

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## THE ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972

## HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1971

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the state of the Union address, with respect to changes ahead desired by the administration in the location and operation of the Office of Education and the rewriting of the ground rules governing the allocation and use of Federal money for educational purposes, leaves many questions, as yet, unanswered.

The budget documents, however, and an analysis prepared by HEW of the detail of the administration's request, help to bring into focus the reality of budgetary cutbacks hidden under the glittering overall totals which seem to promise an increase in financial relief and aid to hard-pressed publicly and privately supported educational institutions at all levels.

Many increases, I fear, may be but phantoms, beautiful to contemplate, but singularly ineffectual in meeting the real fiscal thirst of a parched educational system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a comparison chart prepared by the Office of Education under date of January 29, 1971, be printed in the RECORD as Appendix I following my remarks. I have had added to it columns setting forth, both in dollars and by percentage, the changes proposed to be made for fiscal year 1972, as compared to the moneys actually appropriated by the Congress for the equivalent educational programs in fiscal year 1971.

## SCHOOL COSTS RISE ANNUALLY

Mr. President, in reviewing the figures on the chart, we must start out with this premise:

The cost of educational goods and services rose 9 percent in fiscal year 1971, even though average daily membership increased by only 0.7 percent. The authority for these statements is a study prepared by the statisticians of the National Education Association and released for publication January 11, 1971, under the title of "Research Report 1970, R-15, Estimates of School Statistics 1970-71." Because of the importance of the data contained in it for evaluating the current fiscal problems of education, I ask unanimous consent that certain tables from it be printed in the RECORD as appendix II to my remarks.

Mr. President, when costs have gone up by 9 percent, while the population served, rose by less than 1 percent, it is readily apparent that to provide the same dollar amount for a program for fiscal year 1972, as was given in fiscal year 1971, will represent an actual decline in support levels. Yet, this is what is proposed in the budget estimates for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the program which is

aimed at providing compensatory educational programs and services to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

I find no compelling evidence to support the contention that a rollback in school costs is likely in the year ahead. It is very doubtful that a sound case can even be made that costs will remain static in this area. Certainly we are all aware of discussions now taking place, in area after area, with respect to salary structures for professional and other personnel employed in our schools whose outcome will govern educational costs in fiscal year 1972.

Yet, according to the figures presented by the administration, for all of education at the elementary and secondary level, some \$60 million less are to be provided than was given in the Federal contribution of fiscal year 1971. It is difficult to understand how this kind of "an expansionary budget" will be very helpful to local school systems and their taxpayers.

There are, of course, some areas of educational support which will be hit harder than others. For example, Public Law 874, the impacted aid grant program payments, is to be cut by almost \$111 million under the fiscal year 1971 figure of \$536 million.

## LIQUIDATION OF EISENHOWER PROGRAMS UNDER NDEA

The budget for the Office of Education as presented, can be viewed in a number of ways. While in some quarters, it is hailed as a dismantling of the Kennedy-Johnson programs of effective financial concern for the well-being of students, teachers, and educational institutions, overlooked is the repudiation, in area after area, of the constructive educational legislation which was the product of the Eisenhower administration. Evidence of this unarticulated consequence of the budget recommendations is found in the funding proposed for the various provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Title II of NDEA provides low cost, repayable with interest, direct loans to students through the institutions they attend. The loan fund capital is derived from annual appropriations which are matched by an institution on a 90-10 basis and from repayments made on former advances to students.

The program has operated and is operating with complete acceptance on the part of the Congress. Authorization and appropriations for this purpose have been regularly increased each time the program has come under congressional review. Last year, for example, \$243 million was appropriated as against a budget request of \$179 million.

This year, the administration is asking only \$5 million to offset cancellation of loans because of death, military service or teaching service. No money is provided for new direct loans. Instead, we are advised that, through new legislation, an "NDEA" type program on an insured basis will be submitted to replace and restructure the current program. It seems

to me that the Congress, while certainly willing to give careful study and full consideration to proposal changes in existing laws recommended by the executive branch, nevertheless must, until such changes as are viable have been enacted, continue to operate within existing statutory authority.

First of all is the time element. Sweeping changes over a wide field—and NDEA title II revision is but one of many proposed—cannot and should not, in the public interest, occur overnight. Without prejudice to any proposal submitted by the executive, I submit that the effective date of any change made might very well be such that the fiscal effect would be reflected in the fiscal year 1973 budget, rather than the fiscal year commencing July 1, next. Timing is important for the students and the financial aid officers of the institutions serving them. They need to know what resources will be available as early in the year as possible for sound planning. To delay a legitimate appropriation for an approved purpose until action has been completed upon a proposed restructuring of a working program is not evidence of high responsibility. It would be far better to fund a program, such as this, at a reasonable level in light of the factual evidence presented as to the existing need.

## TITLE III NDEA CUTS

Title III of NDEA, the matching grant program for the purchase of educational technology and materials used in classrooms, is also under attack in this budget.

The recommendations of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, \$50 million was provided in fiscal year 1970. Despite the fact that the program has achieved much grassroots support, and that after repeated legislative review by congressional oversight bodies, the program has been expanded, the budget asks no money for this program.

## GUIDANCE COUNSELING AND TESTING

Of course, some of the NDEA provisions of 1958 have already been merged, for example, the joining together of ESEA III and the guidance counseling and testing provisions of title V NDEA by the 91st Congress. This should not mean, however, that the functions have disappeared or have been repealed. The budget no longer expressly highlights those most helpful programs, but I hope that most careful consideration will be given by the substantive congressional committees when the revenue-sharing proposals of the administration surface, to assure that those areas of activity continue to be effective tools for the location and evaluation of our human resources.

Key to the acceptance of much of the Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson education legislation was provision for direct action on the part of the Office of Education authorities in contracting for services for non-public school children in those States whose own constitutions precluded the State school officials from acting.

The testing provisions of the old title V NDEA now incorporated in title III ESEA are a case in point.

How this type of child benefit can be maintained, if it can, under the administration revenue-sharing proposals will be just one of the questions which should be asked and answered before revenue-sharing proposals are enacted.

#### TITLE IV: NDEA COLLEGE TEACHER TRAINING

One of the little-noticed provisions in the proposed budget concerns title IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which provides supports for graduate students preparing for teaching careers at the post-secondary level. A proposed cut of \$20 million under the amounts provided in fiscal year 1971 would stop all new starts and provide only grants for those now enrolled. Apparently, the rationale of this slash is that there is an oversupply of Ph. D. teachers and that this type of training should no longer be subsidized.

I hope that in hearings before the Senate Education Subcommittee on extension of higher education legislation, the administration will be prepared to document the basis of its decisions in this area. At present, it appears to be inconsistent to increase one component of higher education assistance, as the President proposes to do for undergraduate student assistance, while decreasing support for other essential components needed to accommodate its one area of increase, namely, assistance for those who want to teach undergraduates.

More students with fewer teachers in more crowded quarters seem to be less than a prescription for healthy development. To say we have enough Ph. D.'s now leads me to wonder what proportion of the academic faculty of our junior and community systems now is qualified at the Ph. D. level. One might also ask if the "Ph. D. surplus" is not so much a lack of demand but rather a reflection of cutbacks in support for basic research and the inability of higher education to finance the salaries and expenses of needed professionals.

Have we really and truly reached the millenium, to choose but one example, to find that there is no need for teacher trainers who can prepare students for work with our exceptional children, those physically and mentally handicapped, the emotionally disturbed and the very

gifted? If this is the case, it will be news, I am sure, to the many dedicated parents and professionals who have expressed concerns in this area.

#### LIBRARY PROGRAMS HALVED

The Library Services Act was passed under President Eisenhower in 1956 and expanded to include construction assistance as a last act of the Kennedy administration.

Under the Nixon budget for fiscal year 1972, grants for public libraries—LSCA, title I—total \$15,719,000, a cut of \$19,281,000—more than 50 percent—from last year's appropriation.

Due to the minimum \$200,000 amount each State must receive, the proposed cuts will hit some areas harder than others. For example:

California drops from \$2,278 million in fiscal year 1971 to \$689,000 in fiscal year 1972;

Florida would drop from \$973,530 to \$360,845;

Michigan would get less than a third, dropping from \$1,442,717 to \$420,560;

New York would fall from \$2,906,000 in fiscal year 1971 to \$659,095 in fiscal year 1972.

I ask unanimous consent that a State-by-State table, prepared by the Office of Education, showing grants for library services, be printed as appendix III, following my remarks.

Mr. President, not only are basic grants cut drastically, but whole programs of library services to the physically handicapped—LSCA, title IV (B)—and State institutional library services—LSCA, title IV (A)—are absorbed into the financially shrunken title I, LSCA. We are informed further, that not only is librarian training under title II (B) of the Higher Education Act to be trimmed from \$3.9 million to \$1.9 million, but, to add insult to injury, legislation is to be proposed to eliminate this program by consolidation with EPDA part D, with no additional money being provided under that authority.

Finally, in this area, the \$7 million of last year in construction money for matched grants evidently has evaporated.

#### WHERE ARE THE INCREASES?

Mr. President, I have detailed several area specific cuts in established educational programs proposed in the budget for fiscal year 1972. Let me emphasize

my listings are not complete, but I have tried to indicate some of the problems I have in reconciling the words and claims of the administration with the budgetary actions in the field of education.

Yet, overall, the Office of Education budget, we are told, contains a \$1.5 billion increase from \$4.9 billion to \$6.1 billion. To see how this actuarial conclusion is accomplished, look first at the fine print and the footnotes to charts. There we find the budget includes emergency school assistance, \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972 and \$425 million for fiscal year 1971—in a proposed supplemental. However, the authorization for this program is yet to be approved.

The same is true for some \$471 million of the proposed \$971.3 million for student assistance; for \$100 million sought for the National Foundation for Higher Education; for \$3 million for the National Institute of Education. Also, converting a direct loan to student programs funded last year at \$243 million to an insured loan program—if the Congress approves—would result in an outlay of only \$5 million. However, other student insured loan program changes to be proposed in legislation involve another \$500 million which must await authorization. The Office of Education funding totals for fiscal year 1972 then levels at \$4.1 billion.

In short, the Office of Education budget proposes actual decreases in existing programs and only proposals for increases in other areas. In order to better understand the impact the proposed budget will have on education assistance programs, I ask unanimous consent that a State-by-State breakdown of the funding of each educational program, comparing fiscal years 1970, 1971, and the proposed fiscal year 1972, as prepared by the Office of Education, be printed as appendix IV, at the conclusion of my remarks.

We have seen detailed in the foregoing tables the findings of the Office of Education as to what each State may expect from the budget proposals. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing State totals be printed in the RECORD as appendix V at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

#### APPENDIX I.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION, FISCAL YEAR 1972 BUDGET

Appropriation	Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972		Increase or decrease in appropriations in fiscal year 1971 versus fiscal year 1972	Percent of authorization			
	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	Appropriation	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	President's budget		± dollars	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Difference
Elementary and secondary education	\$4,590,396,213	\$1,915,968,000	\$4,712,884,886	\$1,855,218,000	—\$60,750,000	41.73	39.36	—2.37	
School assistance in federally affected areas	1,018,295,000	550,657,000	1,129,690,000	440,000,000	—110,657,000	54.07	38.85	—15.22	
Emergency school assistance	Indefinite	74,853,000				NA	NA	NA	
Proposed legislation	500,000,000	425,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	575,000,000	85.00	100.00	15.00	
Education for the handicapped	371,500,000	105,000,000	436,300,000	110,000,000	5,000,000	28.20	25.21	—3.05	
Vocational and adult education	1,152,311,455	501,357,455	1,238,561,455	476,073,455	25,284,000	43.51	38.44	—5.07	
Higher education	3,390,220,000	970,239,000	1,027,720,000	1,816,711,000	846,472,000	28.62	176.77	148.41	
Proposed legislation			Indefinite	100,000,000	100,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Education professions development	550,000,000	135,800,000	45,000,000	135,800,000		24.69	301.78	277.09	
Libraries and educational communications	346,100,000	85,280,000	222,000,000	29,400,000	—55,880,000	24.64	13.24	—11.40	
Research and development	15,000,000	98,077,000	35,000,000	105,000,000	6,923,000	653.85	300.00	—353.85	
Proposed legislation			Indefinite	3,000,000	3,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Educational activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	Indefinite	3,000,000	Indefinite	3,000,000		NA	NA	NA	
Salaries and expenses	Indefinite	44,800,000	Indefinite	48,979,000	4,179,000	NA	NA	NA	
Civil rights education	Indefinite	19,151,000	Indefinite		19,151,000	NA	NA	NA	



## APPENDIX I.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION, FISCAL YEAR 1972 BUDGET—Continued

						Increase or decrease in appropriations in fiscal year 1971 versus fiscal year 1972			
Appropriation	Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972		± dollars	Percent of authorization			
	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	Appropriation	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	President's budget		Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Difference	
Student loan insurance fund.....	Indefinite	\$18,000,000	Indefinite		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	Indefinite	4,685,000	Indefinite	\$4,610,000	-75,000	NA	NA	NA	
Total, Office of Education.....	\$11,933,822,668	4,951,867,455	\$9,847,156,341	6,127,791,455	1,175,924	41.49	62.23	20.74	
Less: Permanent appropriations and civil rights education.....	-9,761,455	-30,645,455	-9,761,455	-11,410,455	-19,235,000	313.94	116.89	-197.05	
Total, Labor-HEW Appropriations Committee.....	11,924,061,213	4,921,222,000	9,837,394,886	6,116,381,000	1,195,159,000	41.27	62.17	20.90	
Elementary and secondary education:									
Aid to school districts:									
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I).....	3,457,396,213	1,500,000,000	3,642,834,886	1,500,000,000		43.39	41.18	-2.21	
Local educational agencies.....	2,869,181,800	1,339,738,748			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Handicapped children.....	46,129,772	46,129,772			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Juvenile delinquents in institutions.....	16,429,824	16,429,824			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Dependent and neglected children in institutions.....	1,758,458	1,758,458			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Migratory children.....	57,608,680	57,608,680			NA	NA	NA	NA	
State administration.....	31,026,326	16,579,312			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Incentive grants.....	126,198,171	7,530,469	126,198,171		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Grants for high concentrations of poor.....	309,063,182	14,224,737	309,063,182		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	566,500,000	143,393,000	592,250,000	143,393,000	25.31	24.21	-1.10		
Library resources (ESEA II).....	206,000,000	80,000,000	216,300,000	80,000,000	38.84	36.99	-1.85		
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III).....	140,500,000	50,000,000			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Grants to States.....	114,840,000	47,500,000			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	15,660,000	500,000			NA	NA	NA	NA	
State administration.....	10,000,000	2,000,000			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	30,000,000	10,000,000	31,500,000	10,000,000	33.33	31.75	-1.58		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....	80,000,000	25,000,000	100,000,000	25,000,000	31.25	25.00	-6.25		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	Indefinite	69,000,000	Indefinite	60,000,000	-9,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Program.....	Indefinite	67,981,000	Indefinite	58,700,000	-9,281,000	NA	NA	NA	
Administration.....	Indefinite	1,019,000	Indefinite	1,300,000	281,000	NA	NA	NA	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V).....	110,000,000	29,750,000	130,000,000	33,000,000	3,250,000	27.05	25.39	-1.66	
Grants to States (pt. A).....	76,000,000	28,262,500	80,750,000	31,350,000	3,087,500	37.19	38.82	1.63	
Grants for special projects (pt. A).....	4,000,000	1,487,500	4,250,000	1,650,000	1,322,500	37.19	38.82	1.63	
Local educational agencies (pt. B).....	20,000,000		30,000,000		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Comprehensive educational planning and evaluation (pt. C).....	10,000,000		15,000,000		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Planning and evaluation (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act. sec. 402).....	(*)	8,825,000	(*)	3,825,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	4,590,396,213	1,915,968,000	4,712,884,886	1,855,218,000	-69,750,000	41.74	39.37	-2.37	
School assistance in federally affected areas:									
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 874).....	935,295,000	536,068,000	1,038,440,000	425,000,000	-111,680,000	57.31	40.93	-16.38	
Payments to local educational agencies.....	632,422,000	501,518,000	700,740,000	387,300,000	-114,218,000	79.30	55.27	-24.03	
Payments to other Federal agencies.....	34,550,000	34,550,000	37,700,000	37,700,000	3,150,000	100.00	100.00	0.00	
Low-income housing.....	268,323,000		300,000,000		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Construction (Public Law 815).....	83,000,000	14,589,000	91,250,000	15,000,000	411,000	17.58	16.44	-1.14	
Assistance to local educational agencies.....	65,000,000	3,000,000	73,250,000	9,300,000	6,300,000	4.62	12.70	8.08	
Assistance for school construction on Federal property.....	18,000,000	10,900,000	18,000,000	5,000,000	-5,900,000	60.56	27.78	-32.78	
Technical services.....	Indefinite	4,689,000	Indefinite	700,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	1,018,295,000	550,657,000	1,129,690,000	440,000,000	-110,657,000	54.08	38.95	-15.13	
Emergency school assistance:									
Special educational personnel and programs.....	Indefinite	57,500,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Community participation programs.....	Indefinite	7,500,000			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Equipment and minor remodeling.....	Indefinite	7,900,000			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Federal administration and technical assistance.....	Indefinite	1,953,000	Indefinite		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	Indefinite	74,853,000			NA	NA	NA	NA	
Proposed legislation.....	500,000,000	425,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	575,000,000	85.00	100.00	15.00	
Education for the handicapped:									
State grant programs (EHA pt. B).....	206,000,000	34,000,000	216,300,000	35,000,000	1,000,000	16.50	16.18	-0.32	
Early childhood projects (EHA pt. C, sec. 623).....	(*)	7,000,000	(*)	7,500,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Teacher education and recruitment.....	69,500,000	33,100,000	87,000,000	35,145,000	2,045,000	47.63	40.40	-7.23	
Teacher education (EHA pt. D, secs. 631 and 632).....	69,500,000	31,900,000	87,000,000	33,945,000	2,045,000	NA	NA	NA	
Physical education and recreation (EHA pt. D, sec. 634).....		700,000		700,000	NA	NA	NA		
Recruitment and information (EHA pt. D, sec. 633).....		500,000		500,000	NA	NA	NA		
Research and innovation.....	96,000,000	30,350,000	133,000,000	31,805,000	1,455,000	NA	NA	NA	
Research and demonstration (EHA pt. E, sec. 641).....	27,000,000	15,000,000	35,500,000	15,455,000	455,000	NA	NA	NA	
Physical education and recreation (EHA pt. E, sec. 642).....		300,000		300,000	NA	NA	NA		
Regional resource centers (EHA pt. C, sec. 621).....		3,550,000		3,550,000	NA	NA	NA		
Innovation programs (deaf-blind centers) (EHA pt. C, sec. 622).....	36,500,000	4,500,000	51,500,000	5,000,000	500,000	NA	NA	NA	
Media services and captioned films (EHA pt. F).....	12,500,000	6,000,000	15,000,000	6,000,000		48.00	40.00	-8.00	
Special learning disabilities (EHA pt. G).....	20,000,000	1,000,000	31,000,000	1,500,000	500,000	05.00	04.84	-0.16	
Planning and evaluation (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act. sec. 402).....	(*)	550,000	(*)	550,000		NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	371,500,000	105,000,000	436,300,000	110,000,000	5,000,000	28.26	25.21	-3.05	
Vocational and adult education:									
Grants to States for vocational education.....	789,595,310	389,707,710	849,595,310	384,173,455	-5,534,255	49.35	45.22	-4.13	
Basic vocational education programs.....	609,595,310	322,077,710	609,595,310	381,793,455	59,715,745	55.83	62.63	6.80	
Annual (VEA, pt. B).....	(603,000,000)	(315,302,460)	(603,000,000)	(374,302,000)	58,999,600	52.29	62.07	9.78	
Permanent (Smith-Hughes Act).....	(6,445,310)	(6,445,310)	(7,161,455)	(7,161,455)	716,145	100.00	111.11	11.11	
National advisory council (VEA, pt. A).....	(150,000)	(330,000)	(150,000)	(330,000)	220,000	220.00	220.00	0	
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	50,000,000	20,000,000	60,000,000	(*)	-20,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	35,000,000	21,250,000	50,000,000	(*)	-21,250,000	NA	NA	NA	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	45,000,000	5,500,000	55,000,000	(*)	-5,500,000	NA	NA	NA	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	50,000,000	18,500,000	75,000,000	(*)	-18,500,000	NA	NA	NA	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. A).....	Indefinite	2,380,000	Indefinite	2,380,000		NA	NA	NA	
Vocational research.....	152,716,145	55,749,745	152,716,145	36,000,000	-19,749,745	36.50	23.57	-12.93	
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	75,000,000	16,000,000	75,000,000	(*)		NA	NA	NA	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	10,000,000	4,000,000	10,000,000			NA	NA	NA	
Research.....	67,716,145	35,749,745	67,716,145	36,000,000	250,255	52.79	53.16	-0.37	
Annual (VEA, pt. C).....	(67,000,000)	(35,033,600)	(67,000,000)	(36,000,000)	966,400	52.29	53.73	1.44	
Permanent (Smith-Hughes Act).....	(716,145)	(716,145)	(716,145)		NA	NA	NA	NA	

Footnotes at end of table.

Appropriation	Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972		Increase or decrease in appropriations in fiscal year 1971 versus fiscal year 1972	Percent of authorization			
	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	Appropriation	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	President's budget		± dollars	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Difference
Vocational and adult education—Continued									
Adult education (Adult Education Act)	\$210,000,000	\$55,000,000	\$236,250,000	\$55,000,000		26.19	23.28	-2.91	
Grants to States	210,000,000	45,000,000	236,250,000	45,000,000		NA	NA	NA	
Special projects		7,000,000		7,000,000	-3.33	2.96	-0.37		
Teacher education		3,000,000		3,000,000	NA	NA	NA		
Planning and evaluation (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act, sec. 402)	( <sup>2</sup> )	900,000	( <sup>2</sup> )	900,000		NA	NA	NA	
Total	1,152,311,455	501,357,455	1,238,561,455	476,073,455	-25,284,000	43.51	38.44	-5.07	
Higher education:									
Student assistance:									
Grants and work-study payments	500,750,000	327,700,000	Indefinite	917,300,000	643,600,000	65.44	NA	NA	
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	170,000,000	167,700,000	Indefinite		NA	NA	NA	NA	
1st-year awards	(170,000,000)	(65,496,000)	(Indefinite)		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Continuations and administration	(Indefinite)	(102,204,000)	(Indefinite)		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Work-Study	330,750,000	160,000,000	(Indefinite)	971,300,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Work-study program (HEA IV-C)	(320,000,000)	(158,400,000)	(Indefinite)		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Cooperative education (HEA IV-D)	(10,750,000)	(1,600,000)	(Indefinite)		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Subsidized insured loans	40,000,000	147,800,000	Indefinite	651,800,000	504,000,000	369.50	NA	NA	
Interest on basic NDEA-type loans (proposed legislation)			Indefinite	65,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Interest on special NDEA-type cost-of-education loans (proposed legislation)			Indefinite	20,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Purchases of loan paper (including advances) (proposed legislation)			Indefinite	400,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Proceeds of sales of loan paper (proposed legislation)			Indefinite	(400,000,000)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Interest on prior year loans (HEA IV-B)	( <sup>12</sup> ) 40,000,000	143,200,000	Indefinite	160,000,000	16,800,000	NA	NA	NA	
Program administration	Indefinite	4,600,000	Indefinite	6,800,000	2,200,000	NA	NA	NA	
Administration	(Indefinite)	(2,400,000)	(Indefinite)	(3,400,000)	1,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Computer services	(Indefinite)	(2,200,000)	(Indefinite)	(3,400,000)	(1,200,000)	NA	NA	NA	
Direct loans (NDEA II)	375,000,000	243,000,000	Indefinite	5,000,000	-238,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Contributions to funds	375,000,000	236,500,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Loans to institutions	( <sup>13</sup> )	2,000,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Teacher cancellations	Indefinite	4,500,000	Indefinite	5,000,000	500,000	NA	NA	NA	
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA sec. 408)	96,000,000	50,035,000	Indefinite	50,100,000		NA	NA	NA	
Talent search		5,000,000		5,000,000		NA	NA	NA	
Special services in college	96,000,000	15,000,000	Indefinite	15,000,000	65,000	NA	NA	NA	
Upward bound		30,035,000	Indefinite	30,100,000		NA	NA	NA	
Program		(28,500,000)		(28,500,000)	65,000	NA	NA	NA	
Administration	(Indefinite)	( <sup>14</sup> ) (1,535,000)	(Indefinite)	(1,600,000)	65,000	NA	NA	NA	
Institutional assistance:									
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	91,000,000	33,850,000	Indefinite	38,850,000	5,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Construction	2,068,250,000	72,424,000	1,013,000,000	34,407,000	-38,017,000	3.50	3.40	-.10	
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	25,250,000	21,000,000	Indefinite	29,010,000	8,010,000	NA	NA	NA	
Grants	2,036,000,000	43,000,000	1,013,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	( <sup>15</sup> ) (431,040,000)	(43,000,000)	( <sup>16</sup> ) (214,320,000)	NA	9.98	NA	NA	NA	
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	( <sup>17</sup> ) (1,364,960,000)		( <sup>18</sup> ) (678,680,000)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	( <sup>19</sup> ) (240,000,000)		( <sup>18</sup> ) (120,000,000)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
State administration and planning (HEFA I)	\$7,000,000	\$6,000,000	Indefinite	\$3,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
State administration	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(Indefinite)	(Indefinite)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
State planning	(4,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(Indefinite)	(3,000,000)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Federal administration	Indefinite	( <sup>19</sup> ) 2,424,000	Indefinite	2,397,000	-\$27,000	NA	NA	NA	
Language training and area studies	38,500,000	8,000,000	Indefinite	15,300,000	7,300,000	NA	NA	NA	
Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	38,500,000	6,930,000	Indefinite	14,470,000	7,540,000	NA	NA	NA	
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	Indefinite	1,070,000	Indefinite	830,000	240,000	NA	NA	NA	
University community services (HEA I)	6,000,000	9,500,000	Indefinite	9,500,000		NA	NA	NA	
Aid to land-grant colleges	14,720,000	12,680,000	14,720,000	2,600,000	-10,080,000	86.14	17.66	-68.48	
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	12,120,000	10,080,000	12,120,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI)	70,000,000	7,000,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Television equipment	10,000,000	1,000,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Other equipment	60,000,000	6,000,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	
College personnel development	36,000,000	57,350,000	( <sup>20</sup> ) Indefinite	36,954,000	20,396,000	NA	NA	NA	
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	Indefinite	47,350,000	( <sup>20</sup> )	26,910,000	-20,440,000	NA	NA	NA	
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)	36,000,000	10,000,000	( <sup>20</sup> ) Indefinite	10,044,000	44,000	NA	NA	NA	
Planning and evaluation (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act, sec. 402)	( <sup>2</sup> )	900,000	( <sup>2</sup> )	900,000		NA	NA	NA	
Total	3,390,220,000	970,239,000	1,027,720,000	1,816,711,000	846,472,000	28.62	176.77	148.15	
Proposed legislation (National Foundation for Higher Education)			Indefinite	100,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Education professions development:									
Personnel training and development	450,000,000	67,900,000	45,000,000	59,700,000	-8,200,000	15.09	132.67	117.58	
Training of teacher trainers (EPDA, pt. D)	( <sup>21</sup> ) 340,000,000	12,200,000	Indefinite	12,200,000		NA	NA	NA	
Meeting critical qualitative and quantitative shortages of school personnel	110,000,000	52,100,000	45,000,000	44,500,000	7,600,000	47.36	98.89	51.53	
Vocational education (EPDA, pt. F)	(40,000,000)	(6,900,000)	(45,000,000)	(7,400,000)	500,000	17.25	16.44	-0.81	
State grants for attracting and qualifying teachers (EPDA, pt. B-2)	(65,000,000)	(15,000,000)	Indefinite	(7,000,000)	-8,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Attracting qualified persons (EPDA, sec. 504)	(5,000,000)	(500,000)	Indefinite	(300,000)	200,000	NA	NA	NA	
Other (EPDA, pt. D)	( <sup>22</sup> )	(29,700,000)	Indefinite	(29,800,000)	100,000	NA	NA	NA	
Meeting special needs for educational personnel (EPDA, pt. D)	( <sup>21</sup> )	3,600,000	Indefinite	3,000,000	-600,000	NA	NA	NA	
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas	100,000,000	65,900,000	Indefinite	74,100,000	8,200,000	NA	NA	NA	
Teacher Corps (EPDA, pt. B-1)	100,000,000	30,800,000	Indefinite	37,435,000	6,635,000	NA	NA	NA	
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs (EPDA, pt. D)	( <sup>21</sup> )	35,100,000	Indefinite	36,665,000	1,565,000	NA	NA	NA	
Planning and evaluation	Indefinite	\$2,000,000	Indefinite	\$2,000,000		NA	NA	NA	
Manpower data collection (EPDA, sec. 503)	Indefinite	1,000,000	Indefinite	1,000,000		NA	NA	NA	
Planning and evaluation (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act, sec. 402)	( <sup>2</sup> )	1,000,000	( <sup>2</sup> )	1,000,000		NA	NA	NA	
Total	550,000,000	135,800,000	45,000,000	135,800,000		24.69	301.78	277.09	



## APPENDIX I.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION, FISCAL YEAR 1972 BUDGET—Continued

Appropriation	Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972		Increase or decrease in appropriations in fiscal year 1971 versus fiscal year 1972	Percent of authorization			
	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	Appropriation	Authorization <sup>1</sup>	President's budget		± dollars	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Difference
Libraries and educational communications:									
Public libraries:									
Services.....	\$112,000,000	\$40,709,000	\$127,000,000	\$18,000,000	—\$22,709,000	36.35	14.17	—22.18	
Grants for public libraries (LSCA I).....	75,000,000	35,000,000	112,000,000	15,719,000	19,281,000	46.67	14.03	—32.64	
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	15,000,000	2,281,000	15,000,000	2,281,000	NA	15.21	15.21	NA	
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	15,000,000	2,094,000	( <sup>22</sup> )	( <sup>22</sup> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Library services to physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	7,000,000	1,334,000	( <sup>22</sup> )	( <sup>22</sup> )	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Construction (LSCA II).....	80,000,000	7,092,500	80,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	90,000,000	15,325,000	<sup>11</sup> Indefinite	5,000,000	—10,325,000	MA	NA	NA	
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	38,000,000	3,900,000	( <sup>23</sup> )	2,000,000	—1,900,000	NA	NA	NA	
Cataloging by the Library of Congress (HEA II-C).....	11,100,000	<sup>24</sup> 6,853,500	<sup>11</sup> Indefinite	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....	15,000,000	11,000,000	15,000,000	4,000,000	—7,000,000	73.33	26.67	—46.66	
Planning and evaluation (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act, sec. 402).....	( <sup>24</sup> )	400,000	( <sup>24</sup> )	400,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	346,100,000	85,280,000	222,000,000	29,400,000	—55,880,000	24.64	13.24	—11.40	
Research and development:									
Educational research and development.....	15,000,000	60,577,000	35,000,000	62,000,000	1,423,000	403.85	177.14	226.71	
Early childhood (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	21,500,000	Indefinite	21,500,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
(Sesame Street) (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	(2,000,000)	Indefinite	(5,000,000)	3,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
Reading (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	5,800,000	Indefinite	7,500,000	1,700,000	NA	NA	NA	
Organization and administration (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	6,600,000	Indefinite	7,500,000	900,000	NA	NA	NA	
Higher education (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	2,500,000	Indefinite	3,000,000	500,000	NA	NA	NA	
Drug abuse education (Drug Abuse Education Act).....	10,000,000	6,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000	NA	60.00	30.00	—30.00	
Program.....	(10,000,000)	(5,500,000)	(20,000,000)	(5,268,000)	232,000	55.00	26.34	—20.84	
Program administration.....	Indefinite	(500,000)	Indefinite	(732,000)	232,000	NA	NA	NA	
Environmental education.....	5,000,000	<sup>25</sup> 2,500,000	15,000,000	2,000,000	—500,000	50.00	13.33	—36.67	
Program.....	(5,000,000)	<sup>25</sup> (2,250,000)	(15,000,000)	(1,680,000)	—570,000	45.00	11.20	33.80	
Program administration.....	Indefinite	(250,000)	Indefinite	(320,000)	700,000	NA	NA	NA	
Libraries and educational technology (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	2,171,000	Indefinite	3,000,000	829,000	NA	NA	NA	
Nutrition and health (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	2,000,000	Indefinite	500,000	1,500,000	NA	NA	NA	
Other educational R. & D. (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	11,506,000	Indefinite	11,000,000	—506,000	NA	NA	NA	
Experimental schools (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	12,000,000	Indefinite	15,000,000	3,000,000	NA	NA	NA	
National achievement study (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	4,500,000	Indefinite	6,000,000	1,500,000	NA	NA	NA	
Demonstrations (Coop. Res. Act).....	Indefinite	2,250,000	Indefinite	2,250,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Evaluations (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act, sec. 402).....	( <sup>25</sup> )	4,000,000	( <sup>25</sup> )	4,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Dissemination (Gen. Ed. Prov. Act, sec. 412).....	Indefinite	8,500,000	Indefinite	8,500,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Spread of exemplary practices.....	Indefinite	2,200,000	Indefinite	2,200,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Strengthening State and local dissemination capabilities.....	Indefinite	650,000	Indefinite	650,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Educational resources information centers.....	Indefinite	4,000,000	Indefinite	4,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Interpretive summaries.....	Indefinite	600,000	Indefinite	600,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Applied R. & D. in improving dissemination.....	Indefinite	550,000	Indefinite	550,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
General program dissemination.....	Indefinite	500,000	Indefinite	500,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Training (Cooperative Research Act).....	Indefinite	3,250,000	Indefinite	4,000,000	750,000	NA	NA	NA	
Statistics (Cooperative Research Act).....	Indefinite	3,000,000	Indefinite	3,250,000	250,000	NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	15,000,000	98,077,000	35,000,000	105,000,000	6,923,000	653.85	300.00	—353.85	
Proposed legislation (National Institute of Education):									
Educational activities overseas (special foreign currency program) (Public Law 480):	Indefinite	3,000,000	<sup>11</sup> Indefinite	3,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Grants to American institutions.....	Indefinite	3,000,000	Indefinite	3,000,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Salaries and expenses.....	Indefinite	<sup>26</sup> 44,800,000	Indefinite	48,979,000	179,000	NA	NA	NA	
Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964):	Indefinite	16,000,000	Indefinite	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Training for school personnel and grants to school boards.....	Indefinite	<sup>27</sup> 3,151,000	Indefinite	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Technical services and administration.....	Indefinite	19,151,000	Indefinite	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	Indefinite	19,151,000	Indefinite	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Student loan insurance fund (HEA IV-B):									
Higher education facilities loan fund (HEFA III):	Indefinite	18,000,000	Indefinite	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Participation sales insufficiencies:	Indefinite	4,685,000	Indefinite	4,610,000	—75,000	NA	NA	NA	
Annual.....	Indefinite	2,952,000	Indefinite	2,961,000	9,000	NA	NA	NA	
Permanent.....	Indefinite	1,733,000	Indefinite	1,649,000	—84,000	NA	NA	NA	
Total.....	Indefinite	4,685,000	Indefinite	4,610,000	—75,000	NA	NA	NA	

<sup>1</sup> Amounts include specific authorizations only.<sup>2</sup> Proposed supplemental.<sup>3</sup> Total of \$25,000,000 authorized for planning and evaluation of programs for which the Commissioner of Education has responsibility for administration.<sup>4</sup> Excludes \$447,000 transferred to Office of Secretary for Facilities Engineering and Construction Agency; and includes \$36,000 unobligated balance transferred from other accounts for pay raise.<sup>5</sup> Excludes \$147,000 transferred to General Services Administration for rental of space.<sup>6</sup> Included in authorization for regional resource centers and innovation programs.<sup>7</sup> Authorization sets aside 10 percent of State grants for pt. C research; President's budget provides no funding for research under pt. C.<sup>8</sup> Specific authorization represents amounts only for technical assistance to carry out functions of National Advisory Council.<sup>9</sup> States would be permitted to use funds under pt. B for purposes previously funded under this activity.<sup>10</sup> Funds requested under authority of Cooperative Research Act, for which authorization is indefinite.<sup>11</sup> Based on proposed legislation.<sup>12</sup> Amount represents specific authorization for incentive payments; indefinite amount authorized for interest payments.<sup>13</sup> Total of \$25,000,000 authorized from fiscal year 1959 through duration of act.<sup>14</sup> Includes \$35,000 unobligated balance transferred from other accounts for pay raise.<sup>15</sup> Includes \$206,400,000 unappropriated authorization from 1970 and \$224,640,000 authorized for 1971.<sup>16</sup> Represents unappropriated authorization from 1971; proposed legislation would provide indefinite authorization for 1972.<sup>17</sup> Includes \$653,600,000 unappropriated authorization from 1970 and \$711,360,000 authorized for 1971.<sup>18</sup> Includes \$120,000,000 unappropriated authorization from 1970 and \$120,000,000 authorized for 1971.<sup>19</sup> Excludes \$2,792,000 transferred to Office of Secretary for Facilities Engineering and Construction Agency; and includes \$116,000 unobligated balance transferred from other accounts for pay raise.<sup>20</sup> Proposed legislation would consolidate authorization for fellowships (NDEA IV) with training programs (EPDA, pt. E).<sup>21</sup> Included in \$340,000,000 total authorization for EPDA, pts. C and D.<sup>22</sup> Activity has been consolidated into public library services (LSCA I).<sup>23</sup> Proposed legislation would consolidate authorization for librarian training (HEA II-B) with training programs under EPDA, pt. D.<sup>24</sup> Includes \$240,000 unobligated balance transferred from other accounts for pay raise.<sup>25</sup> Includes \$500,000 under authority of Cooperative Research Act.<sup>26</sup> Includes transfers of \$2,007,000 unobligated balance from other accounts for pay raise, and \$65,000 from Office of Citizen Participation; excludes transfers of \$2,400,000 to Higher Education Insured Loan Program for administrative costs, \$15,000 to Secretary's Advisory Committee, and \$21,000 to Career Service Board.<sup>27</sup> Includes \$151,000 unobligated balance transferred from other accounts for pay raise.

## APPENDIX II

Excerpts taken from Research Report 1970-R15 "Estimates of School Statistics, 1970-71 a publication of the Research Division-National Education Association.

## EXPENDITURES

The total expenditures of the public schools, including current expense, capital outlay, and interest, increased from \$39,090,792,000 in 1969-70 to an estimated \$42,379,987,000 in 1970-71. The increase of \$3.3 billion includes expected expenditures from federal appropriations, rising state appropriations, and increasing local tax revenues. Increased expenditures are estimated for all major categories of expenditure, i.e., current expenditures for elementary and secondary day schools, current expenditures for other programs (community services, community colleges, adult education, etc., when operated by local school districts), capital outlay, and interest on school debt. Repayment of principal on bonded indebtedness is not included.

## Total expenditures

The total amount to be spent during 1970-71 for current expense, capital outlay, and interest on school debt represents a 8.4 percent increase over comparable expenditures estimated for 1969-70 and a 152.1 percent increase over 1960-61.

The total expenditures from 1960-61 to 1970-71, as reported by the U.S. Office of Education and by the NEA Research Division, are as follows (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

## TOTAL EXPENDITURES

School year	Amount (in thousands)	Percent increase over 1960-61	Percent increase over previous year
1970-71.....	\$16,807,934		
1961-62.....	18,373,339	9.3	9.3
1962-63.....	19,735,070	17.4	7.4
1963-64.....	21,324,993	26.9	8.1
1964-65.....	23,029,742	37.0	8.0
1965-66.....	26,248,026	56.2	14.0
1966-67.....	28,352,330	68.7	8.0
1967-68.....	31,917,850	89.9	12.6
1968-69.....	35,782,262	112.9	12.1
1969-70.....	39,090,792	132.6	9.2
1970-71.....	42,379,987	152.1	8.4

## CURRENT EXPENDITURES

Current expenditure of elementary and secondary day schools includes amounts paid for general control, instructional service, operation, maintenance, fixed charges, and other school services at all levels of administration—state, intermediate, and basic local. Current expenditure comprises all governmental contributions to the retirement fund and expenditure for school services, including attendance, health services, transportation, food services, and other. This figure does not include payments for capital outlay and interest on school debt or, except when otherwise noted, amounts spent for community colleges, adult education, summer school, community services, and services to nonpublic-school pupils.

The estimated current expenditure increased from \$32,683,265,000 in 1969-70 to \$35,851,383,000 in 1970-71. The following figures show the increases in current expenditure as reported by the U.S. Office of Education and the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

## CURRENT EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY DAY SCHOOLS

School year	Amount (in thousands)	Percent increase over 1960-61	Percent increase over previous year
1960-61.....	\$13,147,075		
1961-62.....	14,729,270	12.0	12.0
1962-63.....	15,606,328	18.7	6.0
1963-64.....	17,218,446	31.0	10.3
1964-65.....	18,548,925	41.1	7.7
1965-66.....	21,053,280	60.1	13.5
1966-67.....	22,854,760	73.8	8.6
1967-68.....	25,769,474	96.0	12.8
1968-69.....	29,643,410	120.9	12.7
1969-70.....	32,683,265	148.6	12.5
1970-71.....	35,851,383	172.7	9.7

\* Includes expenditures for community colleges, adult education, and summer school programs in California.

Annual increases over the past 10 years have averaged 10.6 percent. In the 10 years since 1960-61, current expenditures for public elementary and secondary day schools have increased 172.7 percent.

## Current expenditure per pupil in ADA

The current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance (ADA) for elementary and secondary day schools for 1970-71 is estimated at \$839, an increase of \$66 over the revised figure of \$773 for 1969-70.

The following figures show the average cost per pupil in ADA for each year since 1960-61 and the percent increases in cost per pupil in ADA (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

## CURRENT EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL IN ADA FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY DAY SCHOOLS

School year	Amount	Percent increase over 1960-61	Percent increase over previous year
1960-61.....	\$393		
1961-62.....	419	6.6	6.6
1962-63.....	433	10.2	3.3
1963-64.....	460	17.0	6.2
1964-65.....	484	23.2	5.2
1965-66.....	537	36.6	11.0
1966-67.....	573	45.8	6.7
1967-68.....	634	61.3	10.6
1968-69.....	702	78.6	11.1
1969-70.....	773	96.7	10.1
1970-71.....	839	113.5	8.5

Current expenditure per pupil in ADA increased from \$393 in 1960-61 to an estimated \$839 in 1970-71, a rise of 113.5 percent. Variations among the states in expenditures per pupil are great. Estimated expenditure per pupil in ADA for 1970-71 varies from a low of \$489 to a high of \$1,429. Expenditures per pupil in ADA in the 50 states are distributed as follows:

## Current expenditure per pupil in ADA for elementary and secondary day schools

	Number of States
\$450 to \$499.....	1
\$500 to \$549.....	1
\$550 to \$599.....	3
\$600 to \$649.....	6
\$650 to \$699.....	5
\$700 to \$749.....	4
\$750 to \$799.....	7
\$800 to \$849.....	4
\$850 to \$899.....	4
\$900 to \$949.....	4
\$950 and over.....	11

## Current expenditure per pupil in ADM

Average daily membership (ADM) is recommended as a better measure than ADA for use in computing per-pupil expenditure. It represents an average of the pupils belonging—those attending (ADA) plus those absent—and provides a measure of the actual number of pupils for whom the expenditures were made. Because some states have not adopted this method of pupil reporting, figures on expenditures per pupil in ADM are incomplete.

Column 4 of Tables 11 and 12 gives the expenditure per pupil in ADM for 1969-70 (revised) and for 1970-71 for each of the states and the District of Columbia reporting average daily membership. From this incomplete return, the NEA Research Division has estimated that for the 50 states and the District of Columbia the expenditure per pupil in ADM is \$722 for 1969-70 and \$787 for 1970-71, or about 94 percent of the expenditure per pupil in ADA for each of these years.

The following figures show the average cost per pupil in ADM starting with 1960-61. The percent increases in cost per pupil in ADM are also shown (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

## CURRENT EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL IN ADM FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY DAY SCHOOLS

School year	Amount	Percent increase over 1960-61	Percent increase over previous year
1960-61.....	\$369		
1961-62.....	394	6.8	6.8
1962-63.....	404	9.5	2.5
1963-64.....	434	17.6	7.4
1964-65.....	454	23.0	4.6
1965-66.....	507	37.4	11.7
1966-67.....	538	45.8	6.1
1967-68.....	594	61.0	10.4
1968-69.....	655	77.5	10.3
1969-70.....	722	95.7	10.2
1970-71.....	787	113.3	9.0

## Current expenditures for other programs

Current expenditures for programs other than elementary and secondary day school programs include expenditures for summer schools, community colleges, adult education, and for community services (public libraries, community centers, recreational programs, etc.) when operated by local school districts.

Current expenditures for other programs amount to \$1,030,063,000 in 1969-70 and to \$1,079,487,000 in 1970-71, an increase of 4.8



## APPENDIX II—Continued

percent. This increase reflects the addition of community college programs in some states, increased funds for vocational and adult education and the many new and expanded community services being administered by local school systems.

## HIGHLIGHTS: 1970-71 AND 1969-70 ESTIMATES—STATISTICS OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

	School year		Change	
	1970-71	1969-70	Amount	Percent
Basic administrative units:				
Total school districts.....	17,896	18,977	-1,081	-5.7
Operating school districts.....	17,153	18,076	-923	-5.1
Nonoperating school districts.....	743	901	-158	-17.5
Pupil enrollment:				
Fall, total.....	45,880,950	45,495,681	385,269	.8
Elementary.....	28,154,794	28,063,665	91,129	.3
Secondary.....	17,726,156	17,432,016	294,140	1.7
Cumulative, total.....	47,625,835	47,173,236	452,599	1.0
Elementary.....	29,379,159	29,203,080	176,079	.6
Secondary.....	18,246,676	17,970,156	276,520	1.5
Average daily membership.....	45,573,161	45,248,568	324,593	.7
Average daily attendance.....	42,723,202	42,262,925	460,277	1.1
Number of high school graduates.....	2,685,676	2,622,550	63,126	2.4
Instructional staff.....	2,269,046	2,233,776	35,270	1.6
Classroom teachers:				
Total.....	2,039,981	2,008,432	31,549	1.6
Elementary school.....	1,124,816	1,109,302	15,514	1.4
Secondary school.....	915,075	899,130	15,945	1.8
Men teachers.....	667,332	652,586	14,746	2.3
Women teachers.....	1,372,559	1,355,846	16,713	1.2
Average annual salaries:				
Instructional staff.....	9,689	9,047	642	7.1
All classroom teachers.....	9,265	8,635	630	7.3
Elementary school teachers.....	9,025	8,412	613	7.3
		School year		Change
		1970-71	1969-70	Amount Percent
Secondary school teachers.....		9,540	8,891	649 7.3
Receipts (in thousands):				
Total revenue and nonrevenue receipts.....		45,268,215	41,620,934	3,647,281 8.8
Revenue receipts by source:				
Total.....		41,936,556	38,192,011	3,744,545 9.8
Federal.....		2,892,957	2,767,045	125,912 4.6
State.....		17,226,776	15,627,751	1,599,025 10.2
Local, intermediate, and other.....		21,816,823	19,797,215	2,019,608 10.2
Nonrevenue receipts.....		3,331,659	3,428,923	-97,264 -2.8
Expenditures (in thousands):				
Total expenditures.....		42,379,987	39,090,792	3,289,195 8.4
Current expenditures for elementary and secondary day schools.....		35,851,383	32,683,265	3,168,118 9.7
Current expenditures for other programs (community services, community colleges, adult education, etc.) when operated by local school districts.....		1,079,487	1,030,063	49,424 4.8
Capital outlay.....		4,140,031	4,158,412	-18,381 -.4
Interest on school debt.....		1,309,086	1,219,052	90,034 7.4
Current expenditure for elementary and secondary day schools per pupil:				
In average daily membership.....		787	722	65 9.0
In average daily attendance.....		839	773	66 8.5

## APPENDIX III.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued

## LIBRARIES AND EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS—LSCA, TITLE I, GRANTS FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

State and outlying areas	1971 estimate <sup>1</sup>		1972 estimate <sup>2</sup>	
	1970 actual	Federal allotment <sup>3</sup>	State and local matching	Federal allotment <sup>3</sup>
Total.....	32,967,611	38,428,000	39,147,380	15,719,000
Alabama.....	603,947	698,252	368,270	288,869
Alaska.....	141,689	201,461	283,287	207,225
Arizona.....	339,674	377,265	286,816	243,276
Arkansas.....	404,797	456,363	235,096	250,552
California.....	2,278,774	2,732,497	3,845,496	689,432
Colorado.....	400,448	451,081	438,800	253,095
Connecticut.....	505,546	578,733	971,583	274,922
Delaware.....	224,543	237,427	338,992	213,418
Florida.....	830,588	973,530	785,648	360,845
Georgia.....	694,934	808,764	534,698	317,191
Hawaii.....	249,629	267,896	293,849	219,460
Idaho.....	254,259	273,519	194,515	218,227
Illinois.....	1,520,618	1,811,640	2,671,499	476,172
Indiana.....	791,704	926,301	971,079	328,570
Iowa.....	535,450	615,055	611,376	271,699
Kansas.....	457,574	520,466	488,776	258,608
Kentucky.....	573,199	660,904	401,301	281,870
Louisiana.....	602,641	696,664	432,818	293,954
Maine.....	294,894	322,875	233,231	224,521
Maryland.....	581,611	671,122	800,637	294,483
Massachusetts.....	857,091	1,005,720	1,260,945	337,004
Michigan.....	1,216,878	1,442,717	1,738,582	420,560
Minnesota.....	623,739	722,290	691,195	293,501
Mississippi.....	457,511	520,389	268,080	259,414
Missouri.....	745,607	870,311	789,321	317,845
Montana.....	255,278	274,757	218,258	217,371
Nebraska.....	354,360	395,102	375,680	236,605
Nevada.....	174,710	211,120	296,746	211,681
New Hampshire.....	246,152	263,672	239,712	218,076
New Jersey.....	980,608	1,155,743	1,621,817	380,179
New Mexico.....	292,440	319,894	211,491	225,603
New York.....	2,422,050	2,906,520	4,252,397	659,095
North Carolina.....	777,399	908,926	558,029	330,257
North Dakota.....	249,585	267,843	182,313	215,684
Ohio.....	1,470,205	1,750,408	1,852,736	468,570
Oklahoma.....	477,707	544,920	388,323	264,726
Oregon.....	402,431	453,489	439,910	251,836
Pennsylvania.....	1,687,181	2,013,947	2,031,752	495,507
Rhode Island.....	280,126	304,938	327,714	222,909
South Carolina.....	485,013	553,794	290,533	267,923
South Dakota.....	256,051	275,696	190,636	216,742
Tennessee.....	644,351	747,326	449,352	300,273
Texas.....	1,453,159	1,729,704	1,306,997	485,890
Utah.....	284,316	310,026	224,595	226,358
Vermont.....	216,955	228,210	180,184	210,976
Virginia.....	698,139	812,657	640,332	317,266
Washington.....	548,321	630,688	756,049	284,841
West Virginia.....	414,771	468,477	271,847	245,492
Wisconsin.....	696,098	810,178	806,299	306,693
Wyoming.....	208,909	218,437	193,088	208,257
District of Columbia.....	202,708	289,330	550,524	219,813
American Samoa.....	27,696	43,160	22,235	40,775
Guam.....	43,897	50,837	26,189	42,520
Puerto Rico.....	441,059	548,394	282,506	268,552
Trust Territory.....	44,391	51,438	-----	42,417
Virgin Islands.....	44,200	45,127	23,247	41,400

<sup>1</sup> Estimated distribution of funds for LSCA I: Grants for public libraries, with a basic amount of \$100,000 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and \$25,000 to the other outlying areas; for LSCA IV-A: State institutional library services, a basic amount of \$40,000 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and \$10,000 to the other outlying areas, ratably reduced to the appropriated amount; and for LSCA IV-B: Library services to the physically handicapped, a basic amount of \$25,000 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and \$5,000 to the other outlying areas; then for titles I and IV-B, the remainder of the funds are distributed on the basis of total population Apr. 1, 1960 (except trust territory, 1958). Matching expenditures computed on the basis of fiscal year 1970-71 "Federal share" percentages.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated distribution of funds with a minimum allotment of \$200,000 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and \$40,000 to the other outlying areas; the remainder distributed on the basis of estimated total population, July 1, 1969 (except outlying areas, July 1, 1958). Required matching expenditures computed on the basis of fiscal year 1972-73 "Federal share" percentages.

<sup>3</sup> Subtract title IV-A and B funds from amounts shown under Federal allotments in both fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1972; this will show what amount remains for title I activities. In other words, an amount of \$55,000 (\$40,000 and \$15,000) should be deducted from the grants for "Library services."

## LIBRARIES AND EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS—LSCA, TITLE II, CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

State and outlying areas	1971 estimate <sup>1</sup>			1972 estimated allotment	State and outlying areas	1971 estimate <sup>1</sup>			1972 estimated allotment
	1970 actual	Federal allotment	State and local matching			1970 actual	Federal allotment	State and local matching	
Total	\$5,094,809	\$7,092,500	\$2,977,271		Nevada	100,000	84,475	6,290	
Alabama	11,392	131,239	27,024		New Hampshire	75,000	89,520	8,655	
Alaska	86,150	83,547	4,988		New Jersey	199,000	175,157	133,531	
Arizona	104,542	100,424	15,527		New Mexico	42,328	94,917	9,862	
Arkansas	115,038	108,018	14,434		New York	405,911	343,229	385,118	
California	262,652	326,523	346,936		North Carolina	195,319	151,463	43,874	
Colorado		107,511	26,762		North Dakota		89,920	6,752	
Connecticut	130,280	119,765	66,758		Ohio	187,033	232,244	161,144	
Delaware	92,135	87,000	9,994		Oklahoma		116,519	26,024	
Florida	153,302	157,665	62,677		Oregon	120,000	107,742	26,911	
Georgia	161,699	141,847	40,889		Pennsylvania	134,428	257,543	179,112	
Hawaii	69,586	89,925	10,886		Rhode Island	90,693	93,481	14,488	
Idaho	32,527	90,465	7,442		South Carolina	103,226	117,371	19,607	
Illinois	277,743	238,122	233,172		South Dakota		362	7,381	
Indiana		153,131	76,666		Tennessee	91,400	135,949	33,641	
Iowa	134,050	123,252	42,993		Texas		230,256	113,536	
Kansas	122,734	114,171	32,090		Utah	97,470	93,969	10,120	
Kentucky	141,289	127,653	28,935		Vermont	96,436	86,115	4,828	
Louisiana	101,300	131,086	31,738		Virginia	125,243	142,221	49,027	
Maine		95,203	10,982		Washington	54,296	124,752	53,647	
Maryland	136,517	128,634	58,020		West Virginia	95,217	109,181	16,933	
Massachusetts	192,785	160,755	101,249		Wisconsin		141,983	61,686	
Michigan		202,706	147,870		Wyoming	86,474	85,177	4,576	
Minnesota		133,546	51,241		District of Columbia		91,983	22,801	
Mississippi	122,724	114,164	17,600		American Samoa	20,393	20,314	162	
Missouri		147,756	61,451		Guam		21,052	542	
Montana	103,236	90,584	8,408		Puerto Rico	77,220	116,852	18,984	
Nebraska		102,137	21,049		Trust Territory	43,310	21,109		
					Virgin Islands	41,503	20,503	259	

<sup>1</sup> Estimated distribution of funds with a basic amount of \$30,000 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and \$20,000 to the other outlying areas; the remainder distributed on

the basis of total population, Apr. 1, 1960 (except trust territory, 1958). Required matching expenditures computed on the basis of fiscal year 1970-71 "Federal share" percentages.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$60,866 for adjustments in fiscal year 1970.

## LIBRARIES AND EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS—LSCA, TITLE III, INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

State and outlying areas	1971 estimate <sup>1</sup>			1972 estimated allotment <sup>2</sup>	State and outlying areas	1971 estimate <sup>1</sup>			1972 estimated allotment
	1970 actual	Federal allotment	State and local matching			1970 actual	Federal allotment	State and local matching	
Total	\$2,079,126	\$2,281,000	\$2,270,937	\$2,281,000	Nevada	40,253	40,253	40,253	40,365
Alabama		42,892	42,892	42,773	New Hampshire	40,537	40,537	40,537	40,564
Alaska	11,345	40,200	40,200	40,225	New Jersey	45,371	45,371	45,371	45,623
Arizona	41,153	41,153	41,153	41,351	New Mexico	40,842	40,842	40,842	40,799
Arkansas	41,581	41,581	41,581	41,578	New York	54,858	54,858	54,858	54,327
California	53,915	53,915	53,915	55,273	North Carolina	44,033	44,033	44,033	44,065
Colorado	41,553	41,553	41,553	41,657	North Dakota	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,489
Connecticut	42,244	42,244	42,244	42,338	Ohio	48,593	48,593	48,593	48,381
Delaware	40,395	40,395	40,395	40,419	Oklahoma	42,061	42,061	42,061	42,020
Florida	44,384	44,384	44,384	45,020	Oregon	30,591	31,566	31,566	41,618
Georgia	43,491	43,491	43,491	43,657	Pennsylvania	50,021	50,021	50,021	49,222
Hawaii	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,607	Rhode Island	40,761	40,761	40,761	40,715
Idaho	40,591	40,591	40,591	40,569	South Carolina	42,109	42,109	42,109	42,120
Illinois	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,619	South Dakota	40,602	40,602	40,602	40,522
Indiana	44,128	44,128	44,128	44,012	Tennessee	43,158	43,158	43,158	43,129
Iowa	42,441	42,441	42,441	42,238	Texas	48,481	48,481	48,481	48,921
Kansas	41,929	41,929	41,929	41,829	Utah	40,788	40,788	40,788	40,823
Kentucky	16,324	42,690	42,690	42,555	Vermont	40,345	40,345	40,345	40,343
Louisiana	42,883	42,883	42,883	42,932	Virginia	43,500	43,512	43,512	43,660
Maine	40,858	40,858	40,858	40,765	Washington	42,526	42,526	42,526	42,648
Maryland	42,745	42,745	42,745	42,949	West Virginia	41,647	41,647	41,647	41,420
Massachusetts	44,558	44,558	44,558	44,276	Wisconsin	43,498	43,498	43,498	43,330
Michigan	46,926	46,926	46,926	46,883	Wyoming	40,292	40,292	40,292	40,258
Minnesota	43,022	43,022	43,022	42,918	District of Columbia		40,676	40,676	40,618
Mississippi	41,928	41,928	41,928	41,854	American Samoa		10,018	10,018	10,024
Missouri	43,824	43,824	43,824	43,678	Guam	10,059	10,059	10,059	10,079
Montana	40,597	40,597	40,597	40,542	Puerto Rico		42,080	42,080	42,139
Nebraska	41,249	41,249	41,249	41,142	Trust Territory	10,063	10,063		10,075
					Virgin Islands	10,028	10,028	10,028	10,044

<sup>1</sup> Estimated distribution of funds with a basic amount of \$40,000 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and \$10,000 to the outlying areas, and the balance distributed on the basis of total resident population, Apr. 1, 1960. The "Federal share" is 50 percent, except for Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for which it is 100 percent.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated distribution of funds with a minimum allotment of \$40,000 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and \$10,000 to the other outlying areas; the remainder distributed on the basis of estimated total population, July 1, 1969 (except outlying areas, July 1, 1968). The "Federal share" is 100 percent.



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALABAMA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A)			
Basic grants				Work-study			
State administrative expenses				Direct loans (NEDA II)			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				Special programs for disadvantaged students			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				(HEA, sec. 408):			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				Talent search			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)				Special services in college			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Upward Bound			
Grants to States				Institutional assistance:			
Grants for special projects				Strengthening developing institutions			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				(HEA III)			
Grants to States				Construction:			
Loans to nonprofit private schools				Subsidized loans (HEFA III)			
State administration				Grants:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)				Other undergraduate facilities			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))				(HEFA I)			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education				State administration and planning			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				(HEFA I)			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)				Language training and area studies:			
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Centers, fellowships, and research			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas				(NDEA VI)			
Emergency school assistance				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)			
Education for the handicapped:				University community services (HEA I)			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)			
Teacher education and recruitment				Permanent (Second Morrill Act)			
Research and innovation				Undergraduate instructional equipment			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped				(HEA VI):			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Television equipment			
Basic vocational education programs:				Other equipment			
State grants				College personnel development			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)				Subtotal, higher education			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)				Education professions development:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)				Personnel training and development			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)				Teacher Corps			
Vocational research:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)				Subtotal, education professions development			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)				Libraries and educational communications:			
Research				Public libraries:			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Services			
Grants to States				Construction (LSCA II)			
Special projects and teacher education				College library resources (HEA II-A)			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education				Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)			
				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications			
				Research and development			
				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
				Total, Office of Education			

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Grants to States			
Aid to school districts:				Loans to nonprofit private schools			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				State administrative			
Pt. A:				Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)			
Basic grants				Bilingual education (ESEA VII)			
State administrative expenses				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)				Construction (Public Law 81-815)			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas			
Grants to States				Emergency school assistance			
Grants for special projects							

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued				Construction:			
Education for the handicapped:				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	\$100,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	Grants:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....	95,000			Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....		\$50,000	
Teacher education and recruitment.....	63,390			Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	\$100,000		
Research and innovation.....				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	28,354	47,491	\$26,625
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	258,390	200,000	200,000	Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
Basic vocational education programs:				University community services (HEA I). Aid to land-grant colleges:	105,854	105,854	105,854
State grants.....	403,555	422,312	510,274	Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	155,388	152,838	
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	22,295	26,240		Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	19,668	27,882		Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	7,022	9,088		Television equipment.....		627	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	205,240	212,006		Other equipment.....		4,384	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	42,566	31,068	28,354	College personnel development.....	31,800		
Vocational research:				Subtotal, higher education.....	1,127,800	708,618	182,479
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	101,868	208,247		Education professions development:			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Personnel training and development.....	157,892	113,728	102,603
Research.....	15,000	46,924		Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Teacher Corps.....	161,000		
Grants to States.....	136,550	141,671	184,592	Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	115,000		
Special projects and teacher education.....				Subtotal, education professions development.....	433,892	113,728	102,603
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	953,764	1,125,438	723,220	Libraries and educational communications:			
Higher education:				Public libraries:			
Student assistance:				Services.....	153,034	241,661	247,450
Grants and work-study payments:				Construction (LSCA II).....	86,150	83,547	
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	83,500	134,977	(*)	College library resources (HEA II-A).....	27,253		
Work-study.....	141,039	144,182	(*)	Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	82,030	118,265		Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....	58,307		
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	324,744	325,208	247,450
Talent search.....	45,000			Research and development:			
Special services in college.....	197,049			Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Upward Bound.....	50,000			Total, Office of Education.....	21,376,953	25,102,721	23,632,280
Institutional assistance:							
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	57,800						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Education for the handicapped:			
Elementary and secondary education:				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	\$224,757	\$252,738	\$260,934
Aid to school districts:				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....	27,378		
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Teacher education and recruitment.....	604,684		
Pt. A:				Research and innovation.....	610		
Basic grants.....	\$9,600,568	\$10,537,286	\$10,537,286	Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	857,492	252,738	260,934
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	15,000	Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....		216,602	216,602	Basic vocational education programs:			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		103,802	103,802	State grants.....	2,947,567	3,084,298	3,620,545
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	1,269,737	1,365,872	1,390,735	Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	162,854	191,640	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	361,721	680,887	683,279	Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	143,660	203,630	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	36,283	46,954	
Grants to States.....	369,169	369,169	409,900	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	229,193	266,893	
Grants for special projects.....				State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,468	31,068	28,354
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Vocational research:			
Grants to States.....	366,659	507,399		Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	216,260	245,948	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	16,610	16,785		Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	15,000	342,700	
State administration.....				Research.....			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	791,845			Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Grants to States.....	379,898	419,113	387,056
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	702,100			Special projects and teacher education.....	150,000		
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	13,628,409	13,947,802	13,491,604	Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	4,311,783	4,832,244	4,035,955
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Higher education:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	9,843,042	11,366,000	10,556,000	Student assistance:			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	2,245,747	3,100,000	5,000,000	Grants and work-study payments:			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	12,088,789	14,466,000	15,556,000	Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,613,800	1,679,041	(*)
Emergency school assistance.....				Work-study.....	1,459,803	1,393,728	(*)
				Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,162,167	2,502,228	



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				College personnel development.....	\$1,013,200		
Talent search.....	\$35,000			Subtotal, higher education.....	8,137,528	\$5,507,551	\$91,157
Special services in college.....	462,892			Education professions development:			
Upward Bound.....	232,000			Personnel training and development.....	915,019	182,441	114,795
Institutional assistance:				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):				Teacher Corps.....	253,129		
Construction:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	279,573		
Subsidized loans (HEFA III):				Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,447,721	182,441	114,795
Grants:				Libraries and educational communications:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	338,282	\$415,830		Public libraries:			
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	275,087			Services.....	380,827	418,418	284,627
State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	70,858	69,534	\$41,157	Construction (LSCA II).....	104,542	100,424	
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	99,110			College library resources (HEA II-A).....	91,920		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	9,005			Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
University community services (HEA I).....	135,360	135,360		Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....	16,864		
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	594,153	518,842	284,627
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	180,964	166,342		Research and development.....	44,100		
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	119,083		
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				Total, Office of Education.....	41,228,995	39,707,618	33,835,072
Television equipment.....		11,936					
Other equipment.....		83,552					

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Vocational research:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	\$112,276	\$254,196	
Aid to school districts:				Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Research.....	15,000	429,443	
PL A:				Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Basic grants.....	\$24,750,018	\$25,585,789	\$25,585,789	Grants to States.....	701,583	785,866	\$577,596
State administrative expenses.....	247,500	255,858	255,858	Special projects and teacher education.....	171,000		
PL B: Special incentive grants.....				Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	5,385,463	6,194,552	5,123,308
PL C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		361,444	361,444	Higher education:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	1,405,549	1,505,599	1,512,247	Student assistance:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	380,294	715,848	718,177	Grants and work-study payments:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,542,800	1,528,973	(?)
Grants to States.....	384,783	384,783	426,890	Work-study.....	2,559,171	2,260,605	(?)
Grants for special projects.....				Direct loans (NDEA II).....	1,821,555	2,032,510	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Grants to States.....	448,166	610,488		Talent search.....	85,131		
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Special services in college.....	546,025		
State administration.....	18,376	18,278		Upward Bound.....	169,000		
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	281,000			Institutional assistance:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	814,719			Construction:			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	28,730,405	29,438,087	28,860,405	Subsidized loans (HEFA III):			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Grants:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	2,694,616	2,824,000	2,225,000	Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	459,141	557,980	
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	7,209			Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	313,893		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	2,701,825	2,824,000	2,225,000	State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	57,328	66,679	39,671
Emergency school assistance.....		2,186,088		Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Education for the handicapped:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	297,836	334,914	345,775	University community services (HEA I).....	142,062	142,062	142,062
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....	110,000			Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	191,087			Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	192,476	172,418	
Research and innovation.....				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	598,923	334,914	345,775	Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Television equipment.....		9,106	
Basic vocational education programs:				Other equipment.....		63,741	
State grants.....	3,693,674	3,864,985	4,517,358	College personnel development.....	252,400		
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	204,075	240,145		Subtotal, higher education.....	8,971,623	5,884,074	231,733
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	180,024	255,170		Education professions development:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	42,330	54,780		Personnel training and development.....	793,478	186,674	115,551
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	234,433	278,899		Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354	Teacher Corps.....	313,531		
				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	386,600		
				Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,493,609	186,674	115,551

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III)			
Libraries and educational communications:				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	\$645,400	\$605,962	\$292,130
Public libraries:				Research and development	19,850		
Services	\$446,378	\$497,944	\$292,130	Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	814,091		
Construction (LSCA II)	115,038	108,018		Total, Office of Education	49,361,189	47,654,351	37,193,902
College library resources (HEA II-A)	83,984						
Librarian training (HEA II-B)							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	\$15,797,196	\$7,050,028	(2)
Pl. A:				Work-study	12,826,286	12,874,714	(2)
Basic grants	\$96,934,750	\$113,934,749	\$113,934,749	Direct loans (NDEA II)	19,240,987	25,604,260	
State administrative expenses	969,574	1,139,347	1,139,347	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pl. B: Special incentive grants		133,907	133,907	Talent search	550,335		
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		1,231,803	1,231,803	Special services in college	1,712,288		
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	11,008,765	12,194,651	12,231,974	Upward Bound	1,043,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	4,081,360	7,682,559	7,612,705	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	356,500		
Grants to States	1,910,647	1,910,647	2,098,831	Construction:			
Grants for special projects				Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	113,244		
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States	2,580,066	3,535,998		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	3,211,049	3,453,412	
Loans to nonprofit private schools	86,700			Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	3,112,252		
State administration	175,073	175,210		State administration and planning (HEFA I)	415,649	306,486	\$194,553
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	1,693,827		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)	7,291,886			Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	394,321		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	4,848,350			University community services (HEA I)	506,816	506,816	506,816
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	129,887,171	141,938,871	138,383,316	Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	523,740	347,252	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	71,447,365	76,697,000	59,668,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	452,413			Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	71,899,778	76,697,000	59,668,000	Television equipment		794,436	
Emergency school assistance		536,604		Other equipment			
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development	5,333,956		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	2,397,629	2,696,116	2,783,546	Subtotal, higher education	66,881,446	50,987,404	751,369
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	159,922			Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment	1,952,026			Personnel training and development	7,262,570	1,030,190	264,839
Research and innovation	2,285,851			Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	6,795,428	2,696,116	2,783,546	Teacher Corps	3,084,997		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	1,754,081		
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development	12,101,648	1,030,190	264,839
State grants	23,903,359	25,010,506	29,905,391	Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	1,320,663	1,554,000		Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	1,165,014	1,651,219		Services	2,932,689	2,786,412	744,705
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	390,527	505,388		Construction (LSCA II)	262,652	326,523	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	512,513	916,098		College library resources (HEA II-A)	927,436		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	93,203	93,203	85,061	Librarian training (HEA II-B)	441,948		
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III)	313,885		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	211,413	691,883		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	4,278,610	6,112,935	744,705
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)	23,548			Research and development	17,020,629		
Research	60,113	2,778,945		Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	1,227,391		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education	340,341,932	315,623,258	235,440,060
Grants to States	2,137,446	2,422,896	2,853,833				
Special projects and teacher education	432,004						
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion	30,249,803	35,624,138	32,844,285				



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):			
Pt. A:				Work-study			
Basic grants				Direct loans (NDEA II)			
State administrative expenses				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				Talent search			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				Special services in college			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				Upward Bound			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)				Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)			
Grants to States				Construction:			
Grants for special projects				Subsidized loans (HEFA III):			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)			
Loans to nonprofit private schools				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)			
State administration				State administration and planning (HEFA I)			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))				University community services (HEA I)			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)				Permanent (Second Morrill Act)			
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas				Television equipment			
Emergency school assistance				Other equipment			
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)				Subtotal, higher education			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)				Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment				Personnel training and development			
Research and innovation				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped				Teacher Corps			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs			
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development			
State grants				Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)				Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)				Services			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)				Construction (LSCA II)			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)				College library resources (HEA II-A)			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)				Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)				Research and development			
Research				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education			
Grants to States							
Special projects and teacher education							
Subtotal, vocational and adult education							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				Bilingual education (ESEA VII)			
Elementary and secondary education:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))			
Aid to school districts:				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Pt. A:				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)			
Basic grants				Construction (Public Law 81-815)			
State administrative expenses				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				Emergency school assistance			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				Education for the handicapped:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Teacher education and recruitment			
Grants to States				Research and innovation			
Grants for special projects				Subtotal, education for the handicapped			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):							
Grants to States							
Loans to nonprofit private schools							
State administration							
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)							

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued							
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	\$86,606	\$79,519	\$44,714
Basic vocational education programs:				Language training and area studies:			
State grants.....	\$3,402,846	\$3,560,314	\$4,205,720	Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	458,060		
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	188,007	221,216		Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	72,678		
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	165,851	235,055		University community services (HEA I).....	162,807	162,807	162,807
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	56,570	73,208		Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	246,035	305,485		Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	210,285	181,817	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Vocational research:				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	116,412	272,457		Television equipment.....		11,915	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	15,000	295,590		Other equipment.....		83,405	
Research.....				College personnel development.....	1,235,300		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Subtotal, higher education.....	10,049,490	6,721,645	257,521
Grants to States.....	503,143	559,625	654,018	Education professions development:			
Special projects and teacher education.....	188,000			Personnel training and development.....	1,439,382	239,206	125,034
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	4,912,932	5,654,018	4,888,092	Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Higher education:				Teacher Corps.....	492,687		
Student assistance:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	188,100		
Grants and work-study payments:				Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,120,169	239,206	125,034
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,915,000	1,902,021	(?)	Libraries and educational communications:			
Work-study.....	1,553,229	1,663,197	(?)	Public libraries:			
Direct loans (NJE II).....	2,390,823	3,134,483		Services.....	547,790	620,977	317,260
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				Construction (LSCA II).....	130,280	119,765	
Talent search.....	98,630			College library resources (HEA II-A).....	167,165		
Special services in college.....	653,611			Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Upward bound.....	100,000			Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Institutional assistance:				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	845,235	740,742	317,260
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	43,066			Research and development.....	3,531,306		
Construction:				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	83,384		
Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	196,494			Total, Office of Education.....	41,322,176	35,327,332	26,364,210
Grants:							
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	436,967	452,481					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	385,934						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION							
Elementary and secondary education:				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Aid to school districts:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				State grants.....	\$653,224	\$683,489	\$853,759
PL A:				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	36,090	42,468	
Basic grants.....	\$2,606,706	\$2,825,067	\$2,825,067	Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	31,837	45,124	
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	10,924	14,137	
PL B: Special incentive grants.....				Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	208,795	220,154	
PL C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		22,497	22,497	State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	647,711	669,101	669,714	Vocational research:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	117,339	220,873	226,869	Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	103,136	213,843	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	15,000	75,943	
Grants to States.....	263,311	263,311	293,686	Research.....			
Grants for special projects.....				Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants to States.....	162,892	171,704	236,372
Grants to States.....	82,557	114,705		Special projects and teacher education.....	113,000		
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	13,333	13,333		Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	1,365,966	1,497,930	1,118,485
State administration.....				Higher education:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Student assistance:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Grants and work-study payments:			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	670,251			Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	367,700	1,166,689	(?)
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	4,551,208	4,278,887	4,187,833	Work-study.....	320,153	345,598	(?)
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Direct loans (NDEA II).....	359,374	548,637	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	1,811,627	1,919,000	1,876,000	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA sec. 408):			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Talent search.....	64,895		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	1,811,627	1,919,000	1,876,000	Special services in college.....	45,000		
Emergency School Assistance.....				Upward Bound.....			
Education for the handicapped:				Institutional assistance:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	100,000	200,000	200,000	Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	95,662		
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Construction:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	95,535			Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Research and innovation.....				Grants:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	195,535	200,000	200,000	Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....		84,324	
				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	162,348		
				(HEFA I).....	44,218	52,017	29,724



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	\$83,350		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....				Subtotal, education professions development.....	436,656	\$126,743	\$104,912
University community services (HEA I).....	\$111,306	\$111,306	\$111,306	Libraries and educational communications:			
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Public libraries:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	160,612	155,601		Services.....	264,938	277,822	253,837
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	Construction (LSCA II).....	92,135	87,000	
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				College library resources (HEA II-A).....	28,845		
Television equipment.....		2,232		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Other equipment.....		15,623		Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....			
College personnel development.....	165,942			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	385,918	364,822	253,837
Subtotal, higher education.....	1,947,210	1,532,027	191,030	Research and development.....	280,222		
Education professions development:				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	144,916		
Personnel training and development.....	306,094	126,743	104,912	Total, Office of Education.....	11,119,258	9,919,409	7,932,097
Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:							
Teacher Corps.....	47,212						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$4,199,600	\$1,830,478	(1)
Pt. A:				Work-study.....	4,025,307	4,581,945	(2)
Basic grants.....	\$33,005,253	\$36,253,182	\$36,253,182	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	4,549,558	6,510,103	
State administrative expenses.....	330,053	362,532	362,532	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....		12,924	12,924	Talent search.....	97,262		
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		290,264	290,264	Special services in college.....	791,059		
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	3,592,837	4,037,886	4,107,058	Upward Bound.....	235,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	1,178,032	2,217,472	2,270,496	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	857,294		
Grants to States.....	718,370	718,370	809,956	Construction:			
Grants for special projects.....	364,245			Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	246,997		
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States.....	1,059,430	1,475,713		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	1,293,421	1,193,372	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		55,120		Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	1,348,031		
State administration.....	54,190			State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	230,583	111,270	\$67,425
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	680,998			Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	177,025		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....	609,787			Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	31,155		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	2,389,000			University community services (HEA I).....	231,724	231,724	231,724
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	43,982,195	45,423,463	44,106,412	Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	267,743	212,142	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	17,317,913	17,763,000	13,602,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	59,730			Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	17,376,923	17,763,000	13,602,000	Television equipment.....		28,461	
Emergency school assistance.....		8,140,628		Other equipment.....		199,228	
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development.....	1,666,900		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	736,246	827,903	854,750	Subtotal, higher education.....	20,298,659	14,948,723	349,149
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....	209,661			Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	913,567			Personnel training and development.....	2,351,941	368,487	149,163
Research and innovation.....	117,874			Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,977,348	827,903	854,750	Teacher Corps.....	568,253		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	820,635		
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development.....	3,740,829	368,487	149,163
State grants.....	9,767,350	10,219,726	11,891,347	Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	539,646	634,989		Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	476,047	674,717		Services.....	874,972	1,017,914	405,865
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	118,602	153,485		Construction (LSCA II).....	153,302	157,665	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	295,999	419,975		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	277,905		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	60,636	60,690	67,433	Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	142,060		
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....	272,102		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	205,542	351,100		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	1,720,341	1,175,579	405,865
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	60,636			Research and development.....	504,900		
Research.....	24,563	1,135,525		Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	1,245,658		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education.....	104,038,760	103,606,307	72,594,965
Grants to States.....	1,519,832	1,308,317	1,168,846				
Special projects and teacher education.....	123,000						
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	13,191,907	14,958,524	13,127,626				

Footnotes at end of table.

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):			
Pt. A:				Work-study:			
Basic grants				Direct loans (NDEA II):			
State administrative expenses				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				Talent search:			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				Special services in college:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III):				Upward Bound:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II):				Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):			
Grants to States:				Construction:			
Grants for special projects:				Subsidized loans (HEFA III):			
Acquisition of equipment and minor re-modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States:				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I):			
Loans to nonprofit private schools:				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I):			
State administration:				State administration and planning (HEFA I):			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII):				Language training and area studies:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII):				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI):			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)):				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act):			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education:				University community services (HEA I):			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874):				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act):			
Construction (Public Law 81-815):				Permanent (Second Morrill Act):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas:				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Emergency school assistance:				Television equipment:			
Education for the handicapped:				Other equipment:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B):				College personnel development:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623):				Subtotal, higher education:			
Teacher education and recruitment:				Education professions development:			
Research and innovation:				Personnel training and development:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped:				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Teacher Corps:			
Basic vocational education programs:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs:			
State grants:				Subtotal, education professions development:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B):				Libraries and educational communications:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F):				Public libraries:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H):				Services:			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G):				Construction (LSCA II):			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B):				College library resources (HEA II-A):			
Vocational research:				Librarian training (HEA II-B):			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D):				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III):			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I):				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications:			
Research:				Research and development:			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964):			
Grants to States:				Total, Office of Education:			
Special projects and teacher education:							
Subtotal, vocational and adult education:							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Bilingual education (ESEA VII):</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)):			
Aid to school districts:				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Pt. A:				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874):			
Basic grants				Construction (Public Law 81-815):			
State administrative expenses:				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas:			
Pt. B—Special incentive grants				Emergency school assistance:			
Pt. C—Special grants for urban and rural schools				Education for the handicapped:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III):				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B):			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II):				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623):			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Teacher education and recruitment:			
Grants to States:				Research and innovation:			
Grants for special projects:				Subtotal, education for the handicapped:			
Acquisition of equipment and minor re-modeling (NDEA III):							
Grants to States:							
Loans to nonprofit private schools:							
State administration:							
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII):							



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Language training and area studies:			
Basic vocational education programs:				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	\$294,132		
State grants	\$1,281,603	\$1,341,119	\$1,570,678	Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	21,710		
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	70,809	83,328		University community services (HEA I)	116,439	\$116,439	\$116,439
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	62,464	88,542		Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	18,922	24,487		Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	165,047	157,941	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	214,409	233,018		Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	28,354	Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Vocational research:				Television equipment		3,691	
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	207,586	222,680		Other equipment		25,839	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)				College personnel development	372,700		
Research	15,000	149,013		Subtotal, higher education	3,089,771	2,384,668	197,513
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Education professions development:			
Grants to States	251,540	272,771	259,916	Personnel training and development	327,033	137,272	106,785
Special projects and teacher education	190,000			Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,343,401	2,446,026	1,858,948	Teacher Corps	231,775		
Higher education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	115,000		
Student assistance:				Subtotal, education professions development	673,808	137,272	106,785
Grants and work-study payments:				Libraries and educational communications:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	322,400	1318,123	(?)	Public libraries:			
Work-study	601,709	548,694	(?)	Services	290,189	308,456	219,460
Direct loans (NDEA II)	400,396	940,250		Construction (LSCA II)	69,586	89,925	
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				College library resources (HEA II-A)	58,624		
Talent search	77,479			Librarian training (HEA II-B)	59,028		
Special services in college	94,667			Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)			
Upward Bound	90,000			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	477,427	398,381	219,460
Institutional assistance:				Research and development	140,052		
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	200,000			Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Construction:				Total, Office of Education	20,737,728	20,720,082	16,455,270
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)							
Grants:							
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	171,585	169,240					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	108,157						
State administration and planning (HEFA I)	3,350	54,451	31,074				

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Aid to school districts:				State grants	\$1,348,046	\$1,410,598	\$1,729,463
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	74,479	87,644	
Pt. A:				Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	65,703	93,129	
Basic grants	\$3,032,174	\$3,332,125	\$3,332,125	Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	16,581	21,458	
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	213,474	230,874	
Pt. B: Special incentive grants		61,747	61,747	State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	28,354
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				Vocational research:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	743,778	781,230	783,885	Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	104,804	221,207	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	153,059	288,111	286,186	Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Research	15,000	156,733	
Grants to States	283,357	283,357	313,648	Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants for special projects				Grants to States	153,041	160,473	264,507
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Special projects and teacher education			
Grants to States	163,334	222,979		Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,022,196	2,413,184	2,022,324
Loans to nonprofit private schools				Higher education:			
State administration	13,333	13,333		Student assistance:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Grants and work-study payments:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)	75,900			Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	578,400	1,293,197	(?)
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	81,336			Work-study	648,557	607,099	(?)
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	4,696,271	5,132,882	4,927,591	Direct loans (NDEA II)	797,527	1,009,547	
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,794,439	3,106,000	2,465,000	Talent search	63,000		
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Special services in college	163,004		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	2,794,439	3,106,000	2,465,000	Upward Bound	70,000		
Emergency school assistance				Institutional assistance:			
Education for the handicapped:				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	116,982	200,000	200,000	Construction:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	25,000			Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	17,885		
Teacher education and recruitment	108,278			Grants:			
Research and innovation				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	210,209	206,857	
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	250,260	200,000	200,000	Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	112,507		
				State administration and planning (HEFA I)	55,990	55,978	32,292
				Language training and area studies:			
				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)			

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued</b>				<b>Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs</b>			
Higher education—Continued					\$115,000		
Institutional assistance—Continued							
Language training and area studies—Continued				Subtotal, education professions development	423,810	\$134,884	\$106,190
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)							
University community services (HEA I)	\$115,039	\$115,039	\$115,039	<b>Libraries and educational communications:</b>			
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Public libraries:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	165,865	158,373		Services	294,850	314,110	258,790
Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	Construction (LSCA II)	32,527	90,465	
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				College library resources (HEA II-A)	36,263		
Television equipment		4,461		Librarian training (HEA II-B)	24,771		
Other equipment		31,226		Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III)	339,627		
College personnel development	153,300			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	728,038	404,575	258,790
Subtotal, higher education	3,201,283	2,531,777	197,331	Research and development			
Education professions development:				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Personnel training and development	308,810	134,884	106,190				
Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:				Total, Office of Education	14,116,297	13,923,302	10,177,230
Teacher Corps							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	\$8,217,209	\$3,305,408	(?)
Pl. A:				Work-study	6,123,321	6,904,502	(?)
Basic grants	\$53,256,753	\$58,140,427	\$58,140,427	Direct loans (NDEA II)	9,409,954	11,795,497	
State administrative expenses	532,568	581,404	581,404	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pl. B: Special incentive grants		539,483	539,483	Talent search	213,000		
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools	6,414,033	7,087,572	7,029,053	Special services in college	932,822		
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				Upward Bound	341,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	2,271,614	4,275,978	4,293,435	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	499,648		
Grants to States	1,057,244	1,057,552	1,180,269	Construction:			
Grants for special projects				Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	65,867		
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States	1,445,776	1,984,149		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	1,694,867	1,706,263	
Loans to nonprofit private schools				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	1,433,544		
State administration	100,742	100,958		State administration and planning (HEFA I)	252,236	175,796	\$108,263
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Language training and area studies:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)	194,957			Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	937,775		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	2,802,497			Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	144,620		
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	68,076,184	73,767,523	71,764,071	University community services (HEA I)	332,436	332,436	332,436
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	13,367,548	14,261,000	11,031,000	Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	389,721	276,519	
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	13,367,548	14,261,000	11,031,000	Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Emergency school assistance		57,590		Television equipment		46,246	
Education for the handicapped:				Other equipment		323,725	
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	1,488,885	1,674,241	1,728,534	College personnel development	2,832,439		
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	97,104			Subtotal, higher education	33,870,450	24,916,392	490,699
Teacher education and recruitment	1,653,507			Education professions development:			
Research and innovation	998,895			Personnel training and development	3,092,785	617,727	192,966
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	4,238,391	1,674,241	1,728,534	Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Teacher Corps	741,224		
Basic vocational education programs:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	841,095		
State grants	12,769,779	13,360,897	16,224,490	Subtotal, education professions development	4,675,104	617,727	192,966
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	705,533	830,164		Libraries and educational communications:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	622,382	882,100		Public libraries:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	215,941	279,453		Services	1,569,543	1,860,565	524,791
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	376,654	604,788		Construction (LSCA II)	277,743	238,122	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	79,345	79,345	85,062	College library resources (HEA II-A)	36,263		
Vocational research:				Librarian training (HEA II-B)	404,694		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	162,978	478,047		Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III)	341,250		
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)	314,355			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	2,629,493	2,098,687	524,791
Research	32,114	1,484,544		Research and development	2,693,451		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	235,062		
Grants to States	1,633,780	1,848,667	2,244,096	Total, Office of Education	146,698,544	137,241,165	104,285,709
Special projects and teacher education							
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion	16,912,861	19,848,005	18,553,648				



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF INDIANA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
<b>Elementary and secondary education:</b>				<b>Student assistance:</b>			
<b>Aid to school districts:</b>				<b>Grants and work-study payments:</b>			
<b>Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):</b>				<b>Educational opportunity grants</b>			
<b>Pl. A:</b>				<b>(HEA IV-A)</b>			
Basic grants	\$17,081,476	\$18,507,013	\$18,507,013	Work-study	\$4,578,100	\$1,666,343	(?)
State administrative exp. ses.	170,815	185,070	185,070	Direct loans (NDEA II)	3,180,690	3,564,667	(?)
Pl. B: Special incentive grants		15,170	15,170	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):	5,326,714	6,198,675	
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		70,455	70,455	Talent search		45,442	
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,132,269	3,455,650	3,436,774	Special services in college		558,657	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,090,524	2,052,751	2,055,068	Upward Bound		170,000	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				<b>Institutional assistance:</b>			
Grants to States	662,709	662,709	735,463	<b>Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):</b>			
Grants for special projects				<b>Construction:</b>			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				<b>Subsidized loans (HEFA III):</b>			
Grants to States	889,093	1,217,833		<b>Grants:</b>			
Loans to nonprofit private schools	48,281	48,292		<b>Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I):</b>			
State administration				<b>Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)</b>			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				<b>State administration and planning (HEFA I)</b>			
Bilingual education (ES A VII)	100,000			<b>Language training and area studies:</b>			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	544,509			<b>Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI):</b>			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	23,719,676	26,214,943	25,005,013	<b>Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)</b>			
<b>School assistance in federally affected areas:</b>				<b>University community services (HEA I):</b>			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	3,388,081	4,000,000	2,911,000	<b>Aid to land-grant colleges:</b>			
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				<b>Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)</b>			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	3,388,081	4,000,000	2,911,000	<b>Permanent (Second Morrill Act)</b>			
<b>Emergency school assistance</b>				<b>Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):</b>			
<b>Education for the handicapped:</b>				<b>Television equipment</b>			
<b>State grant programs (EHA, pt. B):</b>				<b>Other equipment</b>			
<b>Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)</b>				<b>College personnel development</b>			
<b>Teacher education and recruitment</b>				<b>Subtotal, higher education</b>			
<b>Research and innovation</b>				<b>Education professions development:</b>			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,334,523	837,989	865,164	<b>Personnel training and development</b>			
<b>Vocational and adult education:</b>				<b>Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:</b>			
<b>Grants to States for vocational education:</b>				<b>Teacher Corps</b>			
<b>Basic vocational education programs:</b>				<b>Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs</b>			
<b>State grants</b>				<b>Subtotal, education professions development</b>			
<b>Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)</b>				<b>Libraries and educational communications:</b>			
<b>Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)</b>				<b>Public libraries:</b>			
<b>Work-study (VEA, pt. H)</b>				<b>Services</b>			
<b>Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)</b>				<b>Construction (LSCA II)</b>			
<b>State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)</b>				<b>College library resources (HEA II-A)</b>			
<b>Vocational research:</b>				<b>Librarian training (HEA II-B)</b>			
<b>Innovation (VEA, pt. D)</b>				<b>Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)</b>			
<b>Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)</b>				<b>Subtotal, libraries and educational communications</b>			
<b>Research</b>				<b>Research and development</b>			
<b>Adult education (Adult Education Act):</b>				<b>Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)</b>			
<b>Grants to States</b>				<b>Total, Office of Education</b>			
<b>Special projects and teacher education</b>							
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	9,674,080	11,261,695	10,576,582				

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF IOWA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Bilingual education (ESEA VII):</b>			
<b>Elementary and secondary education:</b>				<b>Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))</b>			
<b>Aid to school districts:</b>				<b>Subtotal, elementary and secondary education</b>			
<b>Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):</b>				<b>School assistance in federally affected areas:</b>			
<b>Pl. A:</b>				<b>Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)</b>			
<b>Basic grants</b>				<b>Construction (Public Law 81-815)</b>			
<b>State administrative expenses</b>				<b>Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas</b>			
<b>Pl. B: Special incentive grants</b>				<b>Emergency school assistance</b>			
<b>Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools</b>				<b>Education for the handicapped:</b>			
<b>Supplementary services (ESEA III)</b>				<b>State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)</b>			
<b>Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)</b>				<b>Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)</b>			
<b>Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):</b>				<b>Teacher education and recruitment</b>			
<b>Grants to States</b>				<b>Research and innovation</b>			
<b>Grants for special projects</b>				<b>Subtotal, education for the handicapped</b>			
<b>Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):</b>							
<b>Grants to States</b>							
<b>Loans to nonprofit private schools</b>							
<b>State administration</b>							
<b>Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)</b>							
<b>Footnotes at end of table.</b>							

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued</b>				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	\$134,337	\$91,903	\$55,515
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	43,270		
Basic vocational education programs:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	70,776	158,862	158,862
State grants.....	\$4,198,015	\$4,392,605	\$5,465,011	University community services (HEA I). Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	231,941	272,930		Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	215,572	184,607	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	204,606	290,005		Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	59,496	76,995		Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	249,029	312,346		Television equipment.....		16,353	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	30,991	Other equipment.....		114,471	
Vocational research:				College personnel development.....	1,031,634		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	117,479	277,170		Subtotal, higher education.....	13,532,693	9,210,950	264,377
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	29,970			Education professions development:			
Research.....	15,000	488,067		Personnel training and development.....	507,064	239,649	124,738
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Grants to States.....	309,838	339,237	654,168	Teacher Corps.....	301,344		
Special projects and teacher education.....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	449,450		
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	5,446,442	6,480,423	6,150,170	Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,257,858	239,649	124,738
Higher education:				Libraries and educational communications:			
Student assistance:				Public libraries:			
Grants and work-study payments:				Services.....	577,891	657,496	313,937
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	3,272,100	1,082,647	(?)	Construction (LSCA II).....	134,050	123,252	
Work-study.....	2,320,126	2,602,150	(?)	College library resources (HEA II-A).....	183,891		
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,722,939	4,197,154		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	12,480		
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Talent search.....	40,000			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	908,312	780,748	313,937
Special services in college.....	656,118			Research and development.....	392,083		
Upward Bound.....	110,000			Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	70,005		
Institutional assistance:				Total, Office of Education.....	43,853,472	40,247,138	29,070,138
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	484,425						
Construction:							
Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	48,727						
Grants:							
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	734,682	712,803					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	439,125						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Aid to school districts:				State grants.....	\$3,598,952	\$3,765,756	\$4,620,536
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	198,841	233,980	
Pl. A:				Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	175,408	248,620	
Basic grants.....	\$10,497,614	\$10,838,944	\$10,383,944	Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	48,767	63,110	
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	239,672	290,906	
Pl. B: Special incentive grants.....		13,378	13,378	State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		47,651	47,651	Vocational research:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	1,586,903	1,699,025	1,701,535	Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	220,887	262,443	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	465,110	875,502	858,763	Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Research.....	15,000	418,417	
Grants to States.....	410,248	410,248	450,383	Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants for special projects.....				Grants to States.....	282,224	307,754	538,235
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Special projects and teacher education.....			
Grants to States.....	415,179	563,945		Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	4,810,819	5,622,054	5,187,125
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Higher education:			
State administration.....	21,727	21,550		Student assistance:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Grants and work-study payments:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,740,400	1,962,151	(?)
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	733,952			Work-study.....	1,803,151	1,912,450	(?)
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	14,280,633	14,620,243	14,060,654	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,256,717	3,411,760	
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	8,125,786	9,267,000	7,547,000	Talent search.....	34,000		
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	33,918			Special services in college.....	190,723		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	8,159,704	9,267,000	7,547,000	Upward Bound.....	100,000		
Emergency school assistance.....				Institutional assistance:			
Education for the handicapped:				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	735,622		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	338,673	380,835	393,185	Construction:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	783,658			Grants:			
Research and innovation.....	307,497			Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	562,089	531,076	
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,429,828	380,835	393,185	Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	350,022		
				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	134,791	88,673	52,769
				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	247,741		



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	\$7,125			Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	\$20,000		
University community services (HEA I). Aid to land-grant colleges:	148,596	\$148,596	\$148,596	Subtotal, education professions development.....	629,613	\$206,004	\$118,595
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	201,805	177,342		Libraries and educational communications:			
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	Public libraries:			
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				Services.....	499,503	562,395	300,437
Television equipment.....		13,827		Construction (LSCA II).....	122,734	114,171	
Other equipment.....		96,786		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	181,550		
College personnel development.....	1,019,075			Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	18,720		
Subtotal, higher education.....	11,581,857	7,392,661	251,365	Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Education professions development:				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	822,507	676,566	300,437
Personnel training and development.....	609,613	206,004	118,595	Research and development.....	117,587		
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Teacher Corps.....				Total, Office of Education.....	41,832,548	38,165,363	27,858,361

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$2,699,300	\$909,364	(?)
Pt. A:				Work-study.....	3,089,132	3,191,908	(?)
Basic grants.....	\$35,976,081	\$37,468,749	\$37,464,223	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,985,847	3,405,119	
State administrative expenses.....	359,761	374,687	374,642	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Talent search.....	54,000		
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		498,833	498,833	Special services in college.....	907,348		
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	2,078,567	2,246,048	2,245,669	Upward Bound.....	174,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	641,127	1,206,827	1,199,083	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	604,250		
Grants to States.....	475,514	475,514	525,328	Construction:			
Grants for special projects.....	25,600			Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	139,735		
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States.....	697,959	948,977		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	584,841	927,912	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	577,846		
State administration.....	30,230	30,014		State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	23,380	81,498	\$49,106
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	447,000			Language training and area studies:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	1,366,874			Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	42,098,713	43,249,649	42,307,778	University community services (HEA I). Aid to land-grant colleges:	168,386	168,386	168,386
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	222,244	188,129	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	7,901,881	8,739,006	7,793,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	7,901,881	8,739,006	7,793,000	Television equipment.....		15,255	
Emergency school assistance.....		311,174		Other equipment.....		106,780	
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development.....	667,360		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	509,972	573,460	592,056	Subtotal, higher education.....	12,947,669	9,044,351	267,492
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	415,770			Personnel training and development.....	904,349	246,120	125,964
Research and innovation.....	533,211			Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,458,953	573,460	592,056	Teacher Corps.....	893,124		
Vocational and adult education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	686,418		
Grants to States for vocational education:				Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,483,391	246,120	125,964
Basic vocational education programs:				Libraries and educational communications:			
State grants.....	6,212,161	6,500,330	7,575,842	Public libraries:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	343,223	403,891		Services.....	589,523	703,594	324,425
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	302,771	429,159		Construction (LSCA II).....	141,289	127,653	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	72,761	94,161		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	126,455		
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	258,198	333,357		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	43,935		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	38,600	38,600	42,961	Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....	64,000		
Vocational research:				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	965,202	831,247	324,245
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	230,640	291,602		Research and development.....	81,626		
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	15,623	722,259		Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	188,743		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education.....	77,097,343	72,956,904	59,914,211
Grants to States.....	1,019,688	1,148,538	884,693				
Special projects and teacher education.....	477,000						
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	8,970,665	9,961,897	8,503,496				

Footnotes at end of table.

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A).....			
Basic grants.....				\$2,686,600			
State administrative expenses.....				1 \$1,077,003			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				(?)			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Work-study.....			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				3,592,706			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				3,587,871			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Grants to States.....				Talent search.....			
Grants for special projects.....				128,337			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Special services in college.....			
Grants to States.....				559,326			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Upward Bound.....			
State administration.....				367,000			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Institutional assistance:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				1,122,005			
1,226,100				Construction:			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
40,874,171				144,441			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Grants:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....			
4,467,735				905,989			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
4,715,446				479,452			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....			
9,183,181				170,599			
Emergency school assistance.....				79,935			
7,017,825				\$48,602			
Education for the handicapped:				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				122,685			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
100,000				14,620			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				University community services (HEA I).....			
334,173				178,695			
Research and innovation.....				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
75,000				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				227,449			
1,079,997				190,876			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				50,000			
Basic vocational education programs:				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....			
State grants.....				50,000			
7,152,052				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				Television equipment.....			
395,150				18,275			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				Other equipment.....			
348,579				127,929			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				College personnel development.....			
84,660				1,034,711			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Subtotal, higher education.....			
268,678				15,372,486			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				10,456,585			
44,440				277,297			
Vocational research:				Education professions development:			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				Personnel training and development.....			
236,157				816,614			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				285,423			
17,986				132,364			
Research.....				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Teacher Corps.....			
Grants to States.....				230,268			
1,414,980				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....				532,745			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
9,962,682				1,579,627			
11,693,263				285,423			
9,726,231				132,364			
Total, Office of Education.....				Libraries and educational communications:			
80,743,243				Public libraries:			
79,271,744				Services.....			
56,357,059				645,524			
				739,547			
				336,886			
				Construction (LSCA II).....			
				201,300			
				131,086			
				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
				121,541			
				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
				54,530			
				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
				256,431			
				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
				1,279,326			
				870,633			
				336,886			
				Research and development.....			
				37,541			
				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
				1,374,232			
				Total, Office of Education.....			
				80,743,243			
				79,271,744			
				56,357,059			

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....			
Elementary and secondary education:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....			
Aid to school districts:				163,567			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
Pt. A:				6,054,451			
Basic grants.....				\$8,150,703			
\$3,884,709				\$7,907,430			
State administrative expenses.....				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
150,000				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				2,492,527			
84,765				3,456,000			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
4,333				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				2,492,527			
873,976				3,456,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				3,073,000			
213,526				Emergency school assistance.....			
401,930				Education for the handicapped:			
409,218				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....			
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				153,967			
Grants to States.....				200,000			
303,030				200,000			
Grants for special projects.....				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Teacher education and recruitment.....			
Grants to States.....				160,493			
194,993				99,550			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Subtotal, education for the handicapped....			
State administration.....				414,010			
13,333				200,000			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				200,000			



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MAINE—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Basic vocational education programs:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
State grants.....	\$1,714,714	\$1,794,206	\$2,103,384	University community services (HEA I).....	\$120,745	\$120,745	\$120,745
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	94,738	111,481		Aid to land-grant colleges: Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	173,048	162,164	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	83,572	118,455		Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	20,677	26,759		Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	216,842	238,592		Television equipment.....		4,269	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354	Other equipment.....		29,883	
Vocational research:				College personnel development.....	118,500		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	106,005	226,509		Subtotal, Higher Education.....	3,547,816	2,726,019	204,444
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	15,000	199,356		Education professions development:			
Research.....				Personnel training and development.....	341,107	148,665	108,861
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Grants to States.....	204,502	219,144	342,887	Teacher Corps.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....	249,000			Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	110,318		
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	2,736,118	2,965,570	2,474,625	Subtotal, education professions development.....	451,425	148,665	108,861
Higher education:				Libraries and educational communications:			
Student assistance:				Public libraries:			
Grants and work-study payments:				Services.....	335,752	363,733	265,286
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	735,600	1,266,607	(?)	Construction (LSCA II).....		95,203	
Work-study.....	728,863	778,637	(?)	College library resources (HEA II-A).....	69,947		
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	771,868	971,872		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Talent search.....				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	405,699	458,936	265,286
Special services in college.....	249,782			Research and development.....	9,485		
Upward Bound.....	50,000			Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Institutional assistance:				Total, Office of Education.....	16,111,531	18,105,893	14,233,646
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	50,000						
Construction:							
Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	20,925						
Grants:							
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....		283,459					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	418,652						
State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	59,833	58,383	33,699				

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Aid to school districts:				State grants.....	\$5,241,683	\$5,484,600	\$6,413,756
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	289,602	340,780	
Pt. A:				Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	255,472	362,099	
Basic grants.....	\$18,207,980	\$20,770,840	\$20,862,349	Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	78,808	101,986	
State administrative expenses.....	182,080	207,708	208,624	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	263,064	344,506	
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....		7,730	7,730	State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	32,570	32,570	36,371
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		211,188	211,188	Vocational research:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	2,355,833	2,580,658	2,585,462	Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	233,202	299,260	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	805,571	1,516,369	1,547,150	Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	26,799		
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				Research.....	15,000	609,400	
Grants to States.....	534,643	534,643	601,401	Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants for special projects.....				Grants to States.....	682,321	763,906	782,469
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Special projects and teacher education.....	73,998		
Grants to States.....	607,549	832,052		Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	7,192,519	8,339,107	7,232,596
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....		35,312		Higher education:			
State administration.....	35,310			Student assistance:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	665,819			Grants and work-study payments:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,013,970	1,040,030	(?)
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	1,075,300			Work-study.....	1,886,300	2,394,110	(?)
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	24,470,085	26,696,500	26,023,904	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,749,077	3,682,442	
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	25,308,248	24,942,000	16,757,000	Talent search.....	63,000		
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Special services in college.....	281,483		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	25,308,248	24,942,000	16,757,000	Upward bound.....	175,000		
Emergency school assistance.....		900,044		Institutional assistance:			
Education for the handicapped:				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	702,138		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	493,874	555,357	573,367	Construction:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....	40,000			Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	152,423		
Teacher education and recruitment.....	414,051			Grants:			
Research and innovation.....	256,751			Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	691,630	693,653	
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,204,676	555,357	573,367	Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	480,057		
				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	82,320	88,217	52,183
				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	8,999		

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher education—Continued			
Institutional assistance—Continued			
Language training and area studies—Continued			
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	\$9,375		
University community services (HEA I)	178,822	\$178,822	\$178,822
Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	223,731	188,914	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Television equipment		15,346	
Other equipment		107,422	
College personnel development	1,098,100		
Subtotal, higher education	10,846,425	8,438,956	281,005
Education professions development:			
Personnel training and development	992,154	283,599	133,501
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Teacher Corps	45,000		

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	\$302,150		
Subtotal, education professions development	1,339,304	\$283,599	\$133,501
Libraries and educational communications:			
Public libraries:			
Services	624,356	713,867	337,432
Construction (LSCA II)	136,517	128,634	
College library resources (HEA II-A)	178,319		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	89,140		
Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)			
Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	1,028,332	842,501	337,432
Research and development	2,157,341		
Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	297,525		
Total, Office of Education	73,844,455	70,998,064	51,338,805

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and secondary education:			
Aid to school districts:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Pt. A:			
Basic grants	\$21,630,141	\$26,211,805	\$26,211,805
State administrative expenses	216,301	262,118	262,118
Pt. B: Special incentive grants			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		277,115	277,115
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	3,232,286	3,554,778	3,528,082
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	1,103,113	2,076,448	2,101,628
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	628,412	628,412	704,678
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):			
Grants to States	722,123	987,713	
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	48,101	48,043	
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)	228,005		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)	378,508		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	1,328,603		
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	29,515,593	34,646,432	33,085,426
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	13,302,806	15,005,000	12,305,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	45,005		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	13,347,811	15,005,000	12,305,000
Emergency school assistance			
Education for the handicapped:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	750,780	844,247	871,624
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	133,153		
Teacher education and recruitment	1,149,264		
Research and innovation	1,049,777		
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	3,082,974	844,247	871,624
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Basic vocational education programs:			
State grants	6,866,845	7,184,686	8,227,727
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	379,393	446,412	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	334,679	474,341	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	104,947	135,814	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	285,146	395,104	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	42,667	42,667	46,658
Vocational research:			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	244,827	334,016	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)			
Research	17,269	798,299	
Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	835,242	938,251	1,119,805
Special projects and teacher education	75,000		
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	9,186,015	10,749,590	9,394,190

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Higher education:			
Student assistance:			
Grants and work-study payments:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	\$5,917,000	\$2,382,262	( <sup>2</sup> )
Work-study	5,358,854	4,007,058	( <sup>2</sup> )
Direct loans (NDEA II)	7,061,036	8,691,191	
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Talent search	124,000		
Special services in college	1,228,018		
Upward Bound	245,000		
Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	79,643		
Construction:			
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	132,014		
Grants:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	1,076,094	1,114,870	
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	463,068		
State administration and planning (HEFA I)	192,303	142,216	\$85,397
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	706,435		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	79,837		
University community services (HEA I)	215,348	215,348	215,348
Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	272,428	214,615	
Permanent (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Television equipment		34,381	
Other equipment		240,666	
College personnel development	2,749,549		
Subtotal, higher education	25,950,627	17,029,607	350,745
Education professions development:			
Personnel training and development	2,443,758	351,412	145,507
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Teacher Corps	430,387		
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	428,500		
Subtotal, education professions development	3,302,645	351,412	145,507
Libraries and educational communications:			
Public libraries:			
Services	901,649	1,050,278	381,280
Construction (LSCA II)	192,785	160,755	
College library resources (HEA II-A)	402,687		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	92,020		
Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)	358,239		
Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	1,947,380	1,211,033	381,280
Research and development	2,959,387		
Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	139,342		
Total, Office of Education	89,431,774	79,800,321	56,533,772



APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued  
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A).....			
Basic grants.....				Work-study.....			
State administrative expenses.....				Direct loans (NDEA II).....			
Pt. B—Special incentive grants.....				Special programs for disadvantaged students			
Pt. C—Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				(HEA, sec. 408):			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Talent search.....			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				Special services in college.....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Upward Bound.....			
Grants to States.....				Institutional assistance:			
Grants for special projects.....				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Construction:			
Grants to States.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Grants:			
State administration.....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				Language training and area studies:			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				University community services (HEA I).....			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
Emergency school assistance.....				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....			
Education for the handicapped:				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				Television equipment.....			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Other equipment.....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				College personnel development.....			
Research and innovation.....				Subtotal, higher education.....			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				Education professions development:			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Personnel training and development.....			
Basic vocational education programs:				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
State grants.....				Teacher Corps.....			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				Libraries and educational communications:			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Public libraries:			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				Services.....			
Vocational research:				Construction (LSCA II).....			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Research.....				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
Grants to States.....				Research and development.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....				Total, Office of Education.....			

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....			
Elementary and secondary education:				Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....			
Aid to school districts:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
Pt. A:				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Basic grants.....				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
State administrative expenses.....				Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Emergency school assistance.....			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Education for the handicapped:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
Grants to States.....				Teacher education and recruitment.....			
Grants for special projects.....				Research and innovation.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....			
Grants to States.....							
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....							
State administration.....							

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued</b>			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Basic vocational education programs:			
State grants	\$5,683,713	\$5,947,246	\$7,094,864
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	314,026	369,525	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	277,015	392,643	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	78,808	101,986	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	265,309	349,651	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	35,316	35,316	40,234
Vocational research:			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	123,283	302,795	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)			
Research	15,000	660,805	
Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	393,947	435,130	778,938
Special projects and teacher education	385,000		
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,571,417	8,595,097	7,914,036
Higher education:			
Student assistance:			
Grants and work-study payments:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	4,139,700	1,447,877	(?)
Work-study	2,843,426	3,173,001	(?)
Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,548,774	5,242,794	
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Talent search	137,728		
Special services in college	433,766		
Upward Bound	327,000		
Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	100,000		
Construction:			
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	23,377		
Grants:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	983,409	951,515	
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	640,946		

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
State administration and planning (HEFA I)	\$98,614	\$101,060	\$61,259
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	287,905		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	33,816		
University community services (HEA I)	177,698	177,698	177,698
Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	231,178	192,844	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Television equipment		21,491	
Other equipment		150,434	
College personnel development	677,550		
Subtotal, higher education	15,734,887	11,508,714	288,957
Education professions development:			
Personnel training and development	1,165,892	294,507	134,931
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Teacher Corps	567,443		
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	388,450		
Subtotal, education professions development	2,121,785	294,507	134,931
Libraries and educational communications:			
Public libraries:			
Services	666,761	765,312	336,419
Construction (LSCA II)		133,546	
College library resources (HEA II-A)	183,718		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	53,790		
Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)	35,120		
Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	939,389	898,858	336,419
Research and development	1,374,774		
Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	72,929		
Total, Office of Education	58,165,028	54,916,159	40,490,478

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:			
Aid to school districts:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Pt. A:			
Basic grants	\$41,909,589	\$43,194,908	\$43,194,908
State administrative expenses	419,096	431,949	431,949
Pt. B: Special incentive grants		141,626	141,626
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		653,400	653,400
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,687,041	1,796,735	1,788,456
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	491,458	925,097	904,740
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	432,249	432,249	473,438
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):			
Grants to States	596,634	808,793	
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	24,357	24,110	
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	1,606,652		
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	47,166,986	48,408,867	47,588,507
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	5,804,330	2,639,000	2,106,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	5,804,330	2,639,000	2,106,000
Emergency school assistance		5,684,694	
Education for the handicapped:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	399,693	449,452	464,027
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	22,291		
Teacher education and recruitment	235,037		
Research and innovation			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	657,021	449,452	464,027

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Basic vocational education programs:			
State grants	\$4,712,410	\$4,931,282	\$5,768,192
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	260,361	306,400	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	229,675	325,568	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	56,375	72,956	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	245,661	304,627	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	32,710
Vocational research:			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	224,039	271,868	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)			
Research	15,000	547,920	
Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	936,895	1,054,146	639,208
Special projects and teacher education	490,000		
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	7,201,484	7,845,835	6,440,110
Higher education:			
Student assistance:			
Grants and work-study payments:			
Educational opportunity grants (HE IV-A)	2,363,200	1,705,084	(?)
Work-study	3,420,657	3,268,911	(?)
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,297,922	2,722,316	
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Talent search	83,389		
Special services in college	330,374		
Upward Bound	204,000		
Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	2,628,786		
Construction:			
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)			
Grants:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	653,093	640,997	
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	304,004		
State administration and planning (HEFA I)	81,120	79,743	47,456
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)			
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)			



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
University community services (HEA I).	\$149,826	\$149,826	\$149,826	Subtotal, education professions development.....	\$1,421,634	\$212,009	\$119,590
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Libraries and educational communications:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	201,794	177,336	50,000	Public libraries:			
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000		Services.....	499,439	562,317	301,268
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				Construction (LSCA II).....	122,724	114,164	
Television equipment.....		12,325		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	118,247		
Other equipment.....		86,275		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	14,736		
College personnel development.....	488,066			Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....	357,630		
Subtotal, higher education.....	13,256,231	7,892,813	247,282	Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	1,112,776	676,481	301,268
Education professions development:				Research and development.....	10,000		
Personnel training and development.....	617,399	212,009	119,590	Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	809,784		
Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:				Total, Office of Education.....	77,440,246	73,809,151	57,266,784
Teacher Corps.....	344,394						
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	459,841						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$3,824,000	\$1,495,472	(*)
Pl. A:				Work-study.....	3,520,380	3,640,765	(*)
Basic grants.....	\$26,049,684	\$27,760,020	\$27,760,020	Direct loans (NEDA II).....	4,901,774	5,529,152	
State administrative expenses.....	260,497	277,600	277,600	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pl. B: Special incentive grants.....				Talent search.....	134,000		
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		270,207	270,207	Special services in college.....	516,441		
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	2,797,435	3,072,094	3,091,742	Upward Bound.....	157,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	994,943	1,872,834	1,880,383	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	796,537		
Grants to States.....	607,581	607,581	676,281	Construction:			
Grants for special projects.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	136,789		
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States.....	772,977	1,054,691		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	945,265	1,017,094	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	621,752		
State administration.....	41,652	41,500		State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	100,870	106,624	\$63,848
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	718,285			Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	171,887		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	79,576		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	1,232,380			University community services (HEA I).....	197,785	197,785	197,785
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	33,475,434	34,956,527	33,956,233	Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	252,721	204,214	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	7,797,561	8,443,000	6,206,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	71,736			Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	7,869,297	8,443,000	6,206,000	Television equipment.....		23,391	
Emergency school assistance.....		150,584		Other equipment.....		163,734	
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development.....	1,717,569		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	641,800	721,700	745,143	Subtotal, higher education.....	18,124,346	12,428,231	311,633
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....	35,000			Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	809,625			Personnel training and development.....	924,138	326,759	140,716
Research and innovation.....	279,970			Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,766,395	721,700	745,143	Teacher Corps.....	460,335		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	619,207		
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,003,680	326,759	140,716
State grants.....	7,028,458	7,353,941	8,786,255	Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	388,323	456,929		Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	342,557	485,515		Services.....	789,431	914,135	361,553
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	91,487	118,395		Construction (LSCA II).....		147,756	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	274,666	371,092		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	233,518		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	43,672	43,672	49,825	Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	31,200		
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....	277,113		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	126,619	317,522		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	1,331,262	1,061,891	361,553
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	29,424			Research and development.....	8,129,424		
Research.....	17,675	817,105		Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	135,579		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education.....	82,178,938	68,979,028	51,657,528
Grants to States.....	824,641	926,165	1,100,170				
Special projects and teacher education.....	176,000						
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	9,343,522	10,890,336	9,936,250				

Footnotes at end of table.

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A).....			
Basic grants.....				\$803,000			
State administrative expenses.....				1 \$295,442			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				2,318,975			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				864,228			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				1,019,666			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Talent search.....			
Grants to States.....				50,000			
Grants for special projects.....				Special services in college.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				275,124			
Grants to States.....				Upward Bound.....			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				97,000			
State administration.....				Institutional assistance:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				50,000			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				Construction:			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
5,631,989				Grants:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				189,170			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				349,524			
4,549,036				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....			
Emergency school assistance.....				77,187			
Education for the handicapped:				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				10,755			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				114,763			
Research and innovation.....				University community services (HEA I).....			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				114,763			
236,825				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
Basic vocational education programs:				166,045			
State grants.....				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				50,000			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
60,144				Television equipment.....			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				4,192			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Other equipment.....			
213,099				29,345			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				College personnel development.....			
Vocational research:				201,122			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				Subtotal, higher education.....			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				5,427,723			
Research.....				2,545,974			
15,000				197,575			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Education professions development:			
Grants to States.....				Personnel training and development.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....				242,159			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
2,042,060				Teacher Corps.....			
2,275,025				81,340			
1,840,833				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
				155,000			
				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
				478,499			
				Libraries and educational communications:			
				Public libraries:			
				Services.....			
				295,873			
				Construction (LSCA II).....			
				103,236			
				315,354			
				90,584			
				257,943			
				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
				53,005			
				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
				452,114			
				405,938			
				257,943			
				Research and development.....			
				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
				Total, Office of Education.....			
				18,818,246			
				16,513,588			
				13,230,592			

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....			
Elementary and secondary education:				Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....			
Aid to school districts:				\$3,578			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....			
Pt. A:				280,000			
Basic grants.....				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
State administrative expenses.....				9,976,853			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				\$10,830,003			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				\$10,488,592			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				5,279,657			
Grants to States.....				Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
Grants for special projects.....				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				5,279,657			
Grants to States.....				Emergency school assistance.....			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				7,261,000			
State administration.....				4,741,000			
13,656				Education for the handicapped:			
				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....			
				217,458			
				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
				244,530			
				115,000			
				Teacher education and recruitment.....			
				187,271			
				Research and innovation.....			
				269,188			
				Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....			
				788,917			
				244,530			
				252,460			



APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued  
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Language training and area studies:			
Basic vocational education programs:				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI):			
State grants.....	\$2,227,091	\$2,330,328	\$2,767,668	Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	123,046	144,792		University community services (HEA I).....	\$130,820	\$130,820	\$130,820
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	108,546	153,851		Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	30,821	39,886		Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	183,560	167,712	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	225,076	257,459		Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354	Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Vocational research:				Television equipment.....		9,108	
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	108,940	239,468		Other equipment.....		63,757	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	11,996			College personnel development.....	360,704		
Research.....	15,000	258,925					
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Subtotal, higher education.....	6,432,611	5,057,081	220,993
Grants to States.....	221,891	238,968	401,923				
Special projects and teacher education.....				Education professions development:			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	3,103,475	3,694,745	3,197,945	Personnel training and development.....	667,433	171,354	112,668
Higher education:				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Student assistance:				Teacher Corps.....	290,349		
Grants and work-study payments:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	385,875		
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,476,600	1,609,585	(-)	Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,343,657	171,354	112,668
Work-study.....	1,142,874	1,349,246	(-)				
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	1,846,632	2,248,848		Libraries and educational communications:			
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				Public libraries:			
Talent search.....	55,000			Services.....	395,609	436,351	277,747
Special services in college.....	136,555			Construction (LSCA II).....		102,137	
Upward Bound.....	100,000			College library resources (HEA II-A).....	98,909		
Institutional assistance:				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	290,000			Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Construction:				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	494,518	538,488	277,747
Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....				Research and development.....	6,830		
Grants:				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	356,265	359,064					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	234,347			Total, Office of Education.....	27,426,523	27,797,201	19,291,450
State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	69,254	68,941	40,173				

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Aid to school districts:				State grants.....	\$1,058,551	\$553,955	\$671,804
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	58,485	34,420	
Pt. A:				Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	51,592	36,572	
Basic grants.....	\$932,847	\$1,061,267	\$1,061,267	Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	13,850	10,855	
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	211,228	215,008	
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		704	704	Vocational research:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	601,066	613,086	623,087	Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	203,448	210,309	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	100,155	188,572	194,615	Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	15,000	61,551	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Research.....			
Grants to States.....	260,934	260,934	290,935	Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants for special projects.....				Grants to States.....	123,829	127,168	198,117
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Special projects and teacher education.....			
Grants to States.....	61,619	86,937		Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	1,767,051	1,280,906	898,275
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....							
State administration.....	13,333	13,333		Higher education:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Student assistance:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Grants and work-study payments:			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	167,806			Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	213,200	197,031	(-)
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	2,287,760	2,374,788	2,320,608	Work-study.....	340,408	219,258	(-)
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Direct loans (NEDA II).....	233,905	366,857	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	3,234,652	3,408,000	2,748,000	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Talent search.....	50,000		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	3,234,652	3,408,000	2,748,000	Special services in college.....	163,976		
Emergency school assistance.....				Upward Bound.....	90,000		
Education for the handicapped:				Institutional assistance:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	100,000	200,000	200,000	Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Construction:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	121,767			Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Research and innovation.....				Grants:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	221,767	200,000	200,000	Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....		61,219	
				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	115,796		
				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	27,827	49,153	27,751
				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued			
Higher education—Continued			
Institutional assistance—Continued			
Language training and area studies—Continued			
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)			
University community services (HEA I).....	\$109,524	\$109,524	\$109,524
Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	156,784	153,580	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Television equipment.....		1,355	
Other equipment.....		63,757	
College personnel development.....	90,600		
Subtotal, higher education.....	1,642,020	1,171,734	187,275
Education professions development:			
Personnel training and development.....	343,436	122,827	104,214

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Teacher Corps.....			
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	\$115,000		
Subtotal, education professions development.....	458,436	\$122,827	\$104,214
Libraries and educational communications:			
Public libraries:			
Services.....	214,963	251,373	252,046
Construction (LSCA II).....	100,000	84,475	
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	14,782		
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	329,745	335,848	252,046
Research and development.....	150,400		
Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	96,211		
Total, Office of Education.....	10,188,042	8,894,103	6,710,418

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
Elementary and secondary education:			
Aid to school districts:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Pt. A:			
Basic grants.....	\$1,627,712	\$1,822,638	\$1,822,638
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	715,545	755,932	762,180
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	146,053	274,924	281,038
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States.....	271,088	271,088	302,461
Grants for special projects			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):			
Grants to States.....	118,824	165,189	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	13,333	13,333	
State administration.....	110,000		
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	110,000		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....	152,000		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	3,304,555	3,453,104	3,318,317
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	1,975,593	2,157,000	1,731,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	1,975,593	2,157,000	1,731,000
Emergency school assistance.....			
Education for the handicapped:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	100,000	200,000	200,000
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	73,550		
Research and innovation.....			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	173,550	200,000	200,000
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Basic vocational education programs:			
State grants.....	1,058,551	1,107,570	1,324,207
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	58,485	68,817	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	51,592	73,124	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	13,850	17,923	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	211,228	225,728	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354
Vocational research:			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	205,911	217,672	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	15,000	123,063	
Research.....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States.....	160,283	168,729	270,636
Special projects and teacher education.....			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	1,805,968	2,033,694	1,623,197

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Higher education:			
Student assistance:			
Grants and work-study payments:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....			
Work-study.....	\$745,100	\$278,144	(?)
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	740,084	508,982	(?)
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):	799,685	1,015,645	
Talent search.....	50,000		
Special services in college.....	117,598		
Upward Bound.....	15,000		
Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....			
Construction.....	170,000		
Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Grants:	20,493		
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	76,419	168,618	
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	199,326		
State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	82,249	59,707	\$34,282
Language training and area studies:			
Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	28,690		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
University community services (HEA I).....	114,912	114,912	114,912
Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	164,432	157,617	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Television equipment.....		4,112	
Other equipment.....		28,784	
College personnel development.....	278,500		
Subtotal, higher education.....	3,652,488	2,386,521	199,194
Education professions development:			
Personnel training and development.....	314,699	133,287	106,085
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Teacher Corps.....			
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	115,000		
Subtotal, education professions development.....	429,699	133,287	106,085
Libraries and educational communications:			
Public libraries:			
Services.....	286,689	304,109	258,640
Construction (LSCA II).....	75,000	89,520	
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	48,130		
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	409,819	393,729	258,640
Research and development.....	104,198		
Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Total, Office of Education.....	11,855,870	10,757,335	7,436,433



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A):			
Pt. A:				Work-study:			
Basic grants.....				Direct loans (NDEA II):			
State administrative expenses.....				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Talent search.....			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Special services in college.....			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Upward Bound.....			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):			
Grants to States.....				Construction:			
Grants for special projects.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III):			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States.....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I):			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I):			
State administration.....				State administration and planning (HEFA I):			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII):				Language training and area studies:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII):				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI):			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act):			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				University community services (HEA I):			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Emergency school assistance.....				Television equipment.....			
Education for the handicapped:				Other equipment.....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				College personnel development.....			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Subtotal, higher education.....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				Education professions development:			
Research and innovation.....				Personnel training and development.....			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Teacher Corps.....			
Basic vocational education programs:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
State grants.....				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				Libraries and educational communications:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				Public libraries:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				Services.....			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Construction (LSCA II).....			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
Vocational research:				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
Research.....				Research and development.....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Civil rights education (Title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Grants to States.....				Total, Office of Education.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....							
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				Bilingual education (ESEA VII)			
Elementary and secondary education:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....			
Aid to school districts:				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Pt. A:				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
Basic grants.....				Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
State administrative expenses.....				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Emergency school assistance.....			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Education for the handicapped:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Teacher education and recruitment.....			
Grants to States.....				Research and innovation.....			
Grants for special projects.....				Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):							
Grants to States.....							
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....							
State administration.....							
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....							

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued</b>							
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:							
Basic vocational education programs:							
State grants	\$1,947,460	\$2,037,894	\$2,452,032	State administration and planning (HEGA I)	\$59,653	\$58,706	\$34,241
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	107,597	126,621		Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	97,598		
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	94,917	134,544		Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	23,993	31,050		University community services (HEA I)	121,084	121,084	121,084
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	219,649	245,024		Aid to land-grant colleges: Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	172,614	161,935	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	28,354	Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Vocational research:				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	107,005	230,927		Television equipment		5,933	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)				Other equipment		41,531	
Research	15,000	226,433		College personnel development	481,950		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Subtotal, higher education	5,602,772	3,443,914	205,325
Grants to States	164,109	173,091	315,198	Education professions development:			
Special projects and teacher education	190,000			Personnel training and development	867,418	154,944	109,830
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,900,798	3,236,652	2,795,584	Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Higher education:				Teacher Corps	382,477		
Student assistance:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	351,100		
Grants and work-study payments:				Subtotal, education professions development	1,600,995	154,944	109,830
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)							
Work-study	1,100,795	1,361,464	(*)	Libraries and educational communications:			
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,319,269	1,036,676	(*)	Public libraries:			
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):	1,025,496	1,298,931		Services	333,282	360,736	266,402
Talent search	108,695			Construction (LSCA II)	42,328	94,917	
Special services in college	320,856			College library resources (HEA II-A)	61,893		
Upward Bound	100,000			Librarian training (HEA II-B)	24,516		
Institutional assistance:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)	85,205		
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	150,000			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	547,224	455,653	266,402
Construction:				Research and development	1,240,668		
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	628,743		
Grants:				Total, Office of Education	38,610,807	33,640,147	28,166,956
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	132,300	307,654					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	362,462						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>							
Elementary and secondary education:				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Aid to school districts:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				State grants	\$20,730,525	\$21,689,304	\$25,065,549
Pt