168 have purchased vacation homes. Only 6 people say they are bored. About 33% report increased spending; and several of these say they've finally had to cut back. Anyway, whether more or the same amount of spending, the *patterns* of spending are different now.

"Implications for Urban America" predicts how urban growth might change if 4-day became widespread. Although Professor William W. Nash, Jr., of Harvard, did not see Jim's and my employee study, he predicted a number of the employees' new patterns right on the nose! From these predictions of new activity patterns, he constructs predictions about land, housing, and transportation demand, noting along the way some tips for government, and for the private investor.

One of the differences between the NICB's book and ours, aside from theirs being on 5-day and ours on 4-day, is that theirs was written 11 years after there were a handful of 5-day firms, and ours is only a year after the first handful of 4-day firms. Presumably, the first book on 3-day will come one month after the first 3-day firms! But, no; the first 3-day book has been written before the fact by economist Dr. Millard C. Faught. In Chapter 12, "The 3-Day Revolution to Come," Dr. Faught explains why he is convinced that 3-day will be here, and be here soon. He sees 4-day as an early sign, but no more than that.

Three final notes: "Buzzie Bavasi's 4-day Plan for the Baseball World," a short Bibliography on the workweek, for aficionados, and a few lines about the authors.

WHAT IS THIS BOOK USEFUL FOR?

It should be useful for:

Company decision makers

If you've decided to convert, where do you go to learn from someone else, before you plunge ahead?

If you're just musing about it, where do you go to find out whether to consider it seriously?

If you have some unsolved problems, and you are *not* thinking of 4-day, is there something here that may turn the trick for you?

Union men

What's behind this management move?

How do the workers feel about it?

Business analysts, management consultants, staff advisors, production schedulers, personnel men

If this is what's happening, do you want to know about it?

Business suppliers, servicers, recreation industries, land developers, urban planners, government men

You, too, right?

Students of history and observers of today's world

Interesting, isn't it?

WHAT KINDS OF FIRMS ARE ON 4-DAY?

I had expected to find great similarity among the 4-day firms. Instead, the diversity of 4-day firms is amazing. Types of business, for example, include manufacture, service, retail, and wholesale. And the sizes of the firms, the production processes (of manufacturers), the seasonality of demand, the length of time in business, the locations, and the characteristics of the labor forces are strikingly dissimilar.

The major threads tying the firms together are their purposes for trying 4-day: concern for employees' welfare and incentive, which will be discussed below. There may be a slight tendency for some of the 4-day firms either to be more labor-intensive or more capital-intensive than other firms (in other words, somewhere away from the norm for firms); and also to have a larger proportion of female employees than other firms. The accompanying List of 4-Day Firms (on page 24) shows the basic statistics for each of the 27 firms studied.

TYPES OF FIRMS

Two thirds are manufacturers. Their fields are: abrasives products, electronic balancing devices, foods (both frozen and delicatessen), loudspeakers, metal castings, missile heads, paint rollers, paints and coatings (2 firms), paper boxes, petroleum products (2), pneumatic accessories, sheet metal fabrication (3), textiles, and underwear. (The oil companies are on 4-day for deliveries only.)

The 4 retail firms include clothing, fast foods, and 2 tire store chains that also have commercial and wholesale components. One of the retail firms is on a 4½-day week, at its offices only. The one strictly wholesale firm is a used-car auctioneer. The 4 service firms include: architecture, automatic data processing, a hospital, and a major publisher that is on a 4-day week in May only.

SEASONALITY

Ten have seasonal fluctuations in demand; seven do not.

BATCH PROCESS OR CONTINUOUS FLOW

Three manufacturers labelled their processes as continuous; 4 said they were somewhere between continuous and batch process; and 9 were batch process or job shops.

SINGLE FIRMS OR MULTI-BRANCHES

Twelve of the 27 are single firms; that is, one firm, one location. Fifteen are multi-branched; ranging from two divisions in different states, to over a thousand divisions or franchises across the nation (1 firm) or around the world (2). Eight firms have 2–7 branches; 3 firms, 8–10; and 1 has 1 local office, but divisions and other arrangements around the world.

4 DAYS, 40 HOURS—LIST OF 4-DAY FIRMS

[Note: Appendix A contains profiles of these 27 firms and also of other firms located too late for entry here]

Name	Location	Number of employees	Type	Notes
American Lacquer and Solvents Co. of Florida.	Tampa, Fla	54	mfg. paints, lacquers, etc.	
Auto City, Inc	East Boston, Mass.	130	wholesale auto auction.	night shift only.
Bridgeford Foods and Packing Co.	Anaheim, Calif	[1] 240	mfg. frozen foods and delicatessen.	discontinued 4-day.
Geo. H. Bullard Co., Inc.	Westboro, Mass	120	mfg. abrasives	
Carbonneau Industries.	Grand Rapids, Mich.	[1] 250	mfg. loudspeakers.	discontinued 4-day.
Crocker Co., Inc	Burlington, Mass.	44	sheet metal fabricators.	
Dalton Precision Division.	Cushing, Okla	[2] 97	precision metal casting.	multiple locations.
4-day Tire Stores	Newport Beach, Calif.	34	retail and wholesale, tires.	multiple locations.
Jules Gillette	North Miami, Fla.	[1] 10	retail men's clothing.	multiple locations; discontinued 4-day.
Gulf Oil Corp., (one of many terminals).	Chelsea, Mass	[2] 132	mfg. and sale of petroleum products.	multiple locations; drivers only.
Haines, Lundberg and Waehler, Architects.	New York City, N.Y.	[1] 400	service, architects-engineers.	multiple locations; discontinued 4-day.
R. C. Hollow Metal Co.	Denver, Colo	29	metal fabrication	4½ days summer only.
Interstate, Inc	Braintree, Mass	50	mfg. paint rollers.	
Kyanize Paints, Inc	Everett, Mass	[2] 115	mfg. paints, polish, coatings.	multiple locations.
Lawrence Manufacturing Co.	Lowell, Mass	[2] 215	mfg. knit fabrics.	multiple locations.
McDonald's Corporation.	Chicago, Ill	[2] 741	retail, fast food industry.	multiple locations; 4½ days summer only; offices only.
Merrill Engineering Laboratories.	Denver, Colo	[2] 25-30	mfg. balancing and aligning equipment.	multiple locations.
Milton Machine Co	East Weymouth, Mass.	5	mfg. electronic components.	
Mobil Oil Corporation (one of many terminals).	Dearborn, Mich	[2] 100	mfg. and sale of petroleum products.	multiple locations; drivers only.
Mother's Tire Co	Atlanta, Ga	[1] 18	Retail and wholesale tires.	multiple locations; discontinued 4-day.
New England Metal Spinning Co., Inc.	Malden, Mass	26	metal fabrication	
C. A. Norgren Co	Littleton, Colo	[2] 500	mfg. pneumatic accessories.	multiple locations.
Reader's Digest	Pleasantville, N.Y.	3,500	service, publisher.	multiple locations; May only.
Rex Paper Box Co., Inc.	Braintree, Mass	65	mfg. folding paper boxes.	
Roger Williams General Hospital.	Providence, R.I	1,200	service, hospital	nursing services only.
Nathan Solomon and Co., Inc.	Lowell, Mass	140	mfg. ladies' sleepwear.	
Name withheld by request.	Massachusetts	[2] 100	service, date processing.	multiple locations.

[1] When they were on 4-day.

[2] Does not include those at branches.

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

The firms are located throughout the country, and in some cases, throughout the world, but home offices and single firms are more heavily concentrated on the east coast. The Boston area has 11 of the 27 home offices. Three home offices are in New York, and 1 each in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania. Three firms are in the south; 2 in Florida, and 1 in Georgia. A total of 19 on the east coast. Two firms are in California; 3 in Denver; and 1 each in Chicago, Oklahoma, and Michigan. Branches are just about all over the country.

The concentration of firms in some areas (Massachusetts, Colorado, Florida, and California) appears to be more a function of how innovation spreads than of how geography affects business. The word is spread by local news media and by trade associations. Also, some of the principals are acquainted with each other; for example, several of the principals at Jules Gillette, 4 day Tire, and Mother's Tire have worked together in the past.

YEARS IN BUSINESS

Two of the firms started business in the 19th century; one in 1826, and one in 1899. The newest firm is about 1½ years old, and opened its business on 4-day—4 day Tire Stores, with 8 branches. Only a few other firms have been in business for less than 5 years.

SIZE OF THE FIRMS

Judging by their numbers of employees, there is a large distribution of sizes. About one third of the firms have 215 or more employees (the largest is 3,500); about one third have 100–140 employees; and only a little over a third have fewer than 65 employees.

More than half of 4-day firms have 100 or more employes

Number of employees:	Number of firms
5–18	3
26–65	8
100–140	8
215–250	3
400–700	3
1,200–3,500	2
Total	27

The figures actually underrepresent the number of employees at 4-day firms, (1) because at the oil companies we could count only the 2 terminals we interviewed, excluding those we did not interview (since it was difficult to get correct information); and (2) because for most of the firms we did not count employees at branch offices and franchises. McDonald's, for instance, has 1,400 restaurants which are not included. In a sense, the added information is not strictly necessary: we have established the minimum figures which are more interesting than the out-sizes.

While 4-day is not (so far) a very-big-business phenomenon, it is not a tiny-business phenomenon, either. The median number of employees is 115, which is well above the median size of businesses in the United States. (And the mean average is 300; or 185 excluding the largest firm.)

PROPORTION OF MALES AND FEMALES

The proportion of female workers at 4-day firms is about 60:40 which is greater than the proportion of females at firms around the country (40:60). The range in percent of females is from zero at one firm to 95% at several. (The 25% females on 5-day, when 5-day first began, reflected the average number of women working then.)

AVERAGE AGE

Average age of 4-day workers is about 35 years. The range of averages at the firms is 25 to 42 years.

AVERAGE SENIORITY

Average seniority is about 5 years. The range of average seniority is from ½ year to 15 years.

FORWARD-LOOKING FIRMS

Several of the firms are pioneers with other new personnel practices. Reader's Digest has had the 35-hour week for many years. C. A. Norgren was one of the first firms to have employee profit-sharing and wage continuation for factory workers at times of sickness or accident.

IMPLEMENTATION

When? The dates on which the firms we know of converted to 4-day range from 1940 through today.

Most firms started 4-day in 1969 or later

Dates:	Number of firms
1940	2
1960	1
1962	2
1965	1
1969	15
1970, so far	6
Total	27

Several of the early 4-day experiments were discontinued (1960–1962). Thus, aside from oil firms, there is only one other firm with extensive 4-day experience—Merrill Engineering Laboratories, with 5½ years on 4-day. The others have 6 months to 1½ year's experience.

Many of the firms approached 4-day on an experimental basis. Fourteen said they had trial periods for 4-day ranging from 1 month to 1 year. Only 6 said they simply planned 4-day, and then plunged ahead. Almost all firms consulted with employees, beforehand, in one way or another.

PROPORTION OF LABOR FORCE ON 4–DAY

The 27 firms and branches that we interviewed had 6,800 employees on 4-day out of 8,300 (a *minimum* of 1,500 are not on 4-day, since in many cases there are other uncounted workers at uncounted branches—most of which are not on 4-day). The proportions of 4-day workers at the firms range from a high of 100% on 4-day at several firms to a low of 8% at one firm and 28% at another. The mean average on 4-day at these firms is a maximum of 80%.

Who is excluded from 4–day? The salesmen at manufacturing firms are always excluded from 4-day, since the people they sell to are working on 5-day. The next most frequently excluded are the managers. Shipping and receiving are next, and, finally, office workers.

Half of the women at 4-day firms are on 4-day, and half are not, excluding the largest firm. If the largest firm is included, 75% of the women are on 4-day. But there are 9 firms that have none of their women on 4-day. In most cases, the women are excluded because there is a need for production to be on 4-day, and for the office to be open 5 days.

In a few cases, the women are excluded because the firm was unaware that it could ob-

tain a waiver of the restrictions against long hours for women. (In these cases, we were able to assist the firms by informing them that waivers *are* obtainable in most states; that many firms have received them.)

Generally, the firms with women on the types of 4-day schedules that violate their state's regulations first *try* the schedule, and then, after trying it, obtain a waiver. (More about waivers in Chapters 5 and 9.)

In several of the firms, employees are given a choice of 4-day or 5-day; so that there are 4-day and 5-day workers working side by side on their different schedules. Firms that handle the 4-day adoption process in this fashion (by individual choice) tend to report that more and more workers elect 4-day as time goes by. The 27 short profiles (in Appendix A) provide a few examples of firms starting with 50½ electing 4-day, and getting 80% after a month, and 100% after a year.

WHY DO THEY DO IT?

In every case that we know of, the 4-day idea was initiated by management, and not by labor. Also, it was a *top* management innovation. Why?

The firms choose 4-day to gain a variety of advantages. The most prevalent purposes involve labor. The 27 firms cited 49 labor reasons and 22 non-labor reasons for 4-day.

The labor reasons, in order of greatest frequency, are: more incentive, better morale, or better living conditions for employees; reduction of labor costs as a percentage of sales; recruitment of *more* labor; recruitment of *better* labor; reduction of absenteeism; and/or reduction of tardiness or turnover.

The non-labor reasons, in order of frequency, are: increased output; decreased production costs; reduction of other non-labor costs (for example, better utilization of capital equipment); improved throughput; better sales promotion; and/or better profits on sales.

Several firms have been innovators in personnel policies in the past, and are simply continuing their precedents. The Reader's Digest, for instance, has been on a 35-hour week for years; and DeWitt Wallace, Co-Chairman, says their 4-day week puts the Digest once again in the forefront of what he is convinced will be a major trend.

The 4-day idea has spread in a variety of ways, as mentioned elsewhere, but one aspect of 4-day is common to all the 4-day decisions: 4-day is seen as providing advantages simultaneously to the firm and to labor. The advantages to the firm are varied; but for labor, it is the 3-day weekend.

HOW DOES THE WORKWEEK CHANGE?

Most firms had been working hours above the average for the U.S.A. So, although the firms in many cases reduced the number of hours in their workweeks, the total hours they now have in the workweeks are by and large *not* far below the national average. The median number of hours in the workweeks at the 4-day firms (excluding overtime) is 36, and the mean average is 36.7. In comparison, the mean average for the United States in 1969 is 37.0 hours—a difference of only 0.3.

The current hours in the 4-day firms' workweeks are given in the Chart of Hours, Days, and Shifts, below. All rest breaks and lunch breaks are omitted from the count; and the totals are rounded off to the nearest hour.

CHART OF 4-DAY FIRMS' HOURS, DAYS, AND SHIFTS

Hours per week		Days open per week		Shifts	
Hours	Number of firms	Days	Number of firms	Shifts	Number of firms
40	4(1)				
39	2	7	4(1)		
38	1	6	3		
37	5(1)	5½	1	1	17(4)
36	8(2)	5	7(1)	1½	2
35	4(1)	4½	3	2	4(1)
34	3	4	9(3)	2½	4
Median = 36	Total = 27	Median = 5	Total = 27	Median = 1	Total = 27

Note—Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of firms in that category that discontinued 4-day—a total of 5 firms. There appears to be no particular significance to the pattern for these firms; except possibly, that 3 of them were open for business only 4 days, and 3 are at or below the median number of work hours for the group.

Of the firms for which there is both before and after information, 4 firms increased their total hours, and 13 decreased their hours. Both the mean and the median average decreases for all 17 firms were 1 hour and 10 minutes. The increases ranged from 15 minutes to 1 hour. The decreases ranged from 30 minutes to 4 hours. The median reduction for the 13 firms was about 1 hour and 45 minutes, and the mean average was very close. For 10 firms, no comparison could be made, either because we collected no *before* information (4 firms), or because there was no basis for comparison (4 new firms opened on 4-day, and 2 other firms converted to 4-day 30 years ago).

Sixteen of the firms have ½-hour lunches; two have ¾-hour lunches; and none reports a 1-hour lunch. But only 3 firms reduced their lunch periods.

As mentioned before, the firms are open for business varying numbers of days per week, hours per day, and shifts per day. Nine firms are open only 4 days a week; 2 are open 4½ days, summer only; or May only; and 8 are open 5½ days or more. The median is 5 days. Seventeen firms have 1 shift only. Eight have 2 or 2½ shifts. (The 2½ shifts usually run two 10-hour shifts, sometimes with two 2-hour shifts, sometimes with one 4-hour shift.)

I think it is important to note that the reduction of one day's work hours naturally brings an accompanying reduction in the week's total number of rest, coffee, wash-up, and lunch breaks. The firm also gets less start-up and stoppage (in effect, gets more workhours in the new week when the same number of work hours is compressed into the 4 days). Even when the new week has *fewer* total work hours, there can also be overall gains from having fewer start-ups and breaks to pay for. In addition, in some cases, firms that reduced the workweek also eliminated or reduced some breaks, gaining still more production hours. (Also, most firms had been working hours above the average for the U.S.A.)

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE WAGE BILL?

Most of the firms pay for a standard 40 hours a week, regardless of the actual number of hours in their new standard workweek. There was no change in weekly paycheck for 17 of the 22 firms for which a before and after comparison is practicable (those firms that have recent prior experience on non-4-day schedules). The firms usually have held the paycheck constant by juggling their interpretation of straight hours and overtime hours, counting some prior straight time hours as overtime hours. Some simply gave a rate increase while reducing the total hours paid for.

Of the 5 firms that changed their paychecks, only 1 reduced it (by reducing the number of hours the paycheck is calculated on). One of the 4 that increased their paychecks increased both their workweek and their paycheck by 1 hour (workweek, actually by 50 minutes). One increased its workweek by 50 minutes and its paycheck by a full 10%. The 2 other firms increased their pay rates to compensate for inflation although they decreased work hours.

The paychecks' being as high or higher than before 4-day means that most workers received an increase in rate of pay, because most are working fewer hours for the same total paycheck. Even if we allow for fewer paid breaks and for greater amounts of productive worktime, there is still an effective increase in rate of pay. Of course, for those at the 4 firms with absolute increases in paycheck, the increase in rate of pay is still higher. For the one firm with a reduced paycheck, the generally frequent opportunity for overtime may make the workers come out ahead anyway; they get to overtime sooner in the week.

ATTENDANCE BONUS SYSTEMS

A bonus system was instituted by 3 of the firms that reduced their workweek and by 1 that increased it. Their workweeks are approximately 36 hours excluding breaks. Employees are paid for 40 provided that they work the full 36 hours. If they work less than 36 because of lateness or absence, they lose some of their standard pay for that time and also some or all of their weekly attendance bonus. (Only 1 of the 4 firms still has attendance problems; and that firm reports the severity of its problem is reduced.) Fines are not levied when there are bona fide reasons for lateness or absence.

The bonus system gives a higher pay rate to those workers who choose to work the amount time the firm requires, and a lower rate to those workers who choose to work what the firm regards as a less desirable amount. This pay difference can be viewed as a differential rate for more and less desirable workers or as a form of overtime.

OVERTIME

Almost all the firms have, and pay, overtime for hours beyond their new standard workweek. Many are job shops or have seasonal variations in demand. But some firms have no occasion for overtime, or have all employees on salary or at piecework pay rates with a guarantee against piecework. In each of the firms that does have overtime, it is handled differently. The method seems to be tied to the way in which the firm solved the dilemma of maintaining the same weekly paycheck for a new work schedule with fewer hours in it. Some pay overtime each day for hours above their new daily schedule (above 8, 9, 9½, etc.). Others pay overtime only for those hours at the end of the week that exceed whatever the new standard total is (ranging from 34 to 40). A few pay overtime only when the hours exceed their *old* standard workweek.

WHAT RESULTS?

The greatest number of improvements sought were in labor factors, and it is in labor factors that the greatest number of improvements are obtained. (See Table of Purposes and Results.) The 27 firms cited 77 improvements in labor factors. The

most frequent benefit is incentive, morale, or better living conditions for employees; and the second most frequent is reduction of absenteeism (15 of 22 firms). The other improvements, in order of frequency of mention, are: increased number of job applications; easier recruitment; reduction in labor costs as a percentage of sales; reduced turnover; reduced tardiness; and reduced overtime.

A striking result is that the firms generally obtained more improvements than they had looked for. This was especially prevalent among non-labor factors, where they cited 48 improvements.

TABLE OF PURPOSES AND RESULTS

[The firms generally obtained more than they had sought]

Performance categories	Purpose for 4-day	Results on 4-day: Better	Same	Worse	Total
Labor factors:					
Absenteeism	4	15	2	0	17
Benefit or incentive [1]	19	17	4	[5] 1	22
Costs	7	9	4	[4] 3	16
Overtime	2	4	1	1	6
Recruitment: more [2]	8	12	2	0	14
Recruitment: better [2]	5	9	4	0	13
Tardiness	2	5	7	1	13
Turnover	2	6	3	0	9
Total	49	77	27	6	110

Performance Categories	Purpose for 4 day	Results on 4-day: Better	Same	Worse	Total
Nonlabor factors:					
Costs	4	3	0	0	3
Customer service	1	7	6	[6] 3	16
Ease of scheduling	0	0	4	12	16
Flexible scheduling	0	4	0	0	4
Production costs	4	10	3	[6] 1	14
Profits on sales	2	8	3	0	11
Output	5	12	6	0	18
Throughput	3	3	0	0	3
Sales promotion	3	1	0	[5] 2	3
Total	22	48	22	18	88

[1] Change in morale was used as a measure.
[2] Number of applications was used as a measure.
[3] Ease of recruitment was used as a measure.
[4] All said added costs are compensated for by increased production and sales.
[5] All discontinued 4-day.
[6] Compensated for by sales; so profits are the same.

Note: Not all firms answered all questions.

Output was up for 12 firms. Production costs were down for 10 firms. Profits were up for 8 firms; and customer service was better for 7. (Note: not all firms answered in all categories. The questions of purposes and results were unstructured, and categories were set up after the firms' answers were collected.)

Increases in total output and in throughput were obtained in many cases at firms where the number of hours of labor had been reduced. It is sometimes said that most firms operate at less than peak efficiency. The question is why? The results of 4-day firms indicate that total number of hours on the job is less critical to output than other factors, such as distribution of hours and employees' willingness to produce.

Some of the firms found *some* disadvantages. Twelve firms found scheduling more complex on 4-day, but none discontinued 4-day for this reason. (In fact, none of the firms discontinuing 4-day even mentioned having more complex scheduling.) Other disadvantages cited by some of the firms that are *pleased* with 4-day are fatigue for employees, increased workload for supervisors or management, and shipping and receiving problems for firms open only 4 days. The firms claim that these disadvantages are more than compensated for by the advantages.

The 5 firms that discontinued 4-day cited disadvantages that none of the other firms mentioned: complaints by employees, poor customer service, and worsened ability to promote sales. The firms that discontinued 4-day cited the *same* types of advantages that the other firms did. It appears that the types of factors that they alone had difficulty with are therefore critical factors. None of the other 22 found problems in critical areas.

On the whole, advantages far outweigh disadvantages, and more advantages were obtained than had been anticipated. Some of the advantages, though, particularly easier recruitment, will be temporary if 4-day becomes widespread.

WHY SOME FIRMS DISCONTINUE 4-DAY

The 5 firms that discontinued 4-day after trying it for several months to a year's time or so have a variety of different reasons, and have very few things in common with each other, except that they report disadvantages that none of the other firms report. There are 2 manufacturers, 2 retailers, and 1 service firm.

Three have customer-related reasons for discontinuing 4-day. The architecture-engineering firm found some major clients were dissatisfied with the unavailability of *key* personnel. Their purpose for trying 4-day for the summer was to encourage vacations at other times in the year, to keep the work force more even throughout the year. But, although the employes liked it, and though the firm found it had more flexibility for dealing with a suddenly increased work load, and so on, they had to discontinue it. The firm reports it would like to go on 4-day again in the future when there is a new set of clients.

Two retail firms—one, a discount men's clothing store; the other, a discount tire store chain—were both new firms when they tried 4-day. (Only 4 out of the 27 studied are new firms.) Not enough customers showed up. The owner of the clothing store says he could not afford to risk further experiment after a few months' trial. One of the owners of the tire store said his stores could not afford to spend enough on promotion to make 4-day work out. He, too, says he would like to try 4-day again, with a bigger promotional budget. The purpose behind these retailers' moves to 4-day was to keep labor costs down and also have the firms be different enough to attract customers easily.

The manufacturers' reasons are unrelated. One, in frozen foods and delicatessen, tried 4-day when the workload was high and a key consideration was utilization of equipment—a 7-day, 20-hours-a-day week. When the workload dropped, the greater difficulties for management became key; so 4-day was dropped. The owner comments that they were pleased with 4-day when they needed it.

Another manufacturer of loudspeakers says he went on 4-day for his employees' sake and also because the firm would get better productivity with fewer start-ups. After a year 60–65% of the girls were disgruntled; so it was discontinued. He says he feels he was at fault for not presenting 4-day thoroughly. He calls it "a failure of leadership."

As to characteristics that the firms have in common or have in *contrast* to the firms remaining on 4-day there is little to report aside from the fact that 2 of them are *new very small* retailers; that 3 have customer problems; that 3 of them were among the earliest 4-day starts (2 in 1962; 1 in 1960); and that none are located in New England. The other characteristics fit the pattern of the continuing 4-day firms except that none of these firms had better recruitment as a primary purpose for 4-day which is an important reason for many other firms.

A NOTE ON RETAILERS

The 4 retailers are McDonald's Fast Foods, 4 day Tire Stores, Mother's Tire Stores, and Jules Gillette's discount men's clothing. McDonald's is on 4-day in its offices only; and, there, only in the summer. Mother's and Jules Gillette discontinued 4-day.

So, basically, there is only one set of retail stores on 4-day, the 4-day Tire chain. The owners say 4-day is good for keeping their costs and prices under those of the competition, and that 4-day has had advertising value. Unlike the other 2 retail stores, they promoted 4-day very heavily—$100,000 in their first year of operation. Secondly, they are open Thursday through Sunday; the other 2 were closed Sundays. Thirdly, they have a 40-hour week, while the others had 36 and 35 respectively.

I think that each of these factors—promotion budget for the new stores (all 3 were new), Sunday opening, and 4-hour to 5-hour difference in hours opened—played a part in the results. The California tire stores also have the advantage of being in a district where Sunday sales are both legally permitted and socially accepted.

These 3 retailers provide an example of retail stores being open for 4 days only; but not an example of retail stores using 4-day manpower scheduling on 5-day, 6-day, or 7-day openings, which is another alternative to consider. Could 4-day be useful to a retailer open 5 or more days? It has not been tried, to our knowledge; yet it may be worth exploring. (See Chapter 7 for scheduling ideas.)

HOW DO THE FIRMS EVALUATE 4-DAY?

After giving specifics, most of the firms were asked to give their overall reactions, impressions, and judgments of what 4-day is doing for the firm. Here are their evaluations.

How do you feel about the 4-day week, from the point of view of what it is doing for your company?

Feelings:	*Firms*
Very satisfied	12
Satisfied	2
Indifferent	3
Too soon to tell	5
Discontinued	5
Total	27

Would you recommend it to others?

Recommendations:	*Firms*
Yes	11
Depends on type	5
No, they don't know how to use it	1
Total	17

Would you do it again? Yes=20; No=1 (total=21). Two of the affirmative firms are firms that discontinued 4-day. Both say they

plan to try 4-day again. The 1 negative firm is also a firm that discontinued 4-day. Even the firms that said they felt indifferent to 4-day say they are pleased they tried 4-day, and would do it again.

Would you do it in the same way? Yes=12; No=8 (total=20). Here are the things that they would do differently (the last two comments are from firms that discontinued 4-day):

1. Would pay overtime after the 8th hour in a day, to provide more incentive.

2. Would settle vacation days and their rate of pay before converting, to avoid disputes afterwards.

3. Would allow old employees an extra day off each month without deducting from the bonus, but not new recruits; to discourage abuse and to reward employees who work more years at the firm.

4. Would advertise itself more heavily, to make the firm better known and to bring more customers.

5. Would change other plant rules at the time of introducing 4-day, to get improved work rules at a more favorable time. An exchange of favors.

6. Would spend more time explaining and pursuading employees to choose the 4-day option, rather than 5-day option; so fewer new workers would need to be hired and trained for the 4-day shift.

7. Would spend more on advertising, because feels 4-day could have worked for the new firm had they spent more.

8. Would spend more time explaining and introducing 4-day to the employees, so they would accept it.

Do you expect any erosion of gains you've made on 4-day, or any problems in the long run? Yes=2; No=13; Don't know=1 (total =16). Those saying *yes* felt they would lose their current advantage in recruiting as 4-day spreads.

ARE SOME FIRMS PAYING HIGHER WAGES THAN THEY NEED TO?

Since many 4-day firms report long waiting lines for jobs where once there were few or no applicants, it raises the question: are they overpaying by paying the same wages they used to?

As discussed above, although there were very few pay increases, the reduction of hours means an increased rate of pay. There is also less money being spent on transportation to and from work and, in some cases, on babysitters. These are effective pay increases for employees, though small ones.

But there is an additional effect of the 4-day week. The reallocation of work hours also means, of course, a reallocation of leisure hours. The same number of leisure hours appears to be much more valuable bunched together on 4-day than when spread out, as on 5-day. Chapter 10 and other Chapters report the workers saying they are able to do things on the 3-day weekend that they could not do on a 2-day weekend; and so forth. This means an increase in the marginal utility of the leisure hours; and, therefore, a boost to a higher level of satisfaction for the consumer of the total package of leisure and wage income. Also, because transportation to and from work is now generally less time-consuming, there is an absolute increase in the number of leisure hours available, which are now more valuable hours.

In short, 4-day provides increased pay rate, decreased expenses, more leisure hours, and a distribution of leisure hours that makes them more useful and more valuable whether they are used for leisure or for gaining additional income at a second job. Any one of these alone is a benefit to the workers. Together, they make a vastly improved "pay" package for the same job.

Most of this vast improvement in "pay" is not taxable, either, which makes it even better. Considering that monetary pay increases are generally very quickly eaten away by both a rising tax rate and also spiralling inflation, 4-day is one of the very few types of pay increases a worker can collect which he can also retain intact over time!

The change is not a total advantage, of course. There is a trade-off against some additional fatigue on the job from the longer hours; and also some inconvenience in meshing the 4-day schedule with family, friends, and institutions still on 5-day. Still, the workers seem to come out ahead.

The answer to whether pay is too high must include the improvements the firms obtain. If profits are improved on the same or a lesser wage bill, as many firms report, some of this improvement may justify the higher "pay" package for the workers. The question is probably unanswerable in terms of logic or ethics, and only answerable in terms of action. (One firm reported paying lower wages to new 4-day employees.) The answer is: to experiment.

WILL IT CATCH ON?

Any effort to predict whether 4-day will spread has the advantage of looking back on the advent and spread of the 5-day week in the U.S.A. There are many similarities in the 2 phenomena. Both started with relatively small businesses; both with predominantly manufacturing firms; both with some firms abandoning it along the way; and both in order to give a benefit to labor at little or no cost to the firm. In both cases, output did not suffer, although the 4-day results are much better than 5-day since there is less reduction in total hours with 4-day.

One of the more interesting parallels, to me, is the innovation's emerging in New England. New England, particularly Massachusetts, has been a continual hotbed of innovation, in a country that has done a lot of innovating. Massachusetts was the first state to have laws restricting females' hours of labor to protect them from abuse (1879); the first state to offer free public education; the home of the Suffragette movement; and now the home of the women's liberation movement; and so forth. The first 5-day firm started here in 1908; and the first 4-day firms as well. Why this happens I cannot say, but it is fascinating that beneficial innovations repeatedly occur at and spread from the long-established northeast coast, the heart of the so-called Establishment.

Unlike 5-day, 4-day is taking place at managements' initiative while unions in other industries are still on 5-day, but are pushing for 4-32. Four-day is taking place during a recession, when profits are being squeezed, and also when many molds are being broken.

Four-day is a reallocation of work hours, and occasionally, a small reduction as well, by firms that had workweeks longer than the average for the U.S. It is usually a year-round occurrence, but sometimes a summer thing. It usually begins as an experiment, or on a trial basis; and usually is a conversion from 5-day, but sometimes new firms open with 4-day.

This book was written primarily to be useful to people who have decisions to make. It is based on a careful study of 4-day firms by professional business analysts and practitioners. And all the facts are reported along with their opinions, both pro and con. The reader can, therefore, draw his own conclusions.

A number of us see 4-day as part of today's mold-breaking, and see today's mold-breaking as a thing of ever-increasing pace.

In my opinion, 4-day will spread, and spread rapidly, because it works well. Firms, by and large, are more efficient on 4-day; and employees, by and large, are better off with a 3-day weekend. It may also be better for the nation: if firms are more productive on 4-day, then 4-day has potential for increasing the GNP.

Whether or not 4-day spreads, it is significant that 4-day experiments are happening at a moment in history when many other nations (Russia, for one example) have only just recently reduced their workweek from 6 days to 5, and much of Europe, for instance, is still on 6-day. Conservative Americans may rejoice in this example of the benefits of our brand of capitalism. But there is still more to it.

We note a startling reverse in who actually constitutes the leisure class in America. Over the past decades, managers and professionals have come to work increasingly longer hours and more days per week. Meanwhile, labor has tended to work increasingly fewer hours and fewer days. This is not a complaint—merely a comment on American life today.

Whether 4-day spreads or not, now that it's here, let's see what we can do with it. How can we use it to meet our goals today? Particularly, what if anything can it do for *you?*

ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM TO INCREASE DEPOSITS IN MINORITY BANKS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a largely unrecognized concern of the Nixon administration is its desire to increase deposits of minority owned and minority operated banks. Evidence of this concern is the administration's progress to move $35 million in Federal deposits to minority national banks.

Under Secretary of the Treasury, C. E. Walker, reported on the successful progress of the program to a Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee this week.

Under Secretary Walker stated that this month Federal deposits in minority owned national banks had reached and surpassed the $35 million goal. In addition the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Treasury have concurrently conducted a campaign to send new private State and local government deposits to these banks.

Partially as a result of this administration's actions, and partially as a result of their own aggressive salesmanship, the 35 minority owned commercial banks have had a growth of 40 percent in deposits for the year ending 1971. I take great pride in noting that the only minority owned bank in Minnesota, which is located just outside of my district, had an increase of 135 percent in this period.

Secretary Walker made it clear to the committee that he is pleased with the progress so far, but there is room for plenty more. Specifically, the increased deposits have created a need for greater capital, and there is a need for less volatile, long term, deposits.

I applaud the administration's efforts to help minority owned banks increase and expand their services to their collective clientel. I welcome and encourage further efforts.

Secretary Walker's formal statement is printed below along with the table showing the minority owned banks and their deposit increases, and a letter from the President of the National Bankers Association—the industry association of minority owned banks—to President Nixon recognizing the fine work the administration has done.

DEPOSIT TRENDS IN MINORITY-OWNED COMMERCIAL BANKS, TOTAL DEPOSITS

[Dollar amount in thousands]

Bank	Sept. 30, 1970	Sept. 30, 1971	Percent increase
Bank of Finance, Los Angeles	$14,847	$17,753	19.6
Pan American National Bank, Los Angeles	13,047	15,855	21.5
Industrial Bank, Washington, D.C.	21,150	25,124	18.8
United Community Bank, Washington, D.C.	7,014	11,246	60.3
The Bank of Miami	14,050	23,593	67.9
Citizens Trust Co., Atlanta	24,593	29,337	19.3
Carver State Bank, Savannah, Ga.	3,348	4,260	27.2
Independence Bank, Chicago	13,014	21,891	68.2
Seaway National Bank, Chicago	20,677	26,472	28.0
Douglass State Bank, Kansas City, Kans.	10,027	11,113	10.8
Unity Bank and Trust Co., Roxbury, Mass.	9,542	10,277	7.7
First Independence National Bank, Detroit	[1] 3,900	[1] 17,000	335.9
First Plymouth National Bank, Minneapolis	3,575	8,420	135.5
Swope Parkway National Bank, Kansas City, Mo.	[2] 7,000	13,911	98.7
Gateway National Bank, St. Louis	9,606	14,325	49.1
Centinel Bank of Taos, New Mexico	[2] 3,555	5,359	50.7
Banco Credity y Ahorro Ponceno,[3] New York	5,684	7,574	33.3
Banco de Ponce,[3] New York	64,169	85,220	32,8
Banco Popular de Puerto Rico,[3] New York	38,721	53,488	38.1
Freedom National Bank, New York	38,985	46,207	18.5
Mechanics & Farmers Bank, Durham, N.C.	$20,353	$26,636	30.9
Unity State Bank, Dayton, Ohio	595	3,071	416.1
Freedom Bank of Finance, Portland, Oreg.	1,900	3,709	95.2
Victory Savings Bank, Columbia, S.C.	2,737	3,409	24.6
Tri-State Bank, Memphis, Tenn.	9,610	13,841	44.0
Citizens Savings Bank & Trust Co., Nashville[4]	7,151	6,581	(−8.0)
Pan American National Bank, Houston	1,535	4,209	174.2
Riverside National Bank, Houston	6,193	7,983	28.9
First State Bank, Danville, Va.	4,438	5,618	26.6
Consolidated Bank & Trust Co., Richmond	11,710	14,180	21.1
Liberty Bank of Seattle	3,789	5,847	54.3
Total (31 banks)	396,515	543,509	37.1
Add banks not open September 30, 1970:			
Banco del Pueblo, Santa Ana		1,560	100.0
Pan American National Bank, Union City, N.J.		2,086	100.0
Atlantic National Bank, Norfolk		468	100.0
North Milwaukee State Bank		4,379	100.0
Total at September 30, 1971		552,002	39.2

[1] Approximate amounts as furnished via phone; actual amounts not available.
[2] Figure not available via phone; amount shown is from October 28, 1970 call report.
[3] Deposits reported represent New York City offices only.
[4] Includes a large city account which is maintained with several banks on a regular rotating basis and was not with the Citizens Savings Bank & Trust Co. in September 1971.

STATEMENT ON ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM TO INCREASE DEPOSITS IN MINORITY BANKS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, CHARLES E. WALKER, OCT. 26, 1971

On July 6, 1971, in a hearing before the Subcommittee on International Finance of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Representative Henry Reuss stated that the Administration's program to move $35 million in Federal deposits into minority-owned commercial banks over a 12-month period (October 1970 to October 1971) was "a miserable failure." Later, on September 28, 1971, Mr. Reuss inserted a similar statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Reuss is wrong. The record on the program is now almost fully complete, and it indicates that the program was a success.

Item: Deposits in the 35 minority owned commercial banks (27 owned by Blacks, 8 by Spanish-speaking Americans) increased from $397 million on September 30, 1970 to $552 million on September 30, 1971. This was a growth of $156 million, or almost 40 percent. (See attached table.)

The growth was spread well among the individual institutions. Thirteen had a growth rate that exceeded the average of 40 percent. Only one experienced a decline in deposits (reflecting primarily the shift of a large rotating city account), and a second had a growth rate of only 7.7 percent (during a year of management reorganization).

Item: The specific target for Federal deposits was reached in October and we estimate that at the present time the increase amounts to $40 million—$5 million more than the goal—with additional commitments promising continuing growth in the total.

Item: The Department of Commerce concurrently conducted a campaign to attract $65 million in private deposits to the banks. As indicated above, non-Federal deposits rose by over $100 million, not all of which can be attributed to the program. But the Under Secretary of Commerce tells me that the private-sector program will easily have attracted $100 million (versus the $65 million goal) by the end of 1971.

Item: The president of the National Bankers Association (trade association for the minority banks) wrote President Nixon on October 15, 1971, applauding the success of the program and citing an NBA resolution on the matter. (The letter is attached.)

Conclusion: The program to build deposits in minority banks is off to an excellent start, in fact, there is danger that in some of the institutions deposit growth will outrun capital strength, since sound banking requires the maintenance of adequate capital relative to deposits. This is especially the case for those institutions which are dedicated to serving minority groups, for such loans by their nature tend to be riskier than some other credit extensions.

Nevertheless, the Treasury Department will continue to administer the minority deposit program, with special attention to moving funds that will remain with the institutions for relatively long periods of time.

GATEWAY NATIONAL BANK,
St. Louis, Mo., October 15, 1971.

The PRESIDENT of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Member Banks of the National Bankers Association are fulfilling an important function as conduits of capital and credit to Black and other minority communities in America. Our ability to do so has been enhanced as a result of a deposit solicitation program of the association.

Your response and leadership, as well as that of other governmental agencies and private industry has contributed immeasurably to the success of the program. In recognition of this, the delegates who attended our annual convention recently held in Washington, went on record expressing appreciation to you and others through the following resolution which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved that the National Bankers Association hereby expresses its appreciation to the White House, State and local governmental agencies, American industry and Capital Formations, Inc. for their meaningful response to the Deposit Solicitation program of this association in behalf of its Member Banks. These efforts are beginning to reflect themselves through increased deposits and thereby providing resources which can be channeled into effective economic development of minority communities,

Resolved also, that the members of the association, in recognition of the purposes for which this effort is conducted, hereby reaffirm our commitment to meet our responsibility to use these deposits to the maximum extent possible for the growth and development needs of our respective communities and to urge that this important effort be continued, expanded and made a permanent program.

Your schedule permitting, the officers of our association would welcome the opportunity to meet with you personally to report specifically on how these funds have been utilized in our respective communities, and to discuss the possibility of expanding the program and making it permanent.

Sincerely,

I. OWEN FUNDERBURG,
President, National Bankers Association.

GRAIN CRISIS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday noon 28 Members of the House joined me in signing a wire to President Nixon urging him to order striking dockworkers at Gulf of Mexico ports back to work under Taft-Hartley authority.

The next day, the National Labor Relations Board secured a temporary restraining order in Federal court enjoining the striking dockworkers at the Port of New Orleans from continuing their walkout.

The effect of the back-to-work order was seen almost instantly. Corn prices went up 3½ cents per bushel at the gulf immediately upon the opening of grain markets Monday. This increase was reflected, also immediately, in the prices Illinois waterway grain elevators were able to pay farmers now at the peak of their corn harvest. Later in the day when the dockworkers left the docks after deciding to appeal the restraining order, the price immediately weakened.

These two abrupt price changes show conclusively that grain prices paid cornbelt farmers are directly affected by the dock strike.

NLRB officials believe the walkout at the gulf ports is a secondary boycott which violates the Taft-Hartley law. According to NLRB officials, while the New Orleans dockworkers may have grievances of their own, the principal reason for their strike is not those grievances, but rather, to support the striking east coast dockworkers. Under the Taft-Hartley law, such a strike is considered to be a secondary boycott and, therefore, illegal.

Yesterday NLRB attorneys were in Federal court in New Orleans seeking a temporary injunction to give the NLRB sufficient time to decide the merits of the case.

The court granted the temporary restraining order based on a demonstration of irreparable harm should the strike continue until the temporary in-

junction is granted or the NLRB reaches a decision.

Certainly irreparable harm is being done the farmers of the Nation who are forced to take lower prices for their crop because of the walkout at gulf ports.

In addition, I witnessed corn being dumped on the ground in the rain in my district Saturday morning. This corn, in a pile 15 feet high and going higher, was uncovered, exposed to the elements and certainly going to be of a lower grade when it is sold.

The open air storage is necessary because all available grain elevator and on-farm storage space was taken as a result of the 3-week-old gulf port strike. Grain elevators in Illinois must turn over their total space at least two and one-half times during the harvest to accommodate all the grain their customers produce. Since the dock strike, river barges and railroad cars have been nearly impossible to obtain, bringing normal elevator rotation of corn purchases to a standstill. The only alternatives are to store grain on the ground or not harvest it at all.

The strike has been costing grain farmers at least $1 million a day. For these farmers, the action taken by the NLRB last Saturday was good news, indeed. I have written Secretary of Labor Hodgson today complimenting him for his leadership. A copy of my letter is attached as part of these remarks.

Also attached is a story from the October 18, 1971, issue of the Wall Street Journal, which, in my opinion, spells out more clearly than anything I have seen up to this point, the justifiable reason why the gulf coast dockworkers should be back on the job irrespective of the New York longshoremen's strike.

The material follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 27, 1971.

HON. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary,
U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your interest in obtaining a temporary restraining order enjoining the dockworkers at the port of New Orleans from continuing their strike is good news, indeed, to the grain farmers of the nation. This port is vital to grain shipments overseas.

This past weekend I toured several counties in my west-central Illinois district and on Saturday witnessed a grim sight.

In the community of Waverly, Illinois I saw a 15 foot high pile of corn stored on the ground, damp from a one-inch rainfall the night before. This same situation is occurring in at least 30 Illinois towns and villages as grain elevators, filled to capacity because they are unable to ship their grain, are forced to dump corn on the ground.

Farmers understand very well the impact this strike can have. The price of corn at the Gulf of Mexico immediately went up 3½ cents per bushel after the restraining order was obtained. This price increase was reflected in bids for corn along the Illinois waterway where our farmers are delivering their corn daily. Prices quickly weakened when the gulf dockworkers walked off the job again yesterday.

While it is too early to measure accurately the price impact of the restraining order over the long haul, it is apparent from the immediate spurt when the restraining order was issued, and the subsequent decline in grain prices, that the strike has a direct effect on the price of corn.

The losses to farmers caused by the strike are permanent and irreparable. I urge you to do everything within your power to keep the port of New Orleans open, and I commend your courageous initiatives so far.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 18, 1971]

BIZARRE LABOR DOINGS ON THE DOCKS

(By John D. Williams)

NEW YORK.—The refusal of dockhands here to accept regular employment will continue to tie up ships from Portland, Maine, to New Orleans until some Solomon-style solution is found.

It's bizarre, indeed. Historically, the livelihoods of longshoremen who lug and tug at cargo have been based on the day-by-day uncertainties tied to ship arrivals. In a desperation move that employers claim will save this port from bankruptcy, they recently offered to put the pier workers on their direct payrolls. Full time.

Thomas W. "Teddy" Gleason, the scrappy president of the International Longshoremen's Association, dismissed the bid as "phony." That would seeem to put an end to it, since the shrewd Mr. Gleason has been notably successful at the bargaining table since becoming president of the union eight years ago.

Yet management's offer deserves a hearing; if parts of it should be adopted, even if modified in bargaining, they could bring changes in waterfront employment practices. The dockers themselves, shippers, steamship operators and consumers might be the beneficiaries.

Frantic employers made the offer in an attempt to correct abuses, both legal and illegal, in a Guaranteed Annual Income, called generally GAI benefit. This benefit, which employers were happy to let expire on Oct. 1 as the strike began, assured workers of 2,080 hours of pay (40 hours a week for 52 weeks) a year whether they worked or not.

A KEY DIFFERENCE

The New York Shipping Association, the employer group, agreed in its new offer to continue this benefit, but with a key difference: All workers in the port would become the direct employes of specific stevedoring and steamship concerns, which would decide when and how the men would be used.

On a prior-day notice basis, workers would be informed of their job assignments. If they didn't receive a call, they would be paid for the day that wasn't worked. The new set-up would reduce the need for hiring halls, where GAI benefit chiseling occurs. These hiring halls, supervised by the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor but paid for by employers, are used largely for making up shortages in work gangs.

Mr. Gleason himself wouldn't be chagrined if these centers vanished from the scene, but he objects strenuously to the employer plan that he contends would overhaul long-standing seniority rules. And privately he may consider the plan a threat to some friendly ILA local unions that could be obliterated by the plan.

Since the advent of "containerization"—the movement of van-sized containers on special ships—in the late 1950s, employers have increasingly moved their operations from old Manhattan piers across the port to roomier spaces at Newark and Elizabeth, N.J. Containerized freight, requiring long ship berths and gargantuan cranes as well as wide storage areas, accounts for 35% of the port's traffic, up from under 10% just five years ago.

This means the New Jersey piers are usually busy and short of workers, while many Manhattan piers are dormant with a surplus of idle men collecting GAI. Nearly 20% of the port's piers are inactive and will probably remain so. The highest concentration of dead piers are in the bailiwick of Local 791, whose president, William "Willie" Lynch, is an old friend of Mr. Gleason.

Farther up the Hudson River, at piers 64 and 76, some 185 members of the 868-member Local 824—headed by John Bowers, who is also executive vice president of the international union—haven't worked for about a year because two steamship companies vacated the premises. GAI pays $9,568 a year.

"There's enough work in the port," complains Michael R. McEvoy, chairman of the Sea-Land Service Inc., a subsidiary of R. J. Reynolds Industries Inc. "The problem is getting the worker to the work."

In the busiest days, when shippers were moving a bulge of freight in anticipation of the dock strike, there were 13,000 men working cargo; 4,000 were collecting GAI, and 1,000 were sick, absent for other reasons or on vacation (they get six weeks vacation annually). Employers claim that 2,000 men averaged only about one work day a week during the past year. Men who toil regularly and receive overtime can earn $18,000 or more a year.

About 1,200 men within the past year took their GAI and didn't work a single minute, management claims. Of this group, about 850 are in Manhattan. And 114 of them were checkers, who tally freight and have portwide seniority as members of Local 1, of which Mr. Gleason is also president. Employers charge that some pier work is often delayed by shortages of checkers.

Many workers, in fact, have found canny ways of dodging work while collecting GAI. One technique: A worker enters a hiring center at 8 a.m. and inserts his plastic coded identity card into a machine slot, as required. A brush in the machine "feels" the man's code and transmits it to a central computer at association headquarters in New York's financial district, thus recording his availability. But he doesn't stick around long enough for a job opening. Instead, he rushes to a job as a construction worker, truck driver, parking lot attendant or bartender. He also draws his GAI pay.

"Many longshoremen are smarter than the computer," states a Waterfront Commission staffer. They know when to "badge" into the computer, he says, and when to get out of the hall without losing their GAI. Mr. Gleason has conceded that abuses exist and has offered to help management police the system. But employers claim his offer lacked "teeth."

GAI ROULETTE

There was also a legal way of skirting work without losing GAI pay. It resulted from a special arbitration award four years ago by Theodore W. Kheel, the professional arbitrator who has helped settle many New York labor disputes. His award established "inverse seniority" and led to a practice described by miffed employers as "GAI roulette."

Because of this, Mr. Kheel is no longer a favorite wtih some maritime employers. "I wouldn't permit Kheel to arbitrate anything for me," asserts D. J. Talbot, president of the International Terminal Operating Co., a subsidiary of Ogden Corp.

The Kheel decision permitted a longshoreman with top-seniority ranking to let a job "pass by" to someone of lower seniority without much chance of losing a day's pay under GAI for refusing to work. For example, if there were shortages of 50 men to work a ship's hold, the debiting for job refusal would begin with the lowest men and proceed upward. Otherwise, the award indicated, older men would be overworked while the younger ones sat about collecting GAI.

"A senior man can look around the hiring hall at the number of men junior to him," says a steamship official. "Then he figures how many men are needed to work the ships

at berth that day and leaves the hall early without a GAI debit. And he'll guess right."

Mr. Gleason, however, declares he'll fight to keep "inverse seniority" arguing that it was won in arbitration.

Although employers estimate their plan would be more expensive than the pre-1965 "casual" method of random hiring tied to ship arrivals, they're sure it would be cheaper than GAI.

In the contract year ended Sept. 30, GAI costs soared to more than $30 million from $24.3 million the previous year and from $5.8 million in 1969. This port first consented to a 1,600-hour-a-year guarantee in 1965. Then, after a lengthy strike, employers agreed to enlarge it to 2,080 hours.

Other ports haven't had any major trouble with their versions of GAI, port officials say. But Boston, with a 2,080-hour annual guarantee, employs only 1,200 workers, and this small number is kept busy. Both Baltimore and Philadelphia guarantee only 1,800 hours, and Hampton Roads, Va., 1,600. Other South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico ports don't have the benefit. So the dispute is confined to New York, while the fiery Mr. Gleason tries to maintain his one-port-down, all-down policy. At Houston and several smaller Texas ports, ILA dockers are ignoring him for now by continuing to work.

Mr. Gleason, however, isn't alone in his opposition to the offer. "How would you like it if from one day to the next you didn't know if you were to work as a reporter or a janitor?" grouses an ILA rank-and-filer in New York. Employers insist, though, that men would retain their "craft" categories: longshoremen (deckmen, holdmen) checkers and clerks; maintenance men; coopers (they repair barrels and crates), and carpenters. Deckmen, for example, wouldn't have to paint fences or sweep piers just to keep occupied. But managers want the right, say, of assigning a deckman to the more arduous position of holdman if they need him there.

COMPLAINTS AND DENIALS

Mr. Gleason has another complaint against the plan. He alleges that it would create a "sort of monopoly" for six employers in the port area. New stevedoring concerns wouldn't be able to enter the field here, he argues.

Employers deny this. For one, they counter, there would be a labor-management board supervising the plan as there was under GAI. And the present 21 stevedoring companies and 16 additional concerns specializing in cargo-preparation functions hardly constitute a monopoly, they say.

One matter the employers are certain of is that the old hiring practices under the former GAI must go. The new plan was offered "so that the port, and all who derive their livelihood from it, might survive," says James J. Dickman, chief employer negotiator in New York, who adds:

"The obvious and quick result of this plan would be that men could no longer have two jobs on one day; productivity would increase as shortages of labor disappear; ships wouldn't be idled by lack of labor; and once again the Port of New York would have the ability to compete with the ports of the world."

Mr. Gleason's reaction to the offer: "They can put it on the next trip with the astronauts to the moon."

PARSONS COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, small colleges in America are having serious problems that all of us should know more about. Some typical and special problems are being experienced by Parsons College at Fairfield, Iowa—a fine school in my district.

As Parsons College approaches its 100th anniversary, it can look back to solid achievement as well as some problems and forward to an unparalleled opportunity to take an important place in the Nation's educational community.

The college was established in 1875 through the generosity of a New York merchant, Lewis B. Parsons, who had become enamored with the Iowa countryside and determined to found a college in the State. His will charged his executors to use a portion of his estate to endow "an institution of learning in the State of Iowa." His son, Lewis B. Parsons, Jr., was instrumental in locating the school in Fairfield and served as the first president of the board of trustees of the college.

For 80 years, Parsons College was typical of many small colleges in the Midwest, offering a traditional liberal arts course of instruction to a student body which averaged 200 students per year.

In 1955, under new leadership, Parsons began to grow and to innovate; and national attention has been focused on the college almost continuously since that time.

The college upgraded its faculty in terms of academic excellence and professional preparation. The percentage of faculty holding earned doctorates was increased appreciably. Faculty salaries were raised to the point where they ranked third among all institutions of higher learning according to official statistics of the American Association of University Professors.

New concepts of college education were introduced. The trimester system was inaugurated to permit the most efficient utilization of resources. The curriculum was reduced to eliminate irrelevant and unneeded courses so that faculty and student attention could be concentrated on significant areas of study. A tutoring program was established to assist students needing extra help. This enabled Parsons to admit students who had had academic difficulties at other institutions and who sought a second chance to take advantage of their potential capacity for educational achievement. For many students Parsons became their first real chance.

The physical facilities of the college were also greatly expanded to provide better living accommodations and better instructional facilities for a growing student body.

In response to this new program embarked upon by the college, student enrollments rose from approximately 300 in 1956 to 5,200 in 1966, a phenomenal growth.

But during this period, Parsons also experienced considerable problems arising from its rapid growth and resulting financial stresses, from its innovation and somewhat controversial new concepts, and, probably most important, from its leadership which failed to evidence valid concern with administrative planning because of a desire for ever-accelerating growth and publicity. The result was the unfortunate loss in April, 1967, of academic accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The NCA's action was based on a criticism of the administration of Parsons College and the lack of stability resulting from its policies; criticism was not directed at Parsons' educational concepts, faculty quality, or student achievements. The faculty of this college has always been and remains of the highest quality.

The college depends almost exclusively on tuition and fees for its income. The reduction in student enrollment from 5,200, prior to loss of accreditation, to its present 1,270 was a severe blow. The college responded by reducing the number of faculty and staff, by lowering their average compensation, and other economies.

For the past 4 years Parsons, under new leadership, has benefited from efforts expended by every element of its constituency. Faculty, staff, students, trustees, and loyal supporters of the college worked together to correct the problems and maximize the strengths of Parsons College. Their efforts were rewarded by a complete and unqualified reaccreditation of the college by the North Central Association in April of 1970.

The college is now resuming its rightful role in American higher education. It has a $21 million physical plant with living accommodations for 2,600 students and classrooms for more than 4,000. It has a highly qualified faculty who have remained stanchly dedicated to its mission—to teach students who want to learn. It has a staff who have remained on campus in the face of attractive alternatives. It has an administration that is imaginative and forward-looking, but careful to avoid uneconomic or unrealistic concepts. It has a board of trustees dedicated to the college and generous in time and money in its behalf.

It has programs that face toward the future. In addition to traditional liberal arts, business, and education majors, it has begun several innovative programs; aviation administration, to meet a modern need for personnel throughout this important industry; public service law enforcement, to produce well-educated personnel who can regain respect for the rule of law; and the management of recreational facilities, looking forward to the needs of a Nation with increasing amounts of leisure time. It has added varsity athletics for women to the usual complement of men's intercollegiate sports.

Recognizing the special problems of veterans of the armed services, Parsons has started its own program of aid which supplements the GI benefits. This program employs veterans who have acquired special skills during their enlistments and allows them to earn money to help finance their education. It has made provisions for veterans to receive college credit by examination and for enlisted and commissioned service.

Throughout its difficult times, Parsons has remained dedicated to an educational philosophy oriented toward student opportunity and student achievement. Perhaps the highest accolade received by Parsons College came from the report prepared by the accreditation examining team. They wrote:

The availability of the faculty for student academic concerns and the hours devoted by faculty members to this kind of personal teaching are great strengths at this college . . . (the) faculty seems to be characterized by a tremendous loyalty to the institution and to the task of undergraduate education.

I wish to add my own commendation of Parsons College to those it has already received. The task that lies ahead of them is not easy. But, if the private sector of higher education is to survive to make its unique contribution to America, it must survive at Parsons College and at hundreds of other small schools like Parsons College.

UNSEATING OF NATIONALIST CHINA IN UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Monday night's decision by the United Nations to seat Red China and oust Nationalist China has created shock waves around the world.

As an aftermath to this unfortunate action, President Nixon, U.S. United Nations Ambassador George Bush, and many others whose basic goal was simply the retention of a U.N. seat for Nationalist China, have come under a harsh gun of criticism. Some have said that President Nixon's announced trip to Peking is to blame for the results. Others have said that Ambassador Bush failed to do his homework, that he did not pursue the job of influencing enough nations to vote on our side.

Neither of these criticisms can be called just. There is no connection between the President's intended visit to China and the U.N. action. Admitting Red China to a seat in the U.N. was a predetermined fact. They just had the votes. It is that simple. So, this was not really the issue. The real issue was the retention of a seat for Nationalist China in the General Assembly. It is also a fact that Ambassador Bush performed his homework commendably. We all know him personally and we know him to be a very able man.

However, the trajectory of this Nation's real criticism should be aimed, not at the President or at Ambassador Bush, but rather at all the self-professed, freedom-loving nations who, while continuing to pay lip service to their respect for all that the importance of freedom implies, chose instead to vote for the expulsion of Nationalist China. The vote of these so-called friends of ours is the greatest irritant in this whole shoddy affair.

While some of these nations indicated to us beforehand that they would vote as they eventually did, there were other nations who saw fit to upset the apple cart in a most auspicious manner—voicing off-stage support for our position, but reversing their vote commitments in the showdown.

Well, I guess these countries have raised their true colors. They apparently are nothing more than fair-weather friends whose sole interest in advocating friendship for the United States lies in their exaggerated belief that the United States is available at a moment's notice to come to their aid when trouble is brewing.

The shoe is on the other foot now. When they called upon us to come to their aid and to help preserve their security as free nations, we rarely hesitated. But, when we raised the S.O.S. flag and asked them to come to our assistance to help preserve the security of a free nation, Nationalist China, many of them flinched. Not once, but on two different votes, they turned against us when the chips were down.

It is now readily apparent from talking with Members on the floor that many of you are angry about this. I share your anger.

I have long criticized the exorbitant financial support we have accorded the U.N. I believe an immediate and thorough reassessment of our financial commitment is now in order. In this regard I have introduced a bill calling for a drastic cut in our contribution to the U.N. Other bills will follow, I am sure, as there is more time for research and consideration.

For years, we have lived up to our written monetary obligations to help operate the U.N. Other nations have not. We have also gone beyond this and chipped in with so-called voluntary contributions, much of which has been expended to maintain peacekeeping forces throughout the world. Again, other nations have not done their share. And mind you, Mr. Speaker, many of these peacekeeping forces were sent to protect the interests of some of the nations which turned their backs on us in the U.N. China vote issue.

In the weeks ahead, I fully intend to pursue passage of legislation which will bring this matter back to an even keel. We must reassess our position in and commitment to the United Nations and we must reassess our commitments to our so-called friends who turned their backs on a free nation—Nationalist China—which so desperately needed their vote and support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all appropriate committees of this House to take a close look at all facets of this situation in light of Monday's U.N. vote.

NATO AND CHINESE REPRESENTATION AT THE U.N.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Monday, October 25, votes in the United Nations General Assembly on the question of China's representation merit close examination.

The United States worked diligently for its resolution which would have required there be a two-thirds majority vote to deprive Taiwan of U.N. representation. No NATO allies joined us in sponsoring this resolution. Only three voted for our resolution—Greece, Luxembourg, and Portugal. Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands, and Turkey abstained.

Not a single NATO ally voted against the Albanian resolution, adopted 76 to 35 with 17 abstentions.

Mr. Speaker, we fought a strong battle and we lost. Our response to this defeat should not be immature. We must respond as the mature nation we are, well acquainted with democratic processes including majority rule. We should be especially alert to the fact that those nations most sympathetic to our world view and upon whom we depend for our national security—our NATO allies—did not vote with us on this matter. Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Norway, and Great Britain voted against the U.S. resolution and for the Albanian resolution. Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands, Portugal, and Turkey supported the Albanian resolution.

We cannot ignore this evidence of world and allied opinion on Chinese representation at the U.N. There must be a positive American response to the opportunities and challenges offered by the new era opened by these votes.

NEEDED: A CHANGE IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on August 15 last—as we hardly need to be reminded—President Nixon unveiled the administration's new economic program. The President at that time announced the suspension of dollar-gold interconvertibility. This action was intended to let the dollar float in exchange markets down to a value that would bring an end to U.S. payments deficits. As a bargaining lever to help insure this outcome, he also imposed a 10-percent import surcharge. Proposed as additional parts of the international policy package were an investment tax credit that discriminates against purchases of foreign-produced capital goods, and the indefinite deferral of taxes on profits from exports.

The Treasury subsequently announced that the United States would be willing to lift the import surcharge in the event that other countries would agree to a $13 billion improvement in the U.S. balance-of-payments position brought about by a combination of: First, exchange rate changes; second, reduction of foreign barriers to imports from the United States; and, third, the assumption of a greater proportion of mutual defense costs by other industrial nations. Treasury spokesmen have also repeatedly indicated the unwillingness of the United States to increase the bookkeeping price of gold by even a small amount as part of the mechanism of bringing about exchange rate realinement.

The chief objective of the administration initiative—a substantial fall in foreign exchange value of the dollar—was described as the only way to solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem in a report published August 7 by the Joint Economic Committee Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. We also suggested, as a last resort, unilaterally implementing such a policy

by closing the gold window and letting the dollar float. The Treasury's reaction at the time was to disparage our recommendations. Its press release stated:

> The limited hearings held by Mr. Reuss did not . . . reflect or develop any wide body of congressional opinion. No discussions are planned or anticipated with respect to exchange rate realignments at the International Monetary Fund or elsewhere.

Fortunately, with the aid of the President on August 15, a wide body of congressional opinion now has developed in favor of the substance of our recommendations.

This economically sensible approach to the balance-of-payments problem of the United States is in the process of being spoiled by the protectionist elements of the administration's program.

Since August 15, Secretary Connally and other Treasury spokesmen have pursued a course of studied ambiguity in answering questions on what concessions from foreigners would be adequate to achieve the removal of the surcharge. At the International Monetary Fund meetings a month ago, Secretary Connally asserted that the United States would be willing to lift the surcharge if other countries allowed their currencies to float freely in exchange markets for a period and made "tangible" progress toward the removal of trade barriers. What is tangible and what is not?

On Saturday, October 16, the Secretary of the Treasury asserted:

> We're under no compulsion to get this thing settled this month or this year.

He doubted that an agreement would be reached at the meeting of the Group of Ten Finance Ministers scheduled for November, "because they're not ready to make an agreement." He was not worried by threats of retaliation, "because retaliation is a two-way street."

The following Sunday, on ABC's Issues and Answers, the Secretary said:

> I assure you that we're not in the least holding back, nor are we in the least reluctant to talk about the problems that have arisen as a result of the President's actions.

On Wednesday, October 20, Mr. Connally asserted before the annual meeting of the American Bankers Association that the surcharge is "going to stay on for a while," and that "it's frankly to our advantage to keep it on" until the United States has "some assurances" that its balance-of-payments deficit will be rectified."

On September 15, I wrote Secretary Connally asking whether sufficiently large exchange rate changes plus foreign assurances to negotiate promptly on international monetary reform, the groundrules governing international commerce, and relative contributions to the cost of mutual defense, would be adequate to bring the removal of the surcharge. Secretary Connally's October 19 answer boils down to more of the same ambiguities. The exchange of letters follows:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1971.

Hon. JOHN B. CONNALLY, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You and other Treasury spokesmen have repeatedly emphasized that in exchange for removal of the 10 percent import surcharge imposed as part of the President's new economic program, we expect exchange rate realignment, a redistribution of the costs of mutual defense, and the reduction of foreign barriers to the purchase of imports from the United States.

A willingness on the part of foreigners to accept substantial exchange rate changes, however, could substitute for the immediate elimination of foreign trade barriers in any program to strengthen the U.S. balance of payments. Similarly, military burden-sharing might best be discussed in terms of a willingness of the United States to station troops abroad as influenced by the disposition of foreigners to raise armies for their own defense, and to bear equitably our foreign-exchange costs.

I have suggested that the United States should lift the surcharge if our industrial trading partners agree to sufficiently large exchange rate changes and if they give us their full assurances to negotiate promptly on (1) international monetary reform, (2) the ground rules governing international commerce, and (3) relative contributions to the cost of mutual defense.

I am uncertain, and statements by yourself and Under Secretary Volcker have not clearly indicated, whether the United States will insist upon immediate progress in all three areas of negotiation mentioned above before the surcharge is abolished. Would immediate exchange rate changes of sufficient dimensions plus a formal agreement to negotiate the other issues be adequate to secure the removal of the surcharge?

I would most appreciate an early response to eliminate my confusion.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 19, 1971.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: In your letter of September 15, you asked: would immediate exchange rate changes of sufficient dimensions plus a formal agreement to negotiate the other issues be adequate to secure the removal of the surcharge? These other issues you list as (1) international monetary reform, (2) the ground rules governing international commerce, and (3) relative contributions to the cost of mutual defense. You asked for clarification to eliminate the uncertainty as to whether the United States will insist upon immediate progress in all three areas of negotiation before abolishing the surcharge.

We are concerned with the related problems of assuring the major balance of payments adjustment which is now required, and with the long-range improvement of the monetary system. Some of the problems of the longer run are relevant to and affected by near-term decisions, so that we cannot prudently neglect them now.

As I stated last week at the Annual Meeting of the Fund and the World Bank, the desired turnaround in our basic balance of payments position cannot be fully assured and lasting unless necessary exchange rate changes are accompanied by trading arrangements that assure fair access to world markets for U.S. products. I also firmly believe that a more satisfactory sharing of responsibilities for security must be part of a balanced economic order.

Progress in the three spheres that you mentioned, including selective exchange rate realignments to new parities, would provide one avenue to removal of the surcharge. Inevitably factors of judgment would be involved in assessing the probable tangible results that we could expect from negotiations in each of these three spheres. I could not now give any categorical statement that a commitment to negotiate would be satisfactory, since a wide variation in useful content might lie behind any such general wording. Nor can I, in a period of international negotiation, state what might constitute minimum or acceptable progress in these spheres.

Recognizing that real difficulties can be encountered in reaching satisfactory results through the negotiation of new exchange parities, I recently mentioned an alternative approach, for the consideration of our major trading partners. My suggestion was put in the following terms:

"If other governments will make tangible progress toward dismantling specific barriers to trade over coming weeks and will be prepared to allow market realities freely to determine exchange rates for their currencies for a transitional period, we, for our part, would be prepared to remove the surcharge."

Whether we proceed down this second path, or the earlier approach of negotiated parity changes, in the near-term, it seems clear that we should not go back to the old and familiar international monetary system of the past. There are improvements that need to be made in our longer-term trading and monetary arrangements. A monetary system dependent on persistent U.S. deficits is not tolerable for the future. This has important implications for international management of reserves and reserve growth. There are also growing problems arising from the potential for massive flows of volatile capital.

As our work goes forward, at various levels and through a variety of contacts with other countries, I hope that we will begin to see more clearly all the parameters of a very broad and interwoven set of problems. So far as I am aware, no multilateral selective currency realignment of major currencies has ever been attempted. It is a new endeavor in monetary history. It will test our powers of mutual understanding and realistic cooperation. I am, however, encouraged by the spirit in which the member nations of the Fund are breaking ground on this unprecedented task. I hope we will see a similar spirit in dealing with the trade and military financing issues.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN CONNALLY.

In failing to specify its position—and other major industrial nations do not seem to have any better idea than I do of what the Treasury wants—the administration is playing a dangerous game. It laid its trump cards on the table August 15. The danger is that what presumably began as a negotiating position in August will harden into a firm stance if no agreement is reached soon.

I have no idea what the Treasury's fallback position is. I suspect that the international phase of the new economic program started with a bold assertion on August 15, but has been played essentially by ear since then, and is still being played by ear.

Instead of being in the interest of the United States, as Secretary Connally and other administration spokesmen claim, the combination of international economic policies that has been chosen is actually damaging this country. The wise August 15 decision to suspend gold convertibility and float the dollar has been distorted into a device to appease protectionist forces.

The 10-percent import surcharge, once the dollar was allowed to float, was ostensibly imposed in order to bring speedy exchange rate realinement. But, because there has not been substantial fall in the foreign exchange value of the dollar, our balance-of-payments position still suffers. While appreciable market rate changes have occurred for some cur-

rencies, the changes fall far short of what is needed.

Why is the new international economic policy proving to be a flop? There are at least four reasons.

First, imports: The import surcharge is applicable to only about half of total U.S. imports. It will reduce this total, according to the Treasury's estimate, by only about $2 billion annually. Thus the surcharge is equivalent to a dollar devaluation of perhaps 2 or 3 percentage points. It is not nearly so effective as an agreement upon exchange rate realinement would be. Exchange rate changes would apply to a broader spectrum of U.S. imports and would be larger in magnitude. It seems generally accepted by both OECD and the IMF staff that the required fall in the foreign exchange value of the dollar should be from 10 to 15 percent.

Second, exports: The new policy has done nothing to promote exports. Every week that goes by without exchange rate realinement, U.S. export industries fail to get the boost they would from a fall in their prices internationally. Thus, the United States is being deprived of badly needed jobs in export industries. As a sop, the administration has proposed the tax deferral gimmick known as DISC. Aside from the certainty that DISC would bring big tax windfalls to those large corporations who are our major exporters, it is extremely dubious that this vehicle would be effective in either of its two major announced objectives—promoting exports and discouraging U.S. direct investment abroad. A more appropriate way to achieve both of these goals would be by achieving an early agreement on substantial exchange rate changes.

Third, services: The new international economic policy has done nothing to improve our balance on international purchases and sales of services. Considerable earnings might result, especially from making it less expensive for foreigners to travel in the United States. Similarly, nothing has been done to increase the cost of investment abroad by U.S. firms or to make it more attractive for foreigners to invest here. As long as the dollar is over-valued internationally, U.S. corporations will be able to purchase foreign firms at discount prices. On the other hand, foreigners hesitate to invest in American stocks and bonds so long as they believe the costs of these assets may fall appreciably in the near future. For the same reason, foreigners will hold back on making job-producing direct investments in the United States.

Fourth, political relations: Good relations with a hundred countries around the globe, painstakingly built up over the years, are jeopardized by the new international economic policy.

A flood of propaganda over the past 3 or 4 years has led many Americans to persuade themselves that the United States has somehow been more righteous in its international economic policies than other industrial nations. With the exception of Japanese policies and the agricultural practices of the EEC, such an attitude is simply not warranted by the facts.

As the following piece by Hobart Rowen in the October 24, 1971, Washington Post makes clear, sin against liberal trade practices is widely distributed:

NIXON IGNORES U.S. BARRIERS WHILE PRESSING 10 PERCENT SURTAX

President Nixon and Treasury Secretary John B. Connally, in the high stakes international poker game they're playing to win lowered trade barriers, are trying to convince the world—and appear to have convinced themselves in the process—that the cards have been stacked against the United States in recent years.

And so, with great reluctance (they say) they uncorked a lethal weapon, the 10 per cent import surcharge, to set things straight.

Now, it is true that since the Bretton Woods monetary system was set up in 1944, many of the world's currencies have been devalued, and the United States has suffered from this cumulative, competitive, cheapening of money.

Moreover, Japan and West Germany were allowed to start out at the end of World War II with deliberately undervalued currencies to give them, as defeated nations, a head-start on economic recovery.

So the dollar had gotten out of whack—it was overvalued, especially in comparison to the yen and the Deutschemark, and a realignment of currencies and reform of the antiquated Bretton Woods system was long overdue.

But the facts on the trade situation do not square with the administration's charges. The truth is that the United States has just as many, if not more, trade restrictions than our partners and competitors all over the world, although one would never learn from Mr. Connally's Treasury Department.

And the insensitive use of the surtax as a lever to force trade concessions is seriously jeopardizing many long-term and close relationships—as in Canada—which may never be repaired.

A speech given by John C. Renner, Director of the State Department's Office of International Trade on January 30, 1971, deserves to be recalled. It showed:

Although the U.S. and European average tariff rates will be very close at the end of the Kennedy round (8.3 per cent and 8.4 per cent), a breakdown of major industrial sectors shows that the European community (EEC) will have the highest tariff in none of the 23 major industrial sectors, and the lowest in 11. The U.S. score is not quite so good: the highest in 4, and lowest in 6.

In the distribution among 919 categories of industrial products, the U.S. has considerbly more high tariffs and also more lows, whereas the ECC's tariffs are grouped more closely around the average.

A small but significant number of the 919 industrials is also hampered by quantitative restrictions such as quotas. The U.S., Canada, and the U.K. are using this device more freely than a decade ago, while discrimination against Japan—especially by the EEC—is widespread.

On the agricultural side, as everyone knows, the Europeans have a bad record, with a highly protectionist Common Agricultural Policy. But in terms of industrial quotas, according to Renner, the U.S. restrictions "cover a relatively large number of products and relate to the largest amount of trade," whereas the EEC's quotas, which also cover a large number "pertain to a comparatively small amount of trade." Japan's quotas cover the largest number of products and affect "a considerable amount" of trade.

The point of Mr. Renner's exercise in January is just as valid today: all of the industrialized countries, including the United States, maintains substantial tariff and non-tariff barriers against industrial and agricultural products.

He said then, and it is worth repeating to his colleagues elsewhere in the U.S. government:

"Unilateral action by any country to restrict trade, changes the balance of concessions arrived at over the years, and is most likely to provoke counteraction to restore equilibrium."

Moreover, the anti-American feeling generated by the bull-in-the-China-shop technique has lost us friends. Thoughtful Canadians (distressed as well that President Nixon erroneously named Japan, not Canada, as the No. 1 U.S. trading partner) wonder whether their government should seek to maintain the historic ties between the two nations. "When they imposed the surtax," said one Canadian sadly, "they didn't even say they were sorry they had to do it."

But U.S. policy, in the face of concern abroad over the possibility of retaliation and world recession seems unbending. Secretary Connally told the American Bankers Association in San Francisco the other day that the surtax "is going to stay on for awhile because it frankly is to our advantage to keep it on for awhile."

Mr. Renner's analysis shows there is plenty of discrimination on our side, running from the American Selling Price valuation system to Buy American practices, now exacerbated by the 7 per cent investment tax credit proposal and the DISC idea (see Professor Surrey's separate piece on that issue.)

Perhaps Messrs. Nixon and Connally should be remained that a cut-throat international trade policy between the two great wars brought on Hitler.

Our heavyhanded monetary diplomacy, attributing all the fault to others, is threatening to lose us friends we can ill afford to lose. An editorial in the October 21, Milwaukee Journal makes this clear:

OUR UPSET ALLIES

The mailed fists of economic nationalism have replaced the gloved hand of diplomacy in American relations with longtime allies. The free wheeling Secretary of Treasury John Connally has taken over from the State Department in announcing American policy. As a result it is shaping foreign policy as well, in a way that threatens worsening relations.

Connally was not a diplomat when he called other nations, including our European allies, cry-babies for their reaction to the 10% import surcharge set in President Nixon's new economic policy. He charged that they were making the United States "the whipping boy" and blaming us for their own economic problems. This comes on top of the shock that our trading partners got when they were faced without warning with American import surcharges, demands for currency revaluation and exclusion of foreign built equipment from American tax investment credit.

Actually, Connally is blaming allies for some of our own mistakes—vast spending on the war in Vietnam, inadequate tax policy, overcommitments around the globe.

His approach also overlooks that other nations have problems, too—political problems that often are as important as the economic ones. Take the case of Canada. It is our biggest trading partner. We have clamped down import surcharges without warning at a time when Canada suffers from serious unemployment. We lecture it on the kind of economy it must have in the future—even hinting that it should be content to be a raw materials supplier and market for our finished goods. Whatever the economic sense, no Canadian politician would accept such a proposal without destroying himself.

This country had legitimate complaints about Japanese trading practices. But by forcing agreement to textile quotas, the Connally tactic has made the political posi-

tion of Premier Sato difficult. The new economic policy, paired with the new American approach to China, hit Japan without warning. Kyodo News Service, which usually reflects government thinking, says that "it is obvious that the United States expects Japan to remain subservient."

British Prime Minister Heath has said that "drastic" American economic policies are sending "rough winds blowing across the world of trade and finance." He warned that Britain must quickly join Europe in the Common Market to protect West European interests against a "protectionist trade war" and against new American policies that stress relations with China and the Soviet Union.

In Switzerland officials say that pending agreements with the United States on tracking down money hidden in Swiss banks by lawbreaking Americans, as well as other matters of mutual interest, will have to be suspended until the effects of what the Swiss consider antagonistic trade policies are assessed.

Other nations have similar complaints. Yet the political problems that current US policy imposes on them are ignored by our economic leaders. The world we led toward free trade, that we preached must live by consultation and co-operation, that we have long presumed to lead, is jarred by our sudden unilateral policies. The United States may be a long time undoing the international damage that has been done.

The 10-percent import surcharge and the proposed discriminatory investment tax credit may well violate the procedures of the International Monetary Fund and the rules of the GATT. Exchange rate changes, by contrast, are recognized as the appropriate way for removing persistent balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses. To create more jobs at home, to improve our deteriorating balance of payments, to avoid wrecking friendly relations with old partners around the world, and to preserve and strengthen the only institutions that can insure fair treatment from other nations in the future, we should stop delaying an agreement on substantial exchange rate changes.

If it is in the U.S. national interest to get a quick agreement on exchange rate changes, why has not the Treasury been more energetic and cooperative in pursuing this course? Agreement on increasing the dollar price of gold by a modest amount would go a long way toward concluding such a deal. Leading legislators, Democrats and Republicans alike, have indicated their willingness to cooperate.

What could be the reason for the Treasury's foot dragging? Is Secretary Connally reluctant to do anything that would increase the dollar costs of U.S. military activities abroad, as a fall in the foreign exchange value of the dollar surely would? Is the Secretary concerned about large multinational corporations that are planning to expand their investments abroad and are loathe to see any increase in the cost of establishing themselves in foreign markets? Could it be that Secretary Connally does not perceive that the course he is pursuing is depriving Americans of jobs and impairing the U.S. economic position internationally? Or could it be that the Treasury leadership is measuring the success of its policies by the intensity of the howls of objection coming from the nations against which it is directed?

I do not know whether any of these speculations is the correct explanation for the Treasury's lackadaisical attitude toward resolving the international economic crisis into which the United States has been plunged.

What is clear is that we cannot continue to drift. Most indications are that a major economic slowdown in Western Europe is in the offing—especially if the United States adheres to the course it has adopted since August 15. In the event of a European recession, the likelihood of reaching a realinement agreement beneficial to the United States will decrease and the probability of retaliation will increase. In fact, the dollars and cents benefits the United States can achieve through any agreement may well be decreasing week by week, as time goes by without a mutually acceptable solution.

The international economic policies adopted by the administration imply that the United States wants to be treated like any other country, but without giving up its special status. We should be treated like others in that we ask for greater flexibility in adjusting the dollar exchange rate. We would like to enjoy the same latitude that other countries do in altering the exchange value of their currencies. On the other hand, we want to be regarded as special in that we insist we are specially injured, and have been especially magnanimous in terms of the policies we have followed over past years.

It would be unfortunate if the only way that the United States can learn that it is not so special is by suffering retaliation. Given the combined impact of the 10-percent surcharge, the discriminatory investment tax credit—which together give U.S. producers of capital goods a protective edge of nearly 30 percent—and the DISC export subsidy, retaliation will surely occur in the event of no agreement.

Secretary Connally seems to have lost interest in reaching an early agreement with the other major industrial countries on how to strengthen the U.S. balance of payments. A change is needed.

In order to save American jobs, and to avoid alienating every friend we have in the world, the President would do well to replace Treasury Secretary Conally with Federal Reserve Chairman Burns as our chief monetary realinement negotiator.

The point of closing the gold window on August 15 was to get an appropriate realinement of the exchange value of the overvalued dollar. But Treasury Secretary Connally apparently cares little about such a realinement. Faced with an expressed willingness on the part of the other leading industrial countries to accept a substantial currency realinement if only the United States will acknowledge its share of responsibility for the world's financial troubles by a downvaluing of the dollar as part of the package, Secretary Connally pronounces himself happy with our protectionist 10-percent import surtax, and ready to muddle along on that basis indefinitely.

As a result of the overvalued American dollar, Americans are losing their jobs in our export industries, in import-competitive industries, and through job-exporting excessive American capital investment abroad. Our balance of payments continues to suffer because the import surcharge is vastly less effective than an adequate currency realinement would be. And old friends and allies—from Canada to Costa Rica, from Norway to Japan—are puzzled and hurt at the United States arrogent attitude. Failure in international economics, they perceive, has gone to our heads.

The plain fact is that Secretary Connally's non-negotiating stance hurts vital U.S. interests. Chairman Burns, who also enjoys President Nixon's confidence, thoroughly understands the international monetary game. His mind is untrammeled by the notion that national monetary prestige is more important than orderly world trade. If put in charge of the realinement negotiation, Mr. Burns could, in my judgment, obtain a satisfactory realinement agreement in a matter of weeks. With realinement and a broadened exchange band attained, and the surtax thus rescinded, Secretary Connally could then be turned loose on the kind of table-pounding negotiation which he is good at—getting rid of restrictive trade practices across the board, and inducing greater sharing of the military burden on the part of our allies specifically concerned.

Secretary Connally's famous toughness is good where toughness is indicated—as in breaking down trade barriers and farming out the military burden. It is counterproductive, however, where the toughness hurts mainly ourselves, as in the case of his refusal to realine currencies. A timely switch by the President would well serve the national interest.

AMERICA SAYS WELCOME TO PRESIDENT TITO

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure that I rise before the House. The subject on which I speak is very close to my heart. I refer to the increasingly warm and sincere relations existing between the American and Yugoslav peoples.

This afternoon Marshal Josip Broz Tito, President of Yugoslavia, and his lovely wife, Jovanka, arrive for their first state visit to the United States. I am most pleased, as are other Congressmen of Yugoslav descent, and many other colleagues of ours, that this long overdue, official recognition is being extended to Marshal Tito.

When historians compile the definitive chronology and evaluation of the post-World War II era, Marshal Tito's impact and influence will necessarily loom large. He personally faced down Stalin and his repressive monolithic dogmatism. He opened the first fissures in the Soviet-dominated Communist bloc. His own courage and determination held Yugoslavia together during the starvation

days immediately following the break with the Kremlin. And most recently during the visit of Mr. Brezhnev in Belgrade, we saw the effective repeal of the Brezhnev doctrine and the reaffirmation of Marshal Tito's doctrine of independent national self-determination.

During the years when East and West stared savagely at each other across the Iron Curtain, Tito showed the way and took the leadership in constructing a third world alliance—an alliance that had as its only ideological dogma the belief that the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of every nation, no matter how small or seemingly insignificant, must be respected absolutely.

Marshal Tito, because of the position of leadership inherent in his successful and peaceful dissociation from Soviet domination, was able to communicate to other nonalined nations the belief that it was not necessary to declare sides in the East-West struggle. Marshal Tito understood, as few world leaders or scholars did, that the two power giants must eventually and necessarily arrive at a modus vivendi. The continuation of human life and civilization, as we know it, demanded this detente. He provided a perspective and a balance that did much to mitigate the excesses of our policy of containment and the Soviet Union's policies of repression and subversion.

He also realized, many years ago, that for the third world alliance slavishly to follow the ideological and political lead of one or the other of the nuclear superpowers would further congeal the geopolitical situation—leaving no flexibility nor means of communicating through neutralist governments.

The third world alliance, under the leadership of Marshal Tito, did provide these safety valves. Tito's insistence on being his own man and his declaration that Yugoslavia would follow the ideological and political lead of neither Eastern nor Western bloc has been like a fresh and cooling breeze through the musty and crusty halls of propaganda politics. Both sides have learned from this emminently commonsense approach to living in a divided world.

Mr. Speaker, world leaders have embarked on numerous trips—more are planned. Hopefully, these visits and discussions will pave the way for a permanent easing of world tensions. The visit here today of the single man who showed us that nonalinement and peaceful coexistence are not only desirable and possible, but absolutely necessary, must serve to spur us on to greater efforts at international understanding and good will.

The example of this valorous warrior shows us the path to peace, to deescalation of the nuclear arms race and to competition and cooperation in pacific pursuits.

President Tito has personified, for over 25 years, the quest for world peace through recognition of the integrity and inviolability of all nations.

I admire Tito as head of his nation, diplomat and teacher of diplomats, and as a close personal friend. I look forward to renewing this friendship during President Tito's visit here. We owe all this extraordinary man a great debt. In his personal integrity, strength, and dedication he has demonstrated for all to see those virtues that are truly the signs of a nation's greatness and true world prestige.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a good number of fine press reports and analyses concerning the visit of President Tito and Mrs. Broz to our country. As a further sign of esteem for Marshal Tito, I include these in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 27, 1971]

TITO TO ARRIVE TODAY, WILL VISIT CAMP DAVID

President Tito of Yugoslavia spent the night in Canada before flying to Washington today to meet with President Nixon.

Tito arrived in Gander, Nfld., yesterday aboard an Ilyushin 18 turboprop aircraft. He is accompanied by his wife and Foreign Minister Mirko Tepevac.

The 79-year-old Yugoslav president was welcomed informally in Gander by Canadian Transport Minister Don Jamieson and Bruce Williams, Canada's ambassador to Yugoslavia.

Tito was scheduled to land at Andrews Air Force Base this afternoon. He was to go directly to the presidential retreat at Camp David, Md. Tito will spend a week in the United States before returning to Canada for an official visit.

In an interview broadcast on CBS television last night, Tito said he would encourage Nixon to "come to terms, to reach agreement" with the Chinese and Russians during the president's visit to Peking and Moscow.

"In my estimation, President Nixon's decision to visit Moscow, after China, was quite correct. It is a very good and reasonable move," Tito told Walter Cronkite in the interview, filmed in Belgrade.

"But," Tito said, "the determination to go to China requires further action. What should be the outcome of this? Because, to go to China without anything coming out of it—as, for instance, withdrawal from Indochina and the cessation of the war—could cause great disappointment.

"For the visit to Moscow it is also necessary to work out beforehand a plan as to what is to follow, what agreement will be concluded. I know that negotiations are underway on the question of antimissile defense . . . but all these are partial measures.

"What is needed is a general agreement that such arms shall not be manufactured any longer and that all the technical capabilities of the world shall be put into the service of mankind. . . ."

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 27, 1971]

TITO AND OUR FALSE ASSUMPTIONS

(By Frank Getlein)

President Tito arrives in Washington today and not a moment too soon.

We are accustomed to thinking of leaders of "funny little countries" like Yugoslavia as having a strictly one-way relationship with funny big countries like the United States or the Soviet Union. The relationship is that of client to patron.

In that view, all the world is in the process of being divided up into two or three basic client-patron systems, one headed by the Russians, one by the Americans, one by the Chinese.

Tito represents a conscious, articulate and somewhat successful alternative. In the international divvying-up of the world into power blocs, as envisioned alike by the Comintern and by the State Department of John Foster Dulles, everybody has to belong to one or the other of the great groupings based on the ideologies and the real or imagined national interests of the bloc leaders.

Tito, at a very early stage of his career as the peacetime leader of Yugoslavia, said no. Although the government, brought into existence by its own dedicated struggle against the Nazis in World War II, was indubitably communist, that government refused to regard its nation as a pawn, or even an unreserved ally, of the Soviet Union, which was supposed to be the head Communist country in the world.

Yugoslavia, he said—and he said it with the same fighting determination that had finally defeated the Nazis in that country—preferred to be independent of Russia.

Moreover, he added, Yugoslavia would not only build its own destiny, it would actively assist, as far as it could, other small nations to stay independent of the polar systems of the great powers. As between the world of American capitalism and the world of Russian communism, Tito proclaimed the viable existence of the "Third World" of those nations which wanted to be themselves.

If the two contending power-bloc systems had been merely styled the Greens and the Blues—as at times they might well have been—Tito's independence would have been shocking enough. But the fact that the Greens were actually the Communists and that the Yugoslav government also was Communist—with Tito himself trained in Moscow—was a further shock to both systems, one from which neither has entirely recovered, although both are making some slow progress.

What Tito's independence demonstrated was that there is no such thing as "the" Communists. The seamless robe of Communist unity is not quite as torn to pieces as the seamless robe of Christian unity, but the direction is the same and for basically the same reason: The consciousness of national self-interests at variance with the self-interest of the dominant ideologues.

This variance was a great shock to the Russians because they had mindlessly supposed that anywhere on earth where the red banner was raised was automatically another-Russian ally, not to say province.

This variance was an even greater shock to the Americans because our own international system also is based on that same Russian assumption of the seamless garment of communism.

Despite manifestations of Titoist independence in Albania, China, Vietnam, most of the countries of Eastern Europe and Cuba, we still operate on that assumption, presumably because it is easier than thinking about reality as it actually is.

Since we may take it for granted that no one seriously believes that North Vietnam is in itself a menace to the United States, only the theory of the Communist seamless garment adequately explains our tragic involvement in the affairs of that country.

If we are really fighting, for example, for the right of the Vietnamese to determine their own destiny, we obviously should have been bombing Paris back in 1954 when the French army was the principal obstacle to such self-determination.

Thus, we fight the Vietnamese liberators of their land from French domination because we believe that they are the tools of Russians and/or the Chinese.

The message of Tito, not so much by word as by his very existence, is that we probably have been wrong in that assumption. It is a lesson well worth our learning.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1971]

A PLEA FROM TITO ON EVE OF U.S. VISIT, HE ASKS A VOICE FOR SMALL NATIONS

(By Dan Morgan)

BELGRADE.—President Tito of Yugoslavia will leave for the United States Wednesday determined to make it clear that the activated global diplomacy of the superpowers cannot succeed if it ignores the interests of small countries.

He views the initiatives of the big powers, particularly the steps to end Chinese isolation, as essentially positive ones which will lead to a safer world.

In the case of China, he feels that its "opening to the world" will strengthen the cause of sovereignty and independence of smaller countries, and rather than dividing the world will bring it closer together.

But an undercurrent of concern that interests of smaller countries could be shunted aside in the detente-making process was a dominant theme running through an exclusive, written interview he granted today to The Washington Post.

He indicated that while the men in Washington, Peking and Moscow may be attracting most of the headlines today, Yugoslavia and the nonaligned, small countries it has often spoken for are still in the global politics game.

As for the 79-year-old president himself, he seems to relish the challenge of making Yugoslavia's voice heard once again, and to be flourishing in the midst of one more great service to his country—that of preparing it for a future that have the benefit of his advice.

For the last year, he has been devoting all his energies to a major domestic reform, and to setting relations with the Vatican, Western Europe, the Soviet Union and the nonaligned world on a solid footing. All this activity has been undertaken in expectation of eventual retirement.

His trip to the United States this week is seen in that context of preparing for the future as well. But unlike Tito's first meeting with President Nixon here last year, this meeting takes place in a moment of international change, and with an American President who has begun to measure up to Tito's own stature as a daring statesman.

In recent years, President Tito's personal contacts with the foreign press have become rarer. The interview, the first he has granted to an American newspaper in several years, was therefore something of a departure, and a sign of his determination to advertise Yugoslavia's intensified participation in world affairs as broadly as possible.

The interview itself consisted of questions submitted in advance, with written answers personally approved by him, and released today.

The president then received The Washington Post's Belgrade correspondent at the ceremonial chambers in the White Palace here for a further, brief conversation.

Only slightly more than a year ago, President Tito seemed to some to be withdrawing from active public life. Many say that his decision to plunge back into it last September, by announcing sweeping reorganization of the Yugoslav state, has rejuvenated him.

That impression was borne out in his presence today.

Despite a grueling week-long journey to Iran, India and Egypt that ended only Thursday, the president seemed fresh and healthy. He is to leave for Camp David Wednesday and visit Washington, Houston and California in the United States before going on to Canada and Britain.

His wife, Jovanka Broz, sat by the side of her husband who had just been strolling in the sumptuous garden of the palace. The time was about 11:30 a.m. President Tito, who advised President Nixon a year ago that whiskey is healthier than milk above a certain age, sipped a whiskey and water, without ice.

He spoke in good English but later switched to his native Croat.

Beyond the written questions and answers, there was time for only one spoken question, dealing with Yugoslav security. The rest of the conversation consisted of the introductions and courtesies. In response to a question, he said that his country had "no need for protection."

He then went on to comment on the three-cornered relationship involving the Soviet Union, the United States and nonaligned Communist Yugoslavia, which fits into the sphere of interest of neither superpower.

"Good relations with the United States," he said, "contribute to good relations with other countries, including the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has nothing against our having good relations with the United States. We've spoken with them about this and they said so explicitly. From this I conclude that it's the wish of the Soviet Union for us to have good relations with the United States . . . Brezhnev told me so."

In the conversational part of the interview, he indicated no reservations about the intensified Soviet-American contact saying that if solutions to problems can be agreed on, "then the process of detente will be greatly enhanced."

But in the written answer to a question on the same theme, he added one qualification to an otherwise approving assessment of Moscow-Washington relaxation, as follows:

"It must always be borne in mind that vital problems of the present time cannot be solved without an active and equal participation of all countries concerned, irrespective of their size or power."

He also answered a written question concerning the impact of China's emergence on the international scene in the same vein.

"I welcome the evolution of relations between big states, the evolution that fosters the international detente, assuming of course that the interests of small and medium-sized countries are always taken into account irrespective of their social system."

This view—implying that in the current international situation the interests of smaller countries must be protected—closely paralleled that expressed only last week by Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu in conversations with eight visiting American governors in Bucharest.

Ceausescu, whose independent foreign policy had drawn criticism from the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact lands, said that while big powers had a bigger responsibility for world affairs, all countries regardless of size should participate in settling international questions.

The onset of preparations for bloc-to-bloc discussions on European Security and troop reductions has left nonaligned Yugoslav policy-makers in an ambivalent position. In the first place, as President Tito indicated in the written part of today's interview, troop reductions are seen as laudable. But some Yugoslavs worry that the reductions could eventually lead to unwarranted euphoria in Europe that might even increase the vulnerability of nonaligned Yugoslavia to an aggressor taking advantage of a climate of relaxation.

President Tito wrote in the interview that the reductions of troops should "not be achieved by disturbing the present balance," plus implying that he is opposed to any massive unilateral cutbacks by the United States.

President Tito was also asked if he worried about isolationism in the United States, to which he replied:

"The United States of America as well as other big powers cannot but be present and active in international developments. Present efforts of President Nixon and the U.S. government aimed at finding solutions to some international problems by conducting talks, and the understanding with which these efforts are met by the American public, show quite the opposite tendency . . ."

On other major issues, President Tito had this to say:

The end of Chinese isolation favorably affects world developments and consequently promotes the strengthening of sovereignty and independence of small countries.

While the Soviet Union has said that China is a divisive factor in the Communist movement, President Tito said its "opening to the world" can "overcome world divisions."

Referring to talks he had last week with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India, once Yugoslavia's major partner in the nonaligned movement, he said that there seems to be little danger of the subcontinent becoming divided into spheres of interest of the big powers.

Nonalignment is still valid "as long as there are dangers that stem from new forms of alignment." Though he did not elaborate on "new forms of alignment," this seemed to mean alliances between the big powers at the expense of smaller ones.

Nonalignment aims at the "democratization of international relations," he said.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1971]

TITO: TRADITION OF FRIENDSHIP

This is the partial text of an interview given by President Tito of Yugoslavia to The Washington Post. Written questions were submitted in advance and the answers were returned in writing. It was not a spontaneous, person-to-person interview.

Q.: Would you say that your visit to the United States is part of a broader process of preparing Yugoslavia for the future, and if so, what role do relations with the United States have in that future?

A.: Development of mutual relations and comprehensive cooperation with all countries, based on independence, equality and mutual respect have always been and will remain the core of Yugoslavia's politics.

In its framework, we attach great importance to the relations and cooperation with the USA.

Friendly relations with the United States of America have become a tradition and despite the difference between our social systems and different stands on some international issues, they have been constantly and favorably developing to the mutual benefit.

We would like to promote and enhance further these relations and this cooperation in all spheres of activity, in political, economic, cultural, scientific and other fields and to continue looking for new possibilities.

This is why I am particularly interested in this visit to the United States and this is why I am looking forward to the talks with President Nixon with a special pleasure.

Q.: Since you were host to President Nixon last year, the United States has embarked on a new policy toward China. What significance does it have for small and medium-sized countries, including Communist ones?

A.: The fact that the United States and the People's Republic of China have embarked on the road of normalization shows that a realistic attitude toward the situation in the present world is beginning to prevail and that the states are growing aware of the need to have direct contacts and conduct direct negotiations.

Therefore, I welcome the evolution of relations between big states, the evolution that fosters the international detente, of course, assuming that the interests of small and medium-sized countries are always taken into account irrespective of their social system.

Q.: On the whole, is China's emergence from isolation a factor that is likely to strengthen the cause of sovereignty and independence for small countries?

A.: Renouncement of the policy aimed at isolating the People's Republic of China and preventing it from playing an equitable role in international affairs, and on the other hand, its opening toward the world and its activation in the mainstream of international events can help to overcome the divisions in the world and consequences of the Cold War.

It is beyond any doubt affecting favorably world developments and, consequently, it

also promotes the strengthening of sovereignty and independence of small countries.

Q.: Nonalignment was conceived when the world was divided into clearly defined, hostile military blocs. If the process of the detente in Europe results in looser groupings in Europe, perhaps even in less alignment, what would be the rationale for a movement of nonaligned?

A.: The detente process in Europe shows a favorable tendency and we have stressed it many times as a good example proving that even serious international problems may be solved in a successful way.

Nevertheless, as long as there is the danger which stems from the policy of force and interference in the internal affairs of others and particularly in the affairs of small and underdeveloped countries, as long as there are dangers which may stem from new forms of alignment . . . the policy of nonalignment will be meaningful and justified.

Recent changes in the world, and direct contacts between big powers that we have been always insisting on, do not exclude the need for the nonaligned to maintain their continuous activities. Nonalignment does not only mean resisting the confrontation of super powers and block division of the world; it is also a policy with a long-term program aimed at the democratization of international relations, recognition of independence and equality of all countries and solution of all international problems.

Although the contacts between the big are taking place we must say, unfortunately, that the fundamental solution of some crucial problems of the today's world has not yet started.

I have in mind, for instance, disarmament, solution of development problems, etc. . . .

Q.: This detente process I spoke of has been pretty much between NATO and the Warsaw Pact so far. Do you feel left out of this, and of preparations for a European security conference?

A.: The detente process in Europe was so far taking place within the limits imposed on it by the present bloc structure of relations in Europe. However, an ever increasing number of European countries are beginning to take part in this process, and remarkably, not only in the capacity of members of military and political groupings. An important role in this process belongs to nonbloc countries among which, if I may say so, Yugoslavia figures as well. This fact adds to the importance and scope of the detente process and changes the framework in which it is taking place.

A large number of European countries are also actively involved in the preparations for the European security conference because they see it as the way to ensure quality, security and peace on our continent . . .

Naturally, if the process of detente and understanding in Europe is to be lasting and successful, then it must cover all the parts of our continent including the Mediterranean area.

Q.: Does detente between the main military blocs, if it should eventually occur, affect the security of Yugoslavia?

A.: The relaxation of tension between main military blocs represents, at this stage of development in Europe, a necessary component of a broader process destined to improve the political climate, strengthen confidence, cooperation and security throughout Europe. And that should help us to overcome the division of Europe into military blocs in the first place which would, naturally, favorably affect the security of all European countries including Yugoslavia.

Q.: The bilateral, Soviet-American discussions on all the vital world questions will be climaxed by President Nixon's visit to Moscow in May. What is the significance of this for the smaller European countries?

A.: We hope that the talks between President Nixon and the Soviet leadership will contribute not only to the improvement of relations between those two countries but also to the general efforts made in the world to ensure the lasting peace and international cooperation that will be based on equality.

We think that this can only enhance the already favorable atmosphere concerning the faster solution of European problems which concerns all European countries and the small countries in particular.

Nevertheless it must be always borne in mind that vital problems of the present time cannot be solved without an active and equal participation of all countries concerned, irrespective of their size or power.

Q.: Yugoslavia cooperates economically both with capitalist countries and with socialist countries, where command, or at least administrative mechanisms, still govern the economy. Some Yugoslav managers would like to further depart from economic orthodoxy to take maximum advantage of the technological revolution. Will they have their way in the 1970s?

A.: The economic system of Yugoslavia allows self-managing economic organizations to establish broad contacts with foreign partners including also the possibility to use to an ever increasing extent the achievements of the technological revolution. And they are doing that.

The practical results depend on interests and initiatives shown not only by Yugoslav enterprises but also by their foreign partners.

We want our economy to develop as diversified forms of cooperation with foreign partners as possible, including joint ventures and cooperation on markets of third countries. Our government passed a number of measures intended to facilitate and promote such cooperation.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1971]

A GLIMPSE AT A LEGENDARY LEADER AND HIS COUNTRY

(By Dan Morgan)

BELGRADE.—In a world in which the giants are being replaced by gray and cautious subalterns, or collective ruling boards, President Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, 79, still has the glamor and aura of greatness for which Mr. Nixon has made clear his admiration.

Franco of Spain has ruled longer than Tito, but he seems old and uncertain and is holding things together with a strong hand. Mao, the only other Communist leader equaling Tito in length of rule, is a demigod, remote from public life.

Yet somehow Tito remains contemporary, though he was a witness, in person, to the Russian revolution. On the human level he is warm and witty, drinks whiskey, is curious about what goes on around him. Politically, he has access to almost every world leader.

That is what assures that his talks with President Nixon will range far beyond the limited horizon of Yugoslav-American relations, which are essentially good and getting better.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers has already underlined President Tito's usefulness as an intermediary in the search for Middle East peace, and it is certain that the President will also want to hear Tito's views on other world problems in a moment of international flux.

Nevertheless, Yugoslavia's place in the world is undergoing a period of adjustment that will be crucial in determining where it comes to rest between East and West.

Since the 1969 invasion of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia has moved several notches closer to the West. Economically, the attractions of Western technology to independent-minded factory managers has also been telling. Yugoslavia belongs to a number of Western financial institutions, but its links with Communist economic organizations are informal.

Tito's durability as a statesman and as a living legend is all the more remarkable because Yugoslavia is not the center of world attention it once was.

China has usurped its position as the West's main wedge in dividing the Communist world, and in a period of direct contacts between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, Yugoslavia no longer seems so necessary as a bridge.

In an interview last weekend, Tito himself seemed to acknowledge his country's vulnerability by warning that small countries' interests must not be overlooked and implying that he rejected any unilateral American troop reduction that would upset the European power balance.

Even the Middle East, once a stronghold of Yugoslav prestige, the Arab drift toward the Soviet Union has diminished the voice of nonaligned Yugoslavia.

At the same time, economic and political difficulties at home have forced Tito to devote more attention to domestic affairs.

It has not been easy for Yugoslavs to adjust to the changes in the world, any more than it has been for people in other countries.

In a revealing insight into the way Yugoslavs are accustomed to view their leader, an aide said this week: "Tito always commands page one. There is nothing unusual about that."

But there is nothing to indicate that the meaning of the changes taking place in Yugoslavia's relations with the world have been lost for a moment on President Tito.

Tito's trip to the United States, and most of what he has done in the past year, are evidence, in fact, that he has lost none of his contemporaneity in dealing with those changes. The visit, like his tireless barnstorming this year in dozens of provincial towns to demand unity of Yugoslavia's diverse nationalities, is part of a broader program of preparing Yugoslavia for the 1970s.

His visits to the U.S. Space Center in Houston, and his talks with businessmen and aircraft officials in California, will be a nod to the Western technology and capital that has become the West's strongest magnet in appealing to a new generation of Yugoslav technocrats and managers in factories.

In general, the visit is aimed at engaging the United States politically and economically in a way that will subtly enhance Yugoslavia's security—without, at the same time, sacrificing any of its cherished independence of nonalignment.

As long as Tito is on the scene there will be no abandonment of the principle of nonalignment, although Deputy Foreign Minister Anton Vratusa has admitted in an article in Foreign Affairs that "it is not easy to remain nonaligned."

Tito today does not perhaps enjoy the autocratic power in his own country that he once did; but if that is so it is mainly his own doing, and evidence of his own extraordinary gifts of intuition in moving with change.

The creation of a system of workers' democracy in the factories to replace the old command economy, the transfer of more power to plant managers and banks in 1965, and this summer's constitutional reforms that gave regional political leaders much broader authority have all been instigated by him.

"Such a society as ours cannot be held together by a centralistic course, nor can the spirit of unity be built in that way. A new form of unity is being created," he said a few months ago.

That is his hope; and with Tito, the epitome of Yugoslav unity will be on display in America.

Decentarlization has resulted in more freedom, so that frictions between nationality groups continue to surface unchecked. But the common element of the complaints has been dissatisfaction with centralized government, not with Tito.

In the current atmosphere of openness in Yugoslavia, a few "black" jokes about the 79-year-old can be heard in Belgrade cafes. But for every student who complains about the elegant lifestyles of Tito and the Yugoslav Communist ruling class, there is another Yugoslav who upholds them as fitting for their leader.

AND SOME NATIONAL TRAITS WE SHARE WITH THEM

(By Henry M. Christman)

(The writer is Director of The City Record of the City of New York and is the author of some 20 books, the latest of which is "The Essential Tito.")

The state visit to Washington by President Tito of Yugoslavia, the last surviving major European figure of World War II, will focus renewed attention on the international role of Yugoslavia both as a maverick Communist nation independent of East and West and as a spokesman for nonaligned Asian and African nations comprising one-third of the world's population.

So much global attention has been given to Yugoslavia's unique relationships with the United States, the Soviet Union, and China, and to her position as leader and advocate of the Third World that, ironically, the international implications of Yugoslavia's distinctive internal political, social, and economic developments have been largely overlooked.

Certainly, few Americans realize that in respect to many fundamental domestic political, economic, and ethnic issues, today's America has more in common with contemporary Yugoslavia than with the Western European nations from which our legal and cultural traditions are drawn. Constitutionally and politically, the nations of Western Europe are almost exclusively unitary nation-states; Yugoslavia, like the United States, is a federal republic. The nations of Western Europe are ethnically, culturally, and linguistically homogeneous; Yugoslavia, like the United States, is a pluralistic society with diverse groups at varying states of cultural and economic development. The nations of Western Europe, with only nominal "local color" differences among domestic localities, have nothing comparable to the regional rivalries of the United States or of Yugoslavia, the regional distinctions of the latter exacerbated by the centuries-long occupation and partition of the country among dissimilar conquerors.

With this background in mind, the Yugoslav experiments in political and economic decentralization—and the two are inseparably interrelated—take on a striking relevance to domestic American circumstances. For the Yugoslav workers' councils, whereby the workers "self-manage" their own enterprises, are highly imaginative instruments for developing economic and political initiative and control at the local level and simultaneously defusing ethnic, religious, and regional tensions in the process. America's minorities, striving for community self-determination and minority-controlled local economic enterprises, would find Yugoslavia's system of self-management highly instructive.

On the Yugoslav national level, political decentralization has been accelerated by constitutional reforms giving greater local power to the six republics and the two autonomous regions, and the recent establishment of a new collective federal presidency that structurally precludes domination of the nation by any region or ethnic group.

These innovations are being implemented with such widespread and outspoken public debate that some Western observers visiting Yugoslavia, unprepared for such a torrent of national self-criticism, quickly assume that the country is on the verge of chaos. A leading Western European expert on Yugoslavia, Professor M. J. Broekmeijer, Director of the Institute of Eastern European Affairs at the University of Amsterdam, evaluates current Yugoslav national self-examination as probably the most intensive, extensive, and critical of any nation today.

Will Yugoslavia sooner or later succumb to ethnic conflicts? The same question can be asked of the United States, and with equal validity. For the basic issue in Yugoslavia is also a fundamental American domestic political issue: To what extent can and should prospering groups and areas be expected and required to sacrifice in order to support the needs and development of underprivileged ethnic groups and areas? The futures of the pluralistic societies of both Yugoslavia and the United States depend upon the answer.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 26, 1971]

TITO: LAST OF FOUR WHO SPOKE FOR "THIRD WORLD"

(By Murrey Marder)

President Josip Broz Tito's first state visit to Washington this week will underscore special American interest in supporting an unaligned Communist nation wedged between two power blocs.

The fine gradations of diplomatic ceremonials are usually of little interest to laymen. But in the case of this Tito trip, there is an important distinction drawn by officials on both sides—and also by American emigres of Yugoslav descent who seek to disrupt Tito's visit.

For while Marshal Tito met with President Eisenhower at the United Nations in 1960, and conferred with President Kennedy at the White House in 1963, never before has he received the full-scale state welcome he long has sought in the United States, to help reinforce his often-precarious position in the power balance.

Among anti-Communist emigre groups in this country, Serbs, Croats and others, there is acute awareness of this distinction, according to officials responsible for President Tito's security here. There is reportedly added antipathy among many emigres over the fact that President Nixon, once the great favorite of these groups because of his staunch anti-communism, has made the warmest overtures to Romania, Yugoslavia and other Communist nations.

The record of past assaults on official Yugoslav offices in this country has caused U.S. planners to take special precautions for Tito's safety. The incidents that have marred Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin's Canadian visit, despite extra security measures, underline the problem.

President Nixon on Friday made a special appeal for Americans to accord full courtesy to Tito, mindful of the previous demonstrations against the Yugoslav leader on earlier visits of lesser stature. By providing his mountain retreat at Camp David, Md., Wednesday night as an arrival rest stop for Tito and Mrs. Broz, as the Yugoslavian President's wife is called, President Nixon doubly associated his prestige with their visit.

Tito, now 79, is openly engaged in attempting to assure that Yugoslavia's independent brand of communism survives both the fractionalization hazards of its multiple nationalities and the risk of new Soviet domination. He led Yugoslavia out of the Soviet orbit in the 1948, in a historic break with Moscow.

Tito is the last survivor of the quartet of dynamic figures who aspired to lead the unaligned "third world": India's Nehru, Egypt's Nasser, Indonesia's Sukarno. President Nixon, making the first visit of an American President to Yugoslavia, last fall, confirmed there that this administration accepts and supports Tito's brand of unalignment. American officials said yesterday that the full-dress welcome to be accorded Tito here this week will be added evidence of that policy.

President Nixon told Tito last year that the United States would try to encourage American equity capital to invest in Yugoslavia. An amendment to help fulfill that goal is included in the present foreign aid bill now on the Senate floor. It would authorize guarantees for American investment in Yugoslavia and Romania, through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The United States also recently agreed to reschedule $58.6 million in Yugoslavian debts to the United States, as American support for Yugoslavia's stabilization program.

In addition to its attempts to sustain its own non-doctrinaire brand of market economy, Yugoslavia last month played host to Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev, seeking to gain a guarantee of Soviet respect for Yugoslav sovereignty. The results reportedly were some gain, but with some ambiguity remaining about the Brezhnev doctrine of "limited sovereignty" of Communist nations.

Yugoslavia earlier this month reemphasized its independent stance with military maneuvers marking the first major test of its doctrine of "peoples war," drafted after the 1968 Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia.

THE FUEL OIL SITUATION IN THE NORTHEASTERN STATES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in today's RECORD my testimony delivered before the Senate Subcommittee on Small Business which recently completed hearings in Boston on the fuel oil situation in the Northeastern States. I do so in view of the timeliness of the matter, as well as its continuing importance to the whole of New England. The press is replete with rumors that a decision is imminent. Now is the time for us to make our voices heard on the subject. While there is much to criticize in this Nation's approach to its fuel and energy policies, my remarks, for the most part, are directed specifically to an easing of the present restrictions on the import of No. 2 residual fuel oil. I certainly hope that my colleague on the Senate side, Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE of New Hampshire, is successful this time in his efforts to bring to bear on the administration's policy expert opinion of those most involved with the future of New England. The fact is that New England is laboring under enough disadvantages with its harsh winters and distance from sources of raw material without having to continue to pay artificially high prices for oil. By artificial, I mean prices which have no relation to the marketplace but result from deliberately reduced domestic production protected by a Government policy of import restriction.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS HEARINGS HELD IN BOSTON, OCT. 14 AND 15, 1971

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted with the opportunity to present testimony before your committee in connection with its current hearings on the fuel oil situation in the northeastern States. I only regret that the press of legislative business prevented me from testifying personally before your subcommittee while it was holding its hearings in Boston, October 14 and 15. As I said in

my telegram to you on October 15, I endorse wholeheartedly the statements of my colleagues from Massachusetts, Senators Edward M. Kennedy and Edward W. Brooke and Silvio Conte, as well as my other colleagues in the Congress. The matter your subcommittee is considering goes further than a few pennies savings to the consumer for each gallon of oil consumed—not that this would not in itself be an eminently worthwhile objective. But the issue goes further than that because it directly affects the whole economic structure of the New England region. Current oil import regulations have worked and continue to work an unfair disadvantage on the competitiveness of New England industry. Anything that your subcommittee can do toward attacking this unfair freighting of the overhead cost of doing business in New England will come at a time when the New England economy could use any and all assistance it can get to come out of its present doldrums. I personally appreciate the tremendous leadership that you have given all along on this issue and only hope that by continuing to focus on this problem you will create the atmosphere necessary for the implementation of the necessary changes.

No more authoritative source than the Office of Oil and Gas of the Department of Interior in its recent study entitled, Fuel Oil in New England indicates that "New England, more than any other region or district in the United States, depends upon petroleum fuel for home heating, electric power, industrial use, schools, hospitals, etc. . . . New England oil heating accounts for about 21.5% of all the fuel oil consumed in the United States. As of January 1, 1970, it is estimated that four billion gallons of home heating oil surpass the total gasoline gallonage sold in the same six States region in 1969. Current indications show that out of eleven million people in New England, 75% use No. 2 fuel oil as a source of heating, with 19% on gas and the balance on electricity and other sources of energy."

Now, impressive as these statistics are in demonstrating New England's unique dependence upon oil fuel, probably more than any other section of the country, it does not tell the whole story since a considerable amount of oil is also used by the electric power stations at present in the generation and production of electricity. Thus, in a real sense, the power needs of New England are tied up with the supply and price of oil.

Consequently, New England Congressmen have not, surprisingly, been very much at the forefront as critics and commentators on this Nation's fuel policies. While this committee's sights are justifiably broad enough to include an in depth review of the whole national fuel policy as it affects New England, I hope I will be forgiven if I focus on what I feel to be the most immediate, pressing need at the moment; namely, a revision of the policies with regard to No. 2 residual fuel oil.

The shift from No. 6 residual fuel oil, often referred to as a "bottom of the barrel" product, because of its high sulphur content, is already resulting in an even higher percentage of the No. 2 fuel oil market in this country being consumed by the New England region. There has been a heavy conversion to No. 2 fuel oil by schools and industry. In an attempt to reduce the sulphur content, No. 2 fuel oil is mixed with the higher sulphur content No. 6 fuel oil more and more. This trend to No. 2 serves to aggravate an already serious situation.

It becomes ever more imperative that the home heating oil import program for New England established by the President on June 17, 1970 be extended beyond the scheduled expiration date of December 31 and made a permanent program so that fuel consumption plans in New England can be planned in advance for the first time with some certainty for the years ahead. At the same time, we should increase the authorized level of imports from 40,000 barrels per day to 100,000 barrels per day. This would have the doubly beneficial effect of assuring sufficient supplies as well as holding out the prospect of significant price relief. In addition, the current restriction which confines imports to the western hemisphere should be removed, enabling for the first time the New England region to have access to whatever world market offers No. 2 fuel oil at the most competitive price. As it now stands, the restriction has the effect of confining purchases to Caribbean refineries which, for the most part, are subsidiaries of major United States corporations and as such, offer little price savings to New England.

This is an important point, for, given the heavy consumption of oil in New England, a saving of as little as one cent per gallon in the price of home heating oil can save the New England economy a total of $45 million per year. When compared to what our Canadian neighbors to the north are spending on the same grade oil, free as they are to shop in the most economic markets available around the world, some estimates on the possible savings for New England if it could shop under the same conditions, run as high as $150 million a year. This, in my estimation, is a savings worth fighting for, something within our reach, and a decision which would not be that difficult for our domestic oil industry to live with. All the attention focused on how much prices in New England have risen because of the fact that world market prices for No. 6 fuel oil, which is imported free of any import restrictions at present, seems to me to miss the main point of New England's argument. If the New England fuel bill has risen all that much because of No. 6 fuel oil prices, it is all that much more imperative that we try to save what money we can, any possible way. While No. 6 fuel oil prices may be beyond our control, the fact of the matter is that by shopping around world markets as other cities and towns in Canada are doing, we could be saving ourselves money on No. 2 fuel oil, just when we need such financial relief the most.

I do not want to appear too critical of the present regulations in my suggestions for reform. There is little doubt in my mind that the existing program of 40,000 barrels per day, its restrictions notwithstanding, enabled New England to go through the recent winter (1970–71) without severe shortage or dislocation of supplies for the first time in five years. Rather, I would prefer my suggestions for reform and liberalization be taken as the highest form of tribute to the present program. As General Lincoln has said again and again, and I quote, "The program was a test operation and one to be evaluated." It is the opinion of this congressman, his constituents, and, I am certain, the entire New England delegation that the program has been pointing in the right direction and it is now time to make it a permanent feature of the Nation's fuel policy toward New England, after it has been adequately liberalized so as to have an even greater impact on the rising fuel prices New England otherwise seems to face.

I started off quoting from the study of fuel oil in New England published by the office of oil and gas of the Department of Interior. I would like to continue by disputing the implications in that study insofar as they may represent administration thinking on the situation in New England. The study argues that the rising prices and recent crises faced by New England as far as its fuel supply is concerned cannot be blamed on the import restriction program principally because crude oil has been largely unregulated and this is the principal source of fuel for the six-state region.[1]

[1] Pages 20 ff.

The study is referring, of course, to No. 6 residual fuel oil. The fact of the matter is with environmental regulations written as they are, understandably requiring lower sulphur contents in fuels consumed, it becomes imperative to face reality for what it is and to take steps to see that No. 2 fuel oil is available in sufficient quantity so as not to add to the burden New England will face in any event, because of rising costs of No. 6 residual fuel oils. Current estimates indicate that this next winter will see an increase of at least 10–15% in fuel demands over last year's level in New England. The fact is that domestic refineries have not demonstrated any increased capacity to meet this kind of increased demand.[2] If such capacity should develop in the long run, we would be faced with a different situation. However, such domestic capacity is not going to be available in the near future, which happens to be the approaching winter months when our needs are most severe in New England. Whatever "best possible" interpretation can be placed upon the tremendous influence of this Nation's domestic oil producers on the formulation of this administration's fuel policies, we as representatives of New England must question just how long New England can be held hostage in the present to a national fuel policy of the future.

In other words, we are asking for a regulation now which will take into account the present situation, not what might be the potential from domestic sources at some future date. Given the rapid increase in demand in New England, based on the soundest political decisions of the electorate in favor of more environmental controls, and given the absence of an adequate capacity in our domestic refineries to produce No. 2 fuel oil, then the only safety valve in the situation which stands between healthy growth or certain ruin of the New England economy is a permanent increase in imports under more liberalized terms. The oil and gas study referred to concludes as much when it says the short-term answer will almost certainly be to increase produce imports. This will be necessary even if a crash program creating new capacity were to be undertaken immediately by the domestic oil industry.

All of us remember the recent controversy surrounding the announced price increases by Humble Oil Company, set to rise in stages, notwithstanding the President's wage-price freeze policy on August 15. Without getting involved in the arguments surrounding the company's announcement, the fact is that statistics can already translate this into terms of millions of dollars of extra costs for New England this winter. It is all the more incumbent upon us, as members of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation, in keeping with the spirit of the wage-price freeze, to look for ways to keep this major cost factor of doing

[2] *Petroleum Today*, Winter, 1971. Vol 12, No. 1.

Refineries in the U.S. in recent years have sought to minimize production of residual fuel oil, with the current average residual yield running about seven percent of the barrel. This is understandable in light of what hitherto had been the low cost, and abundance, of imported resid.

Simply, there was no reason to increase domestic resid production when there was so little market demand for it and when its selling price was substantially less than the cost of the unrefined crude oil from which it came. Thus, U.S. refiners have stressed production of "lighter," more heavily refined products—gasolines, jet fuels, and distillates—for which there is a heavy U.S. demand.

Faced with today's changed situation, U.S. refiners are beginning to convert a larger share of their production to meet demand for resid. The task is not an easy one.

business and living in New England down to a minimum.

In recommending such a program, I do not feel that I am endangering the jobs of American workers. No. 2 fuel oil, as produced in this country, is not adequate to meet existing demand. Most purchases will still, in all likelihood, be from foreign subsidiaries of major oil corporations doing business in this country, further minimizing the impact of this nation's balance of payment figures.

If I were looking for examples to illustrate the urgency of the problem under consideration during these hearings, I would have to look no further than the example previously offered by preceding witnesses—namely, the town of Braintree and its municipally-owned Braintree Electric Light Company. The example certainly offers as good an explanation as any of why I, as the Congressman who represents the district which includes the town of Braintree, am in this battle as deeply as I am. When the Braintree Electric Light Department requested bids from seven suppliers of oil last year for this year's supply, the bids were opened on July 13, 1970, only to reveal that there were only four responses, all four indicating that they were unable to bid. Throughout the winter, the town of Braintree was forced to purchase its oil in small lots. As has been pointed out, the cost per barrel doubled and tripled last winter. The result, and I know it full well from my constituents' mail, was that rates for both residential and commercial electricity use increased 42% over what they were the previous spring. I am also appending to this testimony, as part of the *record*, an article which appeared in the "Quincy Patriot Ledger" last year, outlining similar purchasing problems in local communities throughout my district.

In conclusion, I simply want to say that for too long the threat of oil and fuel shortages has hung over the head of the New England economy in a threatening and totally menacing manner, making long range planning almost an impossibility. The present 40,000 barrels a day program has been tested sufficiently by this time for its basic merit to be apparent to all in the area most affected. It is time New England was given a permanent program which would breed confidence and certainty in the region. The most immediate and practical benefit from such certainty would be the encouragement independent marketers would receive to make the necessary investments in storage facilities. I certainly do not need to underline the problems that have been created in the past because of a lack of adequate storage facilities. In short, the time for experimenting and debate is passed. What is needed now is action and I hope the subcommittee will play a part in securing such action.

APPENDIX 1

[From the Patriot Ledger, July 17, 1970]

AREA TOWNS REPORT FUEL OIL SHORTAGE

A shortage of low sulphur oil, increasingly required in the U.S. and Europe as an anti-pollution measure, and the failure of oil companies to expand production capacities fast enough to have caused a fuel oil crisis in New England.

PRICE UP 30 PERCENT

Several area communities have already reported an inability to get oil companies to bid on heating oil contracts and where bids have been received, the price has gone up 30 per cent.

Nationwide, production of residual fuel oil grades 5 and 6 (the basic heating oils) to running 20 million barrels behind last year's rate.

The major oil companies have cut back the amount of heating oil shipped to New England distributors 20 per cent.

Each oil company took a different tack, some cutting back the quantity shipped to customers by 20 per cent; others eliminated 20 per cent of their customers.

In addition to the oil shortages, liquid asphalt, a key road-building material, is in extremely short supply in Massachusetts.

"What you've got is a real fuel oil crisis," said a Washington spokesman for the oil companies.

The first indications of the problem came when area school systems found it extremely difficult—and expensive—to purchase number 5 and number 6 grade oil.

NO BIDDERS

The Holbrook, Milton and Randolph school systems have been unable to find anyone to bid on their 1970–71 heating oil contract.

While Milton was seeking to purchase special "anti-pollution" oil with a low sulphur content, the other two towns were seeking only to buy conventional heating fuel. Nevertheless, Holbrook and Randolph received no bids.

Other towns have received bids, but at extremely high prices.

In Hingham, the school system expects fuel oil costs to go up 30 per cent. The town budgeted $35,000 for heating fuel, and the school department now expects that an emergency transfer from the reserve fund will be necessary.

In Sharon, the bids received for number 5 and 6 oil were so high that they were rejected. The lowest bid was 30 per cent higher than the $31,200 spent last year.

Stoughton reported a similar increase.

HOMEOWNER PROBLEM

The situation will not hit the average homeowner until fall when he prepares to purchase heating fuel for the winter. Some experts have predicted that many homeowners may not be able to find an oil supplier.

It seems there are two basic reasons for the problem: a shortage of oil with low sulphur content and the failure of the oil companies to expand their fuel oil production capacities fast enough.

Low sulphur fuel is becoming required in both the United States and Europe as an anti-pollution measure.

Most number 5 and 6 oil presently available has a 2.2 per cent sulphur content. Pollution fighters want to cut this back to 1 per cent. This would reduce the amount of sulphur dioxide (SO_2) produced by oil burning.

BOSTON, MASS.,
October 15, 1971.

Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Small Business, Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request to be recorded in the record of the hearings currently being conducted by your subcommittee in Boston on the fuel oil situation in the northeastern States, as endorsing whole-heartedly the statements of my colleagues from Massachusetts, Senators Edward M. Kennedy and Edward W. Brooke and Representative Silvio Conte as well as my other colleagues in the Congress. The matter your subcommittee is considering goes further than a few pennies savings to the consumer for each gallon of oil consumed—not that this would not in itself be an eminently worthwhile objective. But the issues goes further than that because it directly affects the whole economic structure of the New England region. Current oil import regulations have and continue to work an unfair disadvantage on the competitiveness of New England industry. Anything that your subcommittee can do toward attacking this unfair freighting of the overhead cost of doing business in New England will come at a time when the New England economy could use any and all assistance it can get to come out of its present doldrums. I personally appreciate this tremendous leadership that you have given all along on this issue and only hope that by continuing to focus on this problem you will create the atmosphere necessary for the implementation of the necessary changes. I will follow up on this telegram with a more detailed transcript for inclusion in the record.

With all good wishes, I remain

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

MATCHING FEDERAL GRANTS TO MUNICIPAL ZOOS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting a bill to encourage, through the use of matching grants, projects to improve and maintain the health and environmental condition of animals in zoos owned and operated by counties and municipalities for the general public.

I have been very disturbed over the thoughtless treatment of many of our wild and caged birds and animals by both institutions and private citizens.

Many of our zoos are not receiving proper funding or civic support. As a result, far too many of these animals are not being properly quartered or cared for. The problems are not difficult to comprehend:

Animals who once roamed freely are now kept in cages which in some cases barely provide walking room;

Animals who traveled in packs or herds are kept singly, their only form of exercise a narrow running path;

Neither adequate facilities nor sufficient veterinary care exists, especially in the smaller zoos, to properly care for sick and aging animals;

Cleanliness of the animals and their living quarters is too often neglected.

These conditions do not exist all together in any one zoo that I know of, but they do exist as individual problems in zoos across the country. This legislation will not solve all the problems of all the zoos. Money alone cannot do that. It must be accompanied by civic interest and pride.

The matching grants will encourage those cities and counties who have an initial interest and awareness of these problems to take the next step and plan for their solution.

Appropriating funds to aid municipal and county zoos breaks new ground. I am requesting that $5 million be set aside for political subdivisions of the States, for the express purpose of improving conditions in zoos as they now exist. This money shall remain available until fully spent and shall apply to the United States, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia. Each individual grant shall not exceed $50,000, although the total amount can vary freely.

Qualification for the grant will be determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, upon presentation of a complete description of the project for which the funds shall be used. Consideration shall be given to those political subdivisions making the largest per capita expenditures on their zoos.

As our life becomes increasingly urbanized, I think it is important that our children continue to have a real experience with nature and animal life in its many forms.

Just as important, we want our children to see these animals treated as humanely and kept as clean and healthy as possible. We want them to see these animals as they would exist in their homelands, as a natural part of their environment.

AN OUTLAW IN THE COMMUNITY OF NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, just as there are individuals who by their acts become outlaws, so there are also nations which by their cruel policies and inhuman actions violate all accepted norms of international behavior.

During the 1930's and early 1940's, Germany, goosestepping to the insane rantings of Adolf Hitler, perpetrated the most heinous crime in the history of humanity, systematically slaughtering 6 million innocent Jews in the name of the demented Nazi principle of Aryan racial superiority. More recently, the Soviet Union, adhering to the atheistic Marxian doctrine of dialectical materialism, has persecuted and oppressed its Jewish minority struggling to maintain its religious heritage against Russia's Communist dictators.

Today, I rise to speak out against the activities of another outlaw nation, another dictatorial regime, which is guilty of committing crimes against humanity by terrorizing its small Jewish community. The criminal nation to which I refer is Israel's bellicose neighbor to the northeast, Syria.

The Syrian regime is mercilessly persecuting the 4,000 remaining Jews within its borders in a program of relentless physical and psychological torment. This is the same Syrian regime which races through the most menacing powder keg since the Balkans in 1914, uttering cloud, childish shouts, waving torches, throwing lighted matches around and calling for a war against Israel.

This is the same Syrian regime which acts as a Soviet satellite in the Middle East, having allowed Russia to utilize Aleppo as a naval base. This is the same Syrian regime that has offered sanctuary to guerrilla skyjackers, insolently contravening international air convention and daring the United States to do something about it.

Earlier this month, the Committee of Concern, a nonsectarian group of Americans formed to call world attention to the plight of Jews in Middle East countries and headed by General Lucius D. Clay, released an alarming report on the status of Syrian Jews. The report revealed that the ruthless Syrian Government has placed a total ban on Jewish emigration and that 12 young Jews have been imprisoned, charged with attempting to flee the country.

Of these 12 victims of harassment, three are members of a single family: 27-year-old Azur Blanga, his 24-year-old wife and their 4-year-old son. Two are members of another family: Isaac Hamra and Sheila Hamra. The list includes two men besides those mentioned: Abdo Saadia and Simon Bissou. Four unmarried women are among these Jewish prisoners: Badio Dibbo, Miss Boukehi, Miss Melles and Miss Yachar. The name of the 12th victim is not known.

In addition, the relatives of these 12 Syrian Jews have been taken into custody and interrogated under torture. It is clear from this torture of the prisoners' relatives that Syria's totalitarian dictators are continuing the practice of guilt by association.

Moreover, all Jewish prisoners that have been released from Syrian jails were subjected during their confinement to various forms of savagery at the hands of their Syrian captors. These included electrical torture, the ripping off of fingernails and other types of brutality.

The Committee of Concern's report also revealed that the Jewish cemetery in Damascus has been almost completely destroyed by highway construction. The sadistic Syrian regime persecutes its defenseless Jewish minority in many other ways.

Jews are prohibited from selling their houses and when a Jew dies, his property is confiscated by the state. Syrian authorities have turned over homes in the Jewish quarter to occupation by Palestinian Arabs who harass the remaining Jewish residents.

Jewish schools have been taken over by the state and Moslem principals appointed.

Jews are barred from practicing in most professional fields.

Within Syria, travel by Jews is restricted to 3 kilometers from one's home address. The ban on travel even extends to needed visits for medical treatment. In contrast to this restriction on Jewish travel, 500,000 Moslem Syrians have crossed the border and visited Lebanon during this year alone.

All Syrian Jews are forced to carry distinctive Jewish identity cards marked with a red stamp, "Member of the Mosaic Faith."

A Higher Committee for Jewish Affairs in the Syrian Ministry of the Interior maintains a constant surveillance over the Jewish community, carrying out frequent arrests and sudden house raids at night.

The Committee of Concern has urged that the barbaric treatment of the Jewish community at the hands of the Syrian regime be brought before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. If their response is that this treatment of the Jewish minority is "an internal matter," then my reply, that of the Committee of Concern and that of scholars and plain-thinking citizens of our one world is that this is the same thing that Hitler said when his persecution of the Jews was questioned.

Tyrants in every part of the world, from time immemorial, have proclaimed their perverted theory that what they do to their own people is wholly their own business and that outsiders should keep their prying noses out of what the tyrants have declared to be exclusively "an internal matter." But the truth is that no nation is an island. Humanity is indivisible. Brutality exercised anywhere inevitably wounds the heart and soul of good men everywhere.

That this truth is not universally acknowledged is a tragedy of our epoch in human history. Indeed, the 20th century will be the subject of close scrutiny by future historians for the bureaucratization of evil, and the slowness of neighboring societies and governments to get involved, that have characterized our age. Too often, our era has been marked by morally bankrupt leaders and misled masses committing cruel and inhuman crimes against oppressed minority groups while the world passes by.

To the Syrian tyrants committing these anti-Jewish atrocities, the answer of the U.S. Government, and the answer of all Americans as individuals, should be loud and clear: In the name of humanity, stop. In the name of decency, reconsider. In the name of conscience, reflect on what you are doing. Mankind everywhere, today, is judging you. The United Nations will judge you. Eternity will judge you also.

The admission and retention of a nation in the United Nations has been the subject of recent deliberation throughout the world. If the United Nations is to serve as a truly effective international forum, then it cannot ignore the barbarous actions of the Syrian regime. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights cannot overlook the sadistic brutality of the Syrian Government in persecuting its Jewish minority. I urge the commission to begin immediately a thorough investigation of the torture now occurring in Syria and that the member nations impose the strongest possible economic and political sanctions on the despotic Syrian Government.

PHANTOM AIRCRAFT TO ISRAEL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, together with a number of colleagues, a resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 jet aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the military balance in the Middle East.

In a letter to the President last July, I stressed that the interruption in the delivery of arms to Israel is a cause of deep concern and alarm to all Americans who recognize that this staunch ally is in the front line of western defense in the Middle East. To withhold

the war planes needed to maintain Israel's deterrent capacity is a grave threat not only to that nation's security, but to the peace of the world. American firmness and resolve to keep Israel strong is, in my opinion, the only viable approach to securing a genuine peace in the Middle East.

It is imperative that the United States respond affirmatively and without further delay to Israel's request for shipment of the Phantom aircraft and provide such supporting equipment and assistance as are essential to maintain Israel's deterrent capability.

The text of the resolution follows:

H. RES. 666

Calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East

Whereas, the Soviet Union is continuing to supply additional sophisticated weapons including advanced jet aircraft, and has deployed combat pilots, and other military personnel in Egypt, and other Arab states;

Whereas, these actions have seriously affected the military balance in the Middle East and increases the danger of war; and

Whereas, the aforementioned developments have encouraged certain Arab states to resist peace negotiations and to threaten the resumption of war;

Whereas, this constitutes a grave threat to peace in the Middle East, prejudicial to the vital interests of the United States;

Whereas, the policy of the United States as expressed by the President and the Congress of the U.S. is to maintain the arms balance in this region;

Resolved by the House, that—

(1) The United States without further delay should take affirmative action on Israel's pending request for F–4 Phantom aircraft, and provide such supporting equipment and assistance as are essential to maintain Israel's deterrent capability;

(2) The United States Government should oppose any attempts at the United Nations to alter the meaning and effect of Security Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967, and should reaffirm the importance of secure and defensible borders as a vital element in a peace settlement to be negotiated by the parties themselves.

ANTITRUST SUIT THREATENS LOCAL COMMUNITIES' FREEDOM TO REGULATE BUILDING PRACTICES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, during this coming October 31 to November 4, the Southern Building Code Congress will hold its annual research conference in the city of New Orleans, La. The SBCC is a voluntary association of State agencies, counties, and municipalities in some 20 States, having as its objective the improvement of building, housing, plumbing gas codes of member jurisdictions. To this end it develops and publishes model codes.

The SBCC does its job well. Over a quarter of a century it has compiled a remarkable record of achievement in helping its member jurisdictions update, with a high degree of uniformity, their codes, and code administration.

The SBCC can also show admirable results in its attempt to balance conflicting objectives and competing interests in the matter of codes, that is, to keep building and related codes open to new materials and new methods on the one hand, while paying due heed to the protection of the American homebuyer on the other.

Mr. Speaker, today this fine organization is on trial for its life. It finds itself, together with its executive officers and member cities, named defendant in a $20 million antitrust suit filed in the Federal District Court for Northern Alabama. Plaintiffs are Celanese Corp. and various other interests in the plastic drainage pipe and fittings industry. The plastic interests are complaining that the Southern Standard Plumbing Code published by SBCC restricts approval of their products to one- and two-family dwellings. They contend that such approval should be unlimited, and that any restriction constitutes an unlawful restraint of trade.

SBCC is in narrow straits. It cannot afford to compromise the suit by giving the plaintiffs half a loaf, for it thereby compromises its credibility and reliability as an independent code authority. With building regulation, as with all regulation, the object is to prohibit, to restrict, in the public interest. A building code which allows a builder to do anything he wants, use anything he wants—even at the expense of the public interest—is a public law or regulation in name only. In fact, it is something else, perhaps an engineering manual.

If private organizations violate the antitrust laws by writing model building codes which permit use of some building materials and construction methods while restricting others, then private organizations cannot write model building codes.

Then city and county building officials cannot get together in bodies like SBCC to pool information and strive for uniformity since they are always recommending some kind of restriction. Then the door is wide open for Federal control as the only alternative route to code updating and code uniformity.

Organizations like SBCC are absolutely necessary to the continued existence of State and local building codes. Whatever helps them preserve their integrity and independence is very much in the public interest. It ought to be an aim of the Congress to protect them from devastating lawsuits and from unwarranted harassment of corporate power and Federal bureaucracy alike.

Mr. Speaker, I speak not in abstraction or conjecture. I mentioned a pending lawsuit. ABS Institute and others against Southern Building Code Congress and others. There is strong indication that the biggest likely winner and, therefore, the principal real party in the interest, in that lawsuit is the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

That should be enough to engage the attention of Congress but that is not all. There are at latest count no less than six antitrust suits pending in three Federal district courts. There are private industry representatives going about the South purporting to speak for HUD. There are local government officials asking industry spokesmen what they must do to qualify for HUD money, because they cannot find out from HUD itself. These events reek with the smell of heavy collusion. They cry out for the most searching investigation by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

In recent years, it has occurred to ambitious bureaucrats inhabiting the corridors of HUD that control over hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers money could mean control over many other things as well, including the contents of State and local building codes. The particular vehicle chosen to effectuate the ambitious schemes has been the requirement known as the workable program for community improvement. If a county or municipality has no certified workable program, it is denied urban renewal loans and grants, sometimes amounting to millions of dollars. If it seeks certification or recertification of a workable program, it must, among other things, adopt a building or other code approved by HUD and so suffer the indignity of forfeiting yet another of its long cherished State and local rights. When the community is forced by HUD to adopt a code of HUD's choice, this applies to all construction in this community, and not only that financed by the U.S. Government. Hence, this change in codes demanded by HUD affects every project in every community henceforward. The Federal power is not confined to Federal or federally assisted projects.

All of this has been done without a shadow of authority from the Congress. It is something HUD simply decided to do, because it controls the money and because cities and counties needed that money appropriated by the Congress.

One of the most favored beneficiaries of the HUD code-cracking policy has been, by all odds, the plastic drainage pipe and fitting industry.

In locality after locality seeking badly needed urban renewal money, HUD has issued a direct order: Approve the material in your plumbing code or no money.

So handsomely in fact did the plastic industry benefit that certain price lists and discount practices began to show remarkably similar patterns. On June 29 of this year, four leading producers of plastic fittings found themselves indicted in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. According to the indictment, the four between them accounted for 54 percent of the sales volume of plastic fittings last year. According to the 180-page bill of particulars filed in the case, base prices were in some instances increased two and three times. Four civil cases have been filed against the same defendants, one by the Justice Department seeking an injunction and three by private parties seeking treble damages. Two of these are pending in the Central California District and bear case numbers 71–1589–AAH and 71–1599–JWC. The other is No. C–71–1275 in the District of Northern California.

Mr. Speaker, in this country corporations no less than real persons are innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. I am not assuming that the four defendants are guilty. I am assum-

ing that there was evidence, including price lists, deemed sufficient to justify an output of money and effort to obtain an indictment. HUD all the while was going about the country insisting on approval of plastic plumbing materials in local codes on the score of significant cost saving. Did HUD have any real idea what the real price structure was for these materials?

Celanese Corp., one of the four defendants in the criminal case, is the only named producer plaintiff in the class action against SBCC. Celanese and its industry colleagues want $20 million from city and county members of SBCC. I am far more concerned as to how many millions these same companies may have cleaned from the good people of those same localities by charging unlawfully fixed and inflated prices for their plastic pipe and fittings. I earnestly recommend that my colleagues in the House whose districts include city and county members of SBCC become likewise concerned.

I further recommend to the consideration of the SBCC itself that it can perform yeoman service for its member jurisdictions by serving as a forum for the exchange of information on possible injury to home buyers in its territory from price fixing.

The individual plaintiff, Mr. A. B. Hunter, has been a prominent partner of HUD in other localities throughout the South. Some of those activities are chronicled in hearings in the 91st Congress, second session, before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, entitled "Housing and Urban Development Legislation of 1970," part 1, at pages 653–60. A local official of Dade County, Fla., who had observed Mr. Hunter's activities in fronting for the HUD code policy in that area, furnished Members of both Houses with a report entitled "Evidence Pointing to Unethical Collusion Between Representatives of HUD Regional Office in Atlanta and Plastic Pipe Industry." It seems that on April 27, 1970, Mr. Hunter testified before the county board and his stenographically recorded testimony contains the following gems:

(1) They are willing to take what we are willing to take.

(2) Mr. Chairman, I make my assurance to you that I will get HUD to accept the two stories because I do it every day.

(3) Mr. Headly, if it will help any, I could get a letter in writing stating that they will accept the two-floor limitation . . . I can have it here immediately.

The entire report makes most interesting reading, but the essential feature of it is that Mr. A. B. Hunter interpreted the policy of HUD to the Dade County government and the accuracy of his interpretation was subsequently confirmed by HUD.

At a later date, Mr. Hunter turned his attention to my own State of Louisiana, where both he and the HUD code policy encountered considerable resistance in the city of New Orleans. A newspaper report in the Times-Picayune of Thursday, March 11, 1971, quotes from a letter written by Hunter to James A. Moreau, council president of New Orleans, as follows:

We intend to immediately take two steps in this matter:

1. To request that all federal funds granted under the Workable program be withdrawn and stopped.

2. To begin litigation against your city for discrimination against our materials.

And so this same Mr. Hunter, who faithfully interpreted the mind of HUD in the case of Miami, and who threatened to call down the wrath of HUD upon the city of New Orleans, now calls upon a Federal court to dynamite the Southern Standard Plumbing Code of the SBCC—and he wants $20 million to boot.

When State and city building regulation has been effectively crippled, HUD will be there ready to fill the void. Even now that agency is circulating for comment a draft "Minimum Property Standards for One- and Two-Family Dwellings." This publication when published in final form, will replace the present minimum property standards for one- and two-living units, FHA No. 300.

The present FHA document is primarily a manual of mortgage insurance practice. The proposed replacement is a HUD rather than FHA document. It has all the earmarks of a building code for the acceptance of housing under the numerous programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It will be followed by other minimum standards for multifamily housing and care-type housing. All three are intended to be mandatory.

Against this crass bureaucratic effort to preempt the entire field of building regulation, SBCC, and the other building officials take their stand as a last hope of State and local code autonomy.

I call upon the SBCC to remain steadfast in the face of this threat. I call upon the delegates who will be attending the annual conference of that body to stand up like men honestly and sincerely dedicated to the best interests of their fellow citizens back home. If they cave in in the face of this threat, then goodbye SBCC. Goodbye other voluntary building code associations such as the International Conference of Building Officials, the Building Officials and Code Administrators International, and the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials. Goodbye State and local rights. Goodbye another part of the much tarnished 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

At the present time the House Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs is investigating the activities of HUD. I would hope and pray that the monopolistic control of those firms indicted by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department be fully explored, that the policies of the workable program which are dictatorial be fully brought out into the open, and that a complete investigation of price fixing within all phases of the industry be brought into the open for the benefit of the American public.

CHINESE REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, with the vote Monday night on Chinese representation the United Nations embarks on a new and difficult, but hopeful phase of its history. Since the advent of the Peoples Republic of China the U.N. has been handicapped by the fact that a government representing more than one-fourth of mankind has been excluded from the channels of international diplomacy offered by the U.N.

In the near future, the Peoples Republic of China will have a seat at the U.N. There, it will have the opportunity to voice its positions on issues crucial to the peace of the world, including disarmament, the resolution of conflicts through U.N. mediation and peacekeeping, the relationship between the developing countries and the rich industrial nations, the future of the deep seas, international implementation of human rights, and international protection of the environment. All of these issues are of crucial importance to mankind and to all Americans. They are issues of human survival in this increasingly dangerous world.

I am appalled by the fact that our Government and this Congress are approaching this opportunity for dialog with the Peoples Republic of China with such a negative attitude and with so little consideration for the future. Some say we should punish the U.N. by drastically reducing our financial responsibilities. Others are saying that the effectiveness of the frail mechanism of the U.N. will be destroyed by the Peoples Republic of China.

I appeal to the American people to ignore these voices of defeatism.

I appeal for a united effort on the part of the administration, Congress, and the public for a greater commitment to the struggle for world peace through the United Nations.

I do not want to spend too much time on the past, but I think that the record should be set straight. What the U.N. has done through the vote in the General Assembly is to affirm the fact that the Peoples Republic of China is the effective government of that most populous of nations. The government on Taiwan can no longer claim that it, as a government effective over only 14 million people, represents all of China. However, the reality is that the government based on Formosa can and will continue as a government with considerable economic and military power and with trade and diplomatic relationships with many other countries.

It is true that the Republic of China is an ally of the United States under a mutual defense treaty, but it is also true that the real hope for peace in Asia lies in a negotiated, rather than a military solution of the Taiwan problem. It is the opinion of a majority of the members of the U.N., including most of our NATO allies, that Monday's decision at the U.N. can open opportunities for such a negotiated solution.

We must stress the positive opportunities that lie ahead in which our Government can take effective leadership. For the U.N. to open up these possibil-

ities, there must be agreement among all the great powers, including China, on the election of a strong Secretary General to replace U Thant when he retires at the end of this year. There must be an effort to restore the financial solvency of the U.N. through special contributions predominantly from the five permanent members of the Security Council. The financial investment is low but the stakes and possible returns are high. There must be a serious effort for disarmament in which Peking takes part. U.S. leadership on these three crucial issues is needed to lay the foundations for a new era of U.N. peacekeeping and peacemaking. We cannot be builders if we approach the U.N. with a negative and punitive attitude.

We will have opportunities for dialog with the Peoples Republic of China on numerous other issues. Hard, serious negotiating is never easy, but whether in the economic and social bodies of the U.N. or in the agencies dealing with human rights and international law we must choose between wasting our strength in propaganda battles and using our skills and our will in effective diplomacy.

In these continuing efforts at the U.N. for peace and justice the United States must not stand as a disgruntled, isolated protester; we can rally the support of allies and neutrals alike. The veto power is not, as U.N. history shows, an insurmountable barrier. The real veto has been the unwillingness of the great powers, including the United States, to use the U.N. honestly and productively.

I suggest that we challenge the Peoples Republic of China and all the other members of the United Nations to a race for peace and justice. Now is the time. Let us have the courage to seize it.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The mechanization of Soviet agriculture in which has occurred during the past few years is dwarfed by comparison with conditions in the United States. For the farmers of the United States operate eight times as much farm machinery as are used on the collectivized and state-owned farms in the Soviet Union.

A BLOW TO FREEDOM

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the vote to seat Red China in the United Nations was a sad note for many of us. I feel that it is a blow to freedom, striking off the the membership of a country that has struggled for freedom and against the perils of communism for more than two decades. I regard the entire matter as an injustice of the most serious proportions.

I am sure the question of our support and further participation in the U.N. will come forward soon.

I am hopeful that a majority of the Congress will refuse to continue financial support. I, for one, will welcome the opportunity to do so.

ARBUTHNOT RIDES AGAIN

(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, a short time ago Frank Sullivan, the noted American humorist, celebrated his 80th birthday and I took the opportunity to note this remarkable anniversary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At that time I referred to Mr. Sullivan's prowess as the fashioner of pieces built upon clichés wherein the noted expert, Mr. Arbuthnot, delivered his pompous and empty phrases.

By a welcome coincidence one of Mr. Arbuthnot's most vacuous effusions, his testimony as a literary critic, appeared in the October 24, 1971, edition of the Book World included with the Washington Post of that day.

It is fitting that this memorable creation should have an audience among those who are experts in producing resounding generalities and therefore I append Mr. Sullivan's 1937 New Yorker article to my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD generally.

THE CLICHÉ EXPERT TESTIFIES AS A LITERARY CRITIC

(By Frank Sullivan)

Q. Mr. Arbuthnot, you are an expert in the use of the cliché as applied to literary criticism?

A. I am told that I am, Mr. Sullivan.

Q. We shall soon find out. What is this object, marked Exhibit A?

A. That is a book.

Q. Good. What kind of book is it?

A. It is a minor classic.

Q. And what kind of document is it?

A. It is a valuable human document.

Q. Very good, Mr. Arbuthnot. Please continue.

A. It is a book in which the results of painstaking—or scholarly—research are embodied, and it should appeal to a wide public. This reviewer could not put it down.

Q. Why not?

A. Because of its penetrating insight. It is a sincere and moving study of family life against the background of a small cathedral town. It is also a vivid and faithful portrayal.

Q. How written?

A. Written with sympathy, pathos, and kindly humor. It throws a clear light on a little understood subject and is well worth reading.

Q. How is it illustrated?

A. Profusely. It is original in conception, devoid of sentimentality, highly informative, consistently witty, and rich in color. You should place it on your library list.

Q. Why?

A. Because it strikes a new note in fiction. Mystery and suspense crowd its pages. The author has blended fact and fiction and the result is an authentic drama of social revolution, a definite contribution to poletarian literature.

Q. Told with a wealth of what?

A. Told with a wealth of detail.

Q. And how portrayed?

A. Realistically portrayed, in staccato prose. For sheer brillance of style there has been nothing like it since *Moby Dick*. Rarely does a narrative move at such a fast pace.

Q. What is it a shrewd comment on?

A. The contemporary scene. It marks a red-letter day in current literature. It is capital entertainment.

Q. What pervades it?

A. A faint tinge of irony.

Q. And how is it translated?

A. Ably. It is a penetrating study in abnormal psychology, and unlike most scientific works it is written in language understandable to the layman. It belongs in the front rank of modern picaresque literature. Ideology.

Q. I beg your pardon?

A. I said ideology. Also catharsis.

Q. What about them?

A. Well, they have to come in somewhere.

Q. I see. Now, to return to the minor classic, Mr. Arbuthnot. Would you call it a subtle and arresting piece of work?

A. Certainly I would. Why do you suppose I'm an expert in the use of the cliché? I'd also call it an honest attempt to depict, a remarkable first novel, a veritable triumph, a genuine contribution, a thrilling saga of life in frontier days, and the most impressive study of degeneration since Zola. It bids fair to do down as one of the great biographies of all time, including *Moby Dick*. In short, it has unusual merit.

Q. How does it augur?

A. It augurs well for the future of the author?

Q. And how does it bid?

A. It bids fair to become a best-seller.

Q. And how does it end?

A. It ends upon a distinct note of despair. It is a work of art.

Q. I'm glad you liked it, Mr. Arbuthnot.

A. Who said I liked it?

Q. Didn't you?

A. Certainly not.

Q. Why not?

A. Because it is, one fears, mawkishly sentimental and, one regrets, faintly pretentious. Curiously enough, it does not carry conviction. Strangely enough, it lacks depth. Oddly enough, the denouement is weak. It is to be regretted that the title is rather misleading and it need hardly be pointed out that the book as a whole lacks cohesion and form. I am very much afraid, one regrets, that it falls definitely into the escapist school of fiction. And of course, like all first novels, it is autobiographical.

Q. I'm glad you told me. I won't buy it.

A. Ah, but in spite of its faults it contains much of real value. It kept me awake till three. In the opinion of the present reviewer it would be the long-awaited great American novel except for one serious defect.

Q. What is that?

A. It lacks an index.

Q. Mr. Arbuthnot, it is easy to see that you have earned your spurs in the field of literary criticism. So much for the book. Now, observe this object I hold here in my hand, marked Exhibit B. What is it?

A. That. *That* is an *author*.

Q. Whose are those italics, Mr. Arbuthnot?

A. The italics are mine.

Q. What kind of author is this?

A. A promising young author who should be watched.

Q. What does he write?

A. Powerful first novels.

Q. What kind of storyteller is he?

A. He's a born storyteller.

Q. What kind of satirist is he?

A. A satirist of the first order.

Q. Tell us more about this interesting creature.

A. Well, he cannot be lightly dismissed. He is undoubtedly to be reckoned with, one feels, as a definite force. He is in the front rank of the younger writers.

Q. Why?

A. Because his work plainly shows the influence of Joyce, Hemingway, Huxley, Proust, Gertrude Stein, Auden, Eliot, and Virginia Woolf. Here is an authentic talent from which we may expect great things.

Q. So what do you do?

A. So I hail him. And I acclaim him. He has a keen ear for the spoken word. He also has a flair. He sets out to tell. He deals with themes, or handles them. He recaptures moods. His execution is brilliant, his insight is poetic, his restraint is admirable, and he has a sense of values. There is something almost uncanny in his ability to look into men's souls. And he paints a vivid word picture and works on a vast canvas.

Q. How?

A. With consummate artistry. He writes with commendable frankness.

Q. Using what kind of style?

A. Using a limpid prose style. He has a real freshness of approach that stamps him as an artist in the true sense of the word. He culls his material and his niche in the hall of literary fame seems secure.

Q. I'm glad you like him, Mr. Arbuthnot.

A. But I don't.

Q. No? Why not?

A. Because his talent is plainly superficial and ephemeral. He has an unfortunate habit of allowing his personality to obtrude. His book is badly documented and not the least of his many irritating mannerisms is his addiction to inexcusable typographical errors. His book is full of clichés and he does not make his characters live and feel and breathe. And he writes with one eye on Hollywood.

Q. You mean to tell me that a cad like that has the audacity to call himself an author?

A. Well now, don't be too hard on him. Although he decidedly does not justify his early promise it is as yet too early to evaluate his work. Want to know about the plot?

Q. Yes, indeed. What about the plot?

A. It is well rounded and fully developed. But it is marred by structural weaknesses.

Q. What kind of structural weaknesses?

A. Inherent structural weaknesses. It is motivated, of course. And its threads are cunningly woven into a harmonious texture by the deft hand of a skilled literary craftsman.

Q. Just one thing more, Mr. Arbuthnot. How many kinds of readers are there?

A. Three—casual, general, and gentle.

Q. Mr. Arbuthnot, I think that is all. I can't thank you enough for having come here today to help us out.

A. It has been a pleasure—a vivid, fascinating, significant, vigorous, timely, gracious, breath-taking, mature, adequate, nostalgic, unforgettable, gripping, articulate, engrossing, poignant, and adult pleasure to be of service to you, Mr. Sullivan. Good day, sir.

SHARED TUITION PLAN: A TAX CREDIT FOR TOMORROW

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, when I was privileged to be a member of the Education and Labor Committee, Congress made history with the passage of two major educational laws—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act. With these two enactments, we committed ourselves to achieving education excellence and to the improvement of educational opportunities.

Obviously, the goal has not yet been reached, but we have made headway. Our intention in 1965 was to guarantee all qualified students the chance to pursue higher education. To do this we expanded an existing work-study program. We initiated programs of educational opportunity grants for low-income students as well as a program of insured loans and loan subsidies. We have since expanded these programs as well as the NDEA student loan program.

However, the spiraling costs of higher education are outstripping our efforts. The average cost of sending a student to a public college is nearly $1,500 a year. The cost of sending a student to a private college is double that amount and if a youngster wishes to attend an Ivy League college the cost is between $4,500 and $5,000 a year. To this, you must add at least $500 a year for transportation, books, laundry, and other expenses. Over a 4-year period the totals are staggering. And pity the poor family with more than two college-bound children. Such expenses make higher education prohibitive to a large percentage of families, no longer just needy, low-income families but middle-income families as well. Equal educational opportunity has become a formidable challenge.

The 92d Congress is considering major higher education legislation. The Senate passed the Education Amendments of 1971 (S. 659) on August 6 and the House Education and Labor Committee recently reported out the Higher Education Act of 1971 (H.R. 7248) which will reach the floor today. Major aspects of this legislation include the provision of general institutional aid or cost-of-education allowances to assist colleges with general operating expenses. Such aid would help colleges to slow down the accelerated increases we have been witnessing in tuition charges. In addition, increases will probably be proposed in existing programs of student financial aid.

I am certain that this alone will not achieve equal educational opportunity. These Federal programs emphasize assistance to poor and lower income families, but offer little help to middle-income families. I certainly do not take issue with the postulate that proportionately greater educational assistance should go to lower income families, but it is not a logical extension of this postulate to assume that middle- to moderate-income families should be without some assistance. It is far more equitable, I submit, to assume that while the lower income families may need complete financing in attaining their higher education goals, the middle- to moderate-income families need partial assistance in meeting their children's education expenses.

We must also develop approaches of student aid which will not require further massive long-term outlays of Federal funds but will help the average family to afford the high cost of college. The primary program of financial assistance for higher education currently available to middle-income families is the insured student loan program. Certainly, all of my colleagues must be aware that in many districts this program is simply not sufficient—another consequence of the tight money, high-interest market.

For years bills have been introduced in both Houses which would provide tax credits or tax deductions for the expenses of higher education. Tax incentives have become a permanent and useful component of our tax system as a vehicle for achieving a public purpose that would be difficult to attain by direct means. But the use of tax credits have usually been opposed by the executive branch and key committee members in Congress. The primary objections have been that such bills would cost the Treasury too much money.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would provide greatly needed financial relief to middle-income parents and yet would not further deplete Treasury revenues. It is ironic indeed that that group of citizens who bears the heaviest tax burden, whose taxes finance Federal student aid programs are not eligible to participate fully in these programs. With such an inequity I can understand the resistance of many taxpayers to higher outlays for education.

My bill would work as follows:

The parent, or taxpayer financially responsible for the tuition and fees of any student enrolled in an institution of higher education, would be allowed a tax credit of up to 50 percent of the educational expenses paid during any given year. The amount of the tax credit would not exceed $1,500 for any given year, and the aggregate credits over the period of education of the student are not to exceed $10,000.

To be eligible for this tax credit, the parent and the student join in an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury under which the student would agree to repay the amount of the tax credit granted to the parent. The amount of the repayment shall include interest from the date of the allowance of the credit, at the prevailing Government interest rate. Repayment would extend over a 10-year period which would begin 2 years after the completion of the education of the student.

Mr. Speaker, my shared tuition plan would allow students from middle income families to complete their education without any further massive Federal Government outlays for tuition. There is no revenue loss for the Government; rather, there is a revenue advance from the Government to the student via the parent.

The student, once responsible for the cost of his education, is likely to be more diligent in his studies as are most of us when we are spending our own money. The parent would have the satisfaction of helping to provide for the education of his children without incurring oppressive debts for a service which benefits the student and our country and the next generation.

The late President Kennedy, in his report to the Congress in 1963, stated:

For the individual the doors to the . . . colleges lead to the richest treasures of our open society . . . the power of knowledge . . . the training and skills necessary for productive employment . . . the wisdom, the ideals and the culture which enrich life . . . the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's . . . world . . .

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep these doors open, I introduce today the shared tuition plan; A tax credit for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with my remarks at this point a short summary of the bill:

ANALYSIS OF SHARED TUITION PLAN: A TAX CREDIT FOR TOMORROW

1. General Purposes: To amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a repayable credit for certain expenses of higher education.

2. General Rule and Amount of Credit: The parent, or taxpayer financially responsible for the tuition of any student enrolled in an institution of higher education, would be allowed a tax credit of an amount equal to the lesser of either 50% of the educational expenses paid during any given year or $1500.

A limit of $10,000 would be set on the total amount of borrowing in order to regulate the deferred revenue and prevent borrowers from incurring inordinate obligations.

3. Requirements: The taxpayer must pay at least 25% of the student's expenses of higher education for the year.

The Secretary of the Treasury will publish a simple uniform agreement under which the taxpayer and the student jointly agree that the amount of the credit shall be repaid during the 10-year period which begins not later than 12 nor earlier than 9 months after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education.

The repayment shall include interest incurred from the date of the allowance of the credit.

The Shared Tuition Plan has been reviewed by the Special Sub-Committee on Education, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Ways and Means Committee, the Office of Tax Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, and the New York State Office of Education.

HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENT AID

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and myself will offer an amendment to title IV of the Higher Education Act, H.R. 7248. Our intent is to add greater equity and predictability to the educational opportunity grant program, whose authorization is extended in title IV.

All of us, I think, recognize the major impact that EOG has had on higher education since its inception in 1965. Over 700,000 students have received financial assistance under this federally funded program. For many, EOG aid has meant the difference between attending college and not attending.

But the accomplishments of this program, as important as they have been, should not blind us to some very real shortcomings in the EOG aid allocation system.

These shortcomings were outlined in a Washington Post editorial just prior to committee action on H.R. 7248. On September 28, the Post observed that—

Student aid programs have grown in a topsy-turvy fashion, and anomalies and inequities abound.

Under the Educational Opportunity Grant program, funds are first allotted among states and some states are able to fill a much higher proportion of requests for aid than others. Hence a student's chances of obtaining aid depend in part on where he happens to live. Within states the money goes to colleges and universities in proportion to their requests and is then doled out by student aid officers. Until recently institutions had considerable latitude in defining "need" and standards varied widely. In the last couple of years the Commissioner of Education has been promulgating stricter definitions of need and has endeavored to ensure that—at least within a given state—requests for aid from the lowest income students are filled first.

At best, however, the current system leaves the student in a quandary. He cannot find out in advance how much aid he will receive and he may be treated very differently depending not only on where he lives but on where he applies.

The Post indicated a preference for the Quie proposal, pointing out that the Green bill, later approved by the full committee, merely perpetuated the inequities in the current system:

The Quie version would establish a uniform national method of determining the aid for which a student was eligible. Any qualified student would receive a grant determined by his family size and financial resources—up to a maximum for the neediest students of $1,400 a year or half the cost of attending college, whichever was less. This formulation seems to us both more equitable and easier for students to grasp and anticipate. We hope the Committee will choose the Quie version.

In effect, the Quie-Fraser amendment reaffirms an original intent of the 1965 Higher Education Act—to provide aid for those students with the greatest need. I hope that my colleagues will give full consideration to this intent before casting their vote tomorrow.

AMBASSADOR YOST ANALYZES U.N. VOTE ON CHINA

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Charles W. Yost, now retired, is one of the five American ambassadors designated in our Foreign Service as career Ambassadors. That rank is the highest position an American career Foreign Service officer can attain.

Until recently, Mr. Yost was the American Ambassador to the United Nations, a post he held for several years. He also served as Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson's professional adviser and was Deputy Ambassador from 1961 until 1965. He is thoroughly versed in the workings of the United Nations, and, having been through a number of the debates in the United Nations on the question of admitting the People's Republic of China, he is entirely familiar with that issue. His analysis of that subject, which appeared in the September–October Vista magazine, has great importance, and I am pleased to attach part of my remarks:

CHINA, THE UNITED STATES AND THE U.N.
(By Charles W. Yost)

From the perspective of history our children and grandchildren will no doubt be amazed that the government which unquestionably controlled the whole of China except Formosa was denied representation in the United Nations for more than two decades after it won the civil war. This prolonged exclusion was an impressive, though hardly an inspiring, demonstration of the power the United States exercised during those decades, for there seems little doubt that but for its opposition the People's Republic of China would have been represented in New York many years earlier.

The United States of course orchestrated the role which Nationalist China played in drafting the Charter and single-handedly installed her among the five permanent members of the Security Council, neither of which roles was justified by China's external capacities at that time or perhaps since that time. Having so fervently sponsored the Nationalists, we were shocked at the early downfall which, pursuant to the mythology of the time, we attributed to the Soviet Union, rather than to their own ineptitude and the capabilities of the Chinese Communists.

Nevertheless, the United States might before long have felt compelled to accept the logic of events and in 1950 at least to tolerate the substitution of Communist for Nationalist China in the UN, if the attack on Korea and Peking's subsequent involvement in it had not occurred. Previous American hostility to the People's Republic was so inflamed by the experience of fighting her armies in Korea that the pattern of excluding her from participation in all international institutions was firmly set for two decades, long after some American leaders, such as Adlai Stevenson, had concluded it was no longer reasonable or profitable. President Kennedy in his first year in office seriously considered a change in the policy but found opposition to any change, from the "China Lobby" and others, still so politically entrenched and articulate that he decided not to risk a costly domestic battle.

In 1965 the traditional resolution presented to the UN Assembly by the friends of Peking, the so-called "Albanian resolution," providing for the "restoration of the lawful rights" of the People's Republic and the expulsion of "the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek," achieved a tie vote and it seemed that perhaps the tide had turned. However, by the time of the next General Assembly the "Cultural Revolution" had produced such shocking disarray inside China that opposition to her participation in the UN revived and was maintained without serious difficulty for another four years.

In 1970, however, the Albanian resolution received for the first time a simple majority, 51 to 40. This "majority," nevertheless, still represented only 40% of UN members, since 25 abstained and 2 did not participate in the vote. Moreover, the previous adoption of the U.S.-sponsored "important question" resolution, requiring a two-thirds majority for any change in Chinese representation, ensured the failure of the Albanian resolution.

If one judged by the voting record alone, one might have said that change in the pattern had been so slight and slow that on these grounds there would be no reason to anticipate an early turnabout. True, the Albanian resolution had a simple majority in 1970, but the votes in favor were only four more than in 1965; the votes *against* were actually two *more* than in 1965, and the abstentions were five more. There were still at the beginning of 1971, moreover, more UN

members having diplomatic relations with Taipei than with Peking.

Nevertheless, a far more significant change had occurred by that time than the bare votes revealed. For years many governments, including many that voted against the Albanian resolution because they opposed the expulsion of Taiwan or merely out of friendship for the United States, had felt it increasingly illogical and unwise that there should be no place in an international institution, which aspires to be universal, for the government firmly in control of the world's largest population. Even many of those most friendly to the United States were growing increasingly unhappy with its insistence that they conform to a policy they felt was obsolete and damaging to their own interests and those of the United Nations.

President Nixon himself had several times voiced his belief that the People's Republic of China should be drawn out of its long-standing isolation and into participation in the common endeavors of the international community. More and more governments were coming to feel that the very process of such participation, the exposure of the leaders and representatives of the PRC to currents of opinion and winds of change outside their own inward-looking society, which would flow from their presence at UN meetings, would be healthy in its effect both on them and on the world at large. There were also matters of the greatest pith and substance in which the involvement of the PRC would be useful, in some cases indispensable—such as the control and reduction of both nuclear and conventional armaments, the stabilization and security of East Asia, and the protection of the environment.

In the context of these considerations and this newly prevailing mood, the simple majority of 2 votes for the Albanian resolution had a catalytic effect far out of proportion to the bare arithmetic. The stage was already set at the beginning of the year, therefore, for some dramatic movement during the 1971 General Assembly. The only question in the minds of informed observers was whether the shift to Peking would be so substantial as to ensure its seating this year or whether, as the Secretary-General had at one point speculated, one more year would elapse before the changeover was consummated.

It did not require much perspicacity to divine that in these circumstances even the United States must be seriously reconsidering its policy, its interests and its options. It was clear enough that the status quo could no longer be preserved and that traditional tactics were almost certain to fail. It was in this highly fluid environment that there occurred the famous ping-pong episode, a clear signal from the People's Republic that it was at last prepared to respond to the cautious overtures for more normal relations which the Nixon Administration had for some time been putting forward. For its part the U.S. Government, with admirable agility and flexibility, almost at once replied with the secret Kissinger visit to Peking and the extraordinary announcement of the President's intention to visit the Chinese capital.

It is not relevant to the subject of this article to go into all the implications of the President's decision, to discuss, for example, whether a Summit meeting with the Chinese before one with the Soviets is wise, whether such a meeting could or could not hasten a Vietnam settlement or whether it is likely to prove politically profitable or unprofitable to Mr. Nixon in November 1972. Two points are, however, both clear and relevant. First, the visit is a bold and imaginative step which, whatever its other consequences, cannot but help to reduce the regrettable isolation of China. Second, many if not most UN members will interpret this gesture by the chief traditional adversary of Communist China as removing any conceivable justification for its further exclusion from the United Nations.

Unfortunately, however, nothing is ever simple in international relations. The United States also has long-standing obligations and commitments to the Republic of China on Taiwan. It has jettisoned the last vestige of fiction that this Government has any legitimate claim to Mainland China, but it cannot, without loss of "honor" and "credibility," abandon altogether a faithful ally and a strategically important Pacific outpost. How to reconcile these moral and military obligations to Taipei with the newly emerging relationship with Peking is as difficult a problem in diplomacy as one can imagine.

Insofar as the UN aspects are concerned, the Administration has chosen to straddle, to try to have its cake and eat it too; in other words, to breathe new life into the old concept of "Two Chinas." In the words of the memorandum the United States submitted to the UN on August 17: "In dealing with the problem of the representation of China, the United Nations should take cognizance of the existence of both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China and reflect that incontestable reality in the manner by which it makes provision for China's representation. . . . Thus the People's Republic of China should be represented and at the same time provision should be made that the Republic of China is not deprived of its representation."

On the face of it, this position does not seem illogical or unreasonable. There has in recent years been a growing sentiment among UN members, which has also been voiced by the Secretary-General, in favor of "universality"; that is, that the UN should become as nearly universal as possible. In particular, it has been felt, and the Secretary-General has urged, that the states divided after World War II should no longer be excluded pending reunification, but that the governments established in *both* parts should be represented in the UN, of course without prejudice to eventual reunification by agreement between them. This "dual representation" would presumably include the two Germanys, the two Koreas and perhaps, after the war there is ended, the two Vietnams. Though it is impossible to determine this exactly, it is probable that a majority of UN members would prefer that this principle of universality should also extend to the governments controlling the two parts of China, even though there is a vast discrepancy between the areas and populations controlled by each. Nevertheless, as has often been pointed out, the 14 million population of Taiwan is larger than that of *more than half* the UN members and its economic level and progress are well above those of most developing countries.

Therefore, one might reasonably suppose that a majority of members of the UN would be happy to resolve the China representation question, if they thought they could, by adopting some "dual representation" formula which would seat the People's Republic in both the Security Council and the General Assembly, but would also provide a seat in the Assembly for the Republic of China on Taiwan. It is of course recognized that the latter government may not be representative of the people of Taiwan, a majority of whom are Taiwanese, not Chinese, but it is tactily understood, even though rarely mentioned, that the governments of a large number of UN members would be unlikely to win a free election in the Western sense. The only realistic criterion for membership and representation must be, not the democratic character of the government concerned, but the Charter criterion of being "able and willing to carry out its obligations under the Charter."

In light of these facts and attitudes, it is probable that, had the United States been willing to support or accept a dual representation" formula several years ago, even one or two years ago, the Assembly would have approved. But having as in other cases waited too long, the United States—and Nationalist China—may well have missed the boat.

Of course the Nationalist Government, still claiming to be the government of the whole of China, has itself hitherto strongly opposed dual representation," but it might be prevailed upon to live with it if the only alternative were total exclusion. However, the real, and probably decisive, obstacle to adoption of a "dual representation" formula for China in 1971 is that the People's Republic, which a majority of UN members now certainly desire to see seated in the UN, continues to insist that it would not under any circumstances sit if Taiwan were still there. Peking reiterated this condition in the most categorical terms last month following Secretary Rogers' announcement of the latest U.S. position. There is no reason not to take the condition seriously, particularly since the People's Republic of China must calculate that the tide is moving so irresistibly in its favor that, even should the U.S. tactic prevail this year, it would almost certainly be set aside by the Assembly next year. There would appear to be almost no incentive for Peking to compromise on an issue which has for years been so central to its national aims. Indeed the Chinese are likely now, in the light of the diminishing U.S. presence in East Asia and their obvious concern that a rearmed Japan might eventually fill the "vacuum," to be even more determined than before not to admit that Taiwan has even the shadow of a right to a status separate from the Mainland.

The U.S. Administration is therefore now confronted with a dilemma perhaps even more acute than that which existed before the proposed Summit meeting was announced. For the reasons stated above, it has felt compelled, while now urging that the People's Republic be represented in the UN, still to insist that the Government of the Republic of China not be deprived of its representation. The United States appears also to feel obliged not merely to assume this posture in a formal way, but to carry out its annual worldwide campaign of rounding up votes in support of the U.S. position on this subject.

It appears, moreover, to be urging the Assembly not only to "affirm the continued right of representation of the Republic of China," but also to "decide that any proposal in the General Assembly which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter." From a commonsense point of view the question of a change in Chinese representation always has been and still is important. However, since resolutions to this effect have for ten years been used as a parliamentary device to exclude the PRC from the United Nations and since it is quite clear that if the GRC is not now in some way "deprived of representation" the PRC will not come in, the new "important question" resolution is likely to be perceived by a majority of UN members as merely a revival of the old one, in different guise but with the same objectionable end in view.

Just why the U.S. Administration, so soon after dramatically renewing contact with the PRC and committing itself to a Summit meeting in Peking, should display such zeal in pursuing in the UN a policy it knows to be utterly obnoxious to the PRC, is far from clear. Perhaps the very fact that it leaned so far and so suddenly toward Peking, to the consternation not only of Taipei but of Tokyo and other friends in East Asia, and to the horror of some right-wing opinion in the United States, has caused it to attempt to compensate and to reassure those thus offended by ardently defending the "rights" of Taiwan in the UN.

It is hard to see, however, how this tactic, even if it should be temporarily successful, could be profitable to the United States or to anyone else. The PRC no doubt expects the United States, at least for the present, to remain loyal to the GRC and to continue to maintain its right to sit in the General Assembly. It seems doubtful, however, that the PRC would expect the United States, just after having agreed to the Summit in Peking, to carry its loyalty to Taipei so far as actually to mobilize a UN majority for a posture which the PRC has repeatedly and categorically stated would prevent its assuming a UN seat. If this should occur, one wonders what would happen to the new climate of détente between the two countries.

Certainly there would be an outburst of rage in Peking which would be more than ritualistic. Under those circumstances would the Nixon-Chou meeting take place as and when planned? If it did, could it in that atmosphere accomplish the objectives the participants originally had in mind? In announcing the meeting far in advance, both parties have given hostages to fortune in that each has to some extent constrained himself not to take in the interval action so obnoxious to the other that the meeting would be called off or, if held, would prove a fiasco. In this respect President Nixon would seem to have more of a problem than the Chinese Prime Minister, for he would suffer more politically at home and abroad than would Chou En-lai if his dramatic initiative should fizzle out.

In light of these considerations, perhaps what we should devoutly hope for is that, despite its conspicuous efforts, the United States would fail in the forthcoming Assembly to obtain approval of any form of dual representation, the PRC would be seated in the Security Council and the General Assembly on its own terms, and the GRC would consequently lose its seats. Actually this would seem to be the more probable outcome. It seems doubtful that so strong a tide could be stemmed at the last minute by a tactical device which, no matter how plausible and attractive it may seem in principle, how consonant it may be with the widely touted goal of "universality," would nevertheless clearly frustrate the will of the majority that the PRC at last be seated. It seems questionable that the majority would tolerate any such frustration. The United States is therefore likely to be saved by its friends, hopefully this year rather than next, from the hazards of the curiously ambivalent tactics it has chosen to pursue.

Two final points need to be made. First, it is sometimes claimed that the introduction into the Security Council, as a permanent member with a veto, of a state having a view of the world so alien to that of the majority of UN members, so alien even to that of the Soviet Union, would cripple the Council and bring to a halt even the sadly insufficient peacemaking and peacekeeping enterprises in which it now engages. This of course might just be what would happen.

My judgment would be, however, that the PRC is acutely aware of this suspicion and expectation on the part of many UN members, that it would be clever enough initially to surprise them by displaying in the UN the urbanity and tact characteristic of Chou En-lai, and that over the longer run the Thoughts of Mao Tse-tung would prove no more irreconcilable with the UN Charter than the less explicitly formulated "thoughts" of other great powers and many small ones.

Second and finally, the unfortunate fact that the GRC may soon no longer be represented in the United Nations does not at all mean that it will cease to exist as a viable and respectable government or that U.S. association with it and commitments to it will not be maintained as long as it freely choose to continue its separate status. The other divided states, not to mention Switzerland, have existed for many years without representation at the UN. It is to be hoped that seats for them, and perhaps for Taiwan as well, will eventually be offered but, if they are not, these states will nevertheless continue to survive.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. SULLIVAN for October 28 and October 29, on account of business in the District.

Mr. GRAY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today and Thursday, October 28, 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:

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SPENCE, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. CRANE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 20 minutes, on October 28.

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

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BLATNIK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MINISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 5 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. LANDGREBE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEITH in two instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ROBISON of New York in two instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. QUILLEN in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. WYLIE in four instances.

Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. SKUBITZ.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. KUYKENDALL in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. BADILLO in two instances.

Mr. DRINAN in two instances.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in 11 instances.

Mr. KYROS in two instances.

Mr. DENT in three instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. KEE.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. FAUNTROY in five instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. RANGEL in five instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. BEGICH in three instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. CAREY of New York.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. DELLUMS in eight instances.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in four instances.

Mr. STEED.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 137. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Wyoming to the occupants of the land.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 26, 1971, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9844. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 923. A joint resolution to assure that every needy schoolchild will receive a free or reduced price lunch as required by section 9 of the National School Lunch Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 28, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1230. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Agency for fiscal year 1970, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 592, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1231. A letter from the Tulsa regional solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the decision on appeal in the matter of the heirship determination of Joseph James, deceased halfbreed Kaw allottee, pursuant to Private Law 90-318; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1232. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the activities and status of civil defense in the United States, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WAGGONNER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6065. A bill to amend section 903(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (Rept. No. 92-589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10604. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of the lump-sum death payment to pay the burial and memorial services expenses and related expenses for an insured individual whose body is unavailable for burial; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8116. A bill to consent to the Kansas-Nebraska Big Blue River compact; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9418. A bill to designate the Mountain Park Reservoir, Okla., as the Tom Steed Reservoir (Rept. No. 92-592). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11232. A bill to further provide for the farmer-owned cooperative system of making credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives, for rural residences, and to associations and other entities upon which farming operations are dependent, to provide for an adequate and flexible flow of money into rural areas, and to modernize and consolidate existing farm credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 11421. A bill to provide for the prevention of sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COTTER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 11422. A bill to prohibit the export of domestically extracted crude oil, and any petroleum products made from such oil, unless Congress first approves such exportation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself and Mr. HARSHA):

H.R. 11423. A bill to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act until January 31, 1972; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 11424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax to a taxpayer who pays the tuition and certain related items of a student at an institution of higher education, where the taxpayer and the student agree to repay the credit (with interest) to the United States after the education is completed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CELLER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DOW, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 11425. A bill to permit greater involvement of American medical organizations and personnel in the furnishing of health services and assistance to the developing nations of the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 11426. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts, to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 11427. A bill to protect collectors of antique glassware against the manufacture in the United States or the importation of imitations of such glassware; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11428. A bill to amend section 509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt libraries from the definition of private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 11429. A bill to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. jobs, technology, and capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 11430. A bill to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. MCCLURE):

H.R. 11431. A bill to amend the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 772); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BURTON, Mr. KYROS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. PICKLE, and Mrs. ABZUG):

H.R. 11432. A bill to change the minimum age qualification for serving as a juror in Federal courts from 21 years of age to 18 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 11433. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R 11434. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedurec for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11435. A bill to require the National Railroad Passenger Corp. to provide free or reduced-rate railroad transportation to retired railroad employees and their dependents on the same basis that such transportation was available to such employees and dependents on the date of enactment of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 11436. A bill to amend the Morrill Acts, the Bankhead-Jones Act, the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, and other agricultural statutes to constitute the College of the Virgin Islands and the University of Guam as land-grant colleges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. QUIE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ERLENBORN, and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 11437. A bill to amend the Walsh-Healey Act and the Contract Work Hours Standards Act to permit certain employees to work a 10-hour day in the case of a 4-day

workweek, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois):

H.R. 11438. A bill to promote fair practices in the conduct of election campaigns for Federal political offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 11439. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to liberalize the standards of eligibility for civil service retirement survivor annuities applicable to adopted children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 11440. A bill to amend section 1072 (2) of title 10, United States Code, to include a foster child within the definition of dependent; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 11441. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to Federal habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 11442. A bill to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 11443. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that rentals in housing projects assisted thereunder shall be subject to regulation under State or local laws, with any Federal authority to regulate rentals in such projects being inapplicable where such State or local laws exist, and to assure to tenants in such projects the right of hearing and judicial review on the establishment of such rentals or any increase therein; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 11444. A bill to prohibit foreign governments from acquiring any real property in the United States or any territory thereof which is of historical value; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11445. A bill to establish the official residence of the Chief Justice of the United States by private gift to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself and Mr. WYATT):

H.R. 11446. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 11447. A bill authorizing additional medical and dental care and other related benefits for reservists and members of the National Guard, under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEE (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. THONE, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. DORN, and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.R. 11448. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 11449. A bill to provide that the United States disclaims any interest in a certain tract of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11450. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to require the National Railroad Passenger Corp. to provide free or reduced-rate transportation for certain railroad employees and their eligible dependents to the same extent such transportation was available to such employees and their dependents on the date of enactment of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11451. A bill to require that the texts of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States be promptly transmitted to the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 11452. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to extend for 2 years (until December 31, 1973) the date by which an area must have adopted adequate land use and control measures in order to qualify for flood insurance coverage and the date as of which the existing authority for emergency Federal implementation of the program will expire, to suspend (until December 31, 1973) the existing provisions making flood insurance coverage a condition of Federal disaster assistance, and to assure the inclusion of church properties among those for which flood insurance is provided; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BETTS, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 11453. A bill to provide for disclosures designed to inform the Congress with respect to legislative measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11454. A bill to establish a program of Federal grants to encourage and assist municipal zoos to improve and maintain the health and environmental condition of their animals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 11455. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Navajo Tribe of Indians in Court of Claims case No. 49692, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 11456. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to permit grants thereunder to be made to a State agency in any case where local agencies are prevented by State law from receiving and expending such grants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11457. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce either to give the State of Pennsylvania alternative mileage on the Interstate System or to pay the Federal share of the Pennsylvania Turnpike; to the Commerce on Public Works.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R.11458. A bill to amend the depository library program (44 U.S.C. 1901–1914); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 11459. A bill to provide a program of pollution control in the river basins and waterways of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance to municipalities and regional water basin management associations for the construction of waste treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11460. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 11461. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 relating to payment of black lung benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11462. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to investigate, plan, and construct projects for the control of streambank erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Con. Res. 440. Concurrent resolution expressing congressional recognition of a declaration of general and special rights of the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRASCO, and Mr. BRINKLEY):

H. Res. 662. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CABELL, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENHOLM, and Mr. DENT):

H. Res. 663. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. DORN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H. Res. 664. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middles East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LENT, and Mr. LLOYD):

H. Res. 665. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POFF, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H. Res. 666. Resolution calling for the

shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. SISK):

H. Res. 667. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUCKEY, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VANIK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H. Res. 668. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYATT, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. YATES, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H. Res. 669. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 670. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HULL, Mr. KEE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H. Res. 671. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. CAREY of New York):

H. Res. 672. Resolution relative to Irish national self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H. Res. 673. Resolution calling for peace in northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Res. 674. Resolution to provide an official flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 675. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F–4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 11463. A bill for the relief of Col. and Mrs. Allen B. Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11464. A bill for the relief of Caroleen G. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

150. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Herbert Johnson, Glen Rock, N.J., relative to impeachment of certain civil officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WILL THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY DESTROY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN AMERICA?

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Eugene C. "Gene" Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis News, Phoenix Republic and Phoenix Gazette, placed the following editorial on the front page of his papers during the Veterans Day Weekend. The editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star and Phoenix Republic on Sunday, October 24, and in the Indianapolis News and Phoenix Gazette on Monday, October 25.

This editorial is a convincing and forthright presentation of one of the most serious problems facing our country today and I submit it here for the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

WILL THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY DESTROY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN AMERICA?

The most serious threat to freedom in America today—including freedom of the press—comes from a Federal bureaucracy which seems determined to gain control over every facet of American life.

This is not a partisan issue. As a matter of fact, there are now three great parties in America—the Democratic party, the Republican party and the Federal bureaucracy. Of the three, the Federal bureaucracy is the strongest and most powerful because it is the best organized and is protected from political reprisal by civil service.

When a new administration comes in, less than 10 per cent of the bureaucrats go out; the other 90 per cent keep their jobs regardless of which party is in power.

The U.S. State Department is probably the most bureaucrat-infested agency in the entire government. A small coterie of career men who are protected and immune from discipline by civil service constantly harass and embarrass whoever is secretary of state. They did it to Dean Rusk and are doing it now to Secretary Rogers. Secretary Foster Dulles had some very terrible experiences with this group. These State Department parasites don't want any secretary to succeed. They want to run the State Department in their image. They never want to get tough with any nation, whether friend or foe. They just want to be personally popular in all capitals of the world, no matter what their actions do to the prestige of our foreign policy. It's a hell of a way to run a State Department but that is the way it is being run now. If President Nixon is re-elected, he should ask Congress for the right to abolish civil service in the State Department and clean house from the first under secretary to the brocaded janitors.

Entrenched behind the safety of civil service tenure, the bureaucrats always proclaim that they are acting in the public interest and proceed to issue decree after decree, having the full force and effect of law, whereas not 20 per cent of the bureaucratic rules and regulations and orders are ever voted on by the Congress.

There are thousands of honest and dedicated men and women in the government civil service but their leaders and department heads make life unbearable for anyone who dares speak out against the arrogant plan for government by bureaucratic decree.

PRESIDENT STYMIED

The American people don't realize just how terrifically strong this bureaucracy is. At the present time there are 2,911,000 Federal employes; when President Nixon came to office, out of 4,000 and some employes in the Office of Economic Opportunity he could only change 16! Think of it. The President of the United States was absolutely overwhelmed, to the tune of 4,000 to 16.

Another instance of the arrogant determination of the bureaucracy developed recently in the Interior Department. The United States government has a treaty with the Navajo nation. The treaty is just as binding as any treaty we have with Canada or Mexico, yet the bureaucrats in the Interior Department paid no attention whatever to its stipulations. President Nixon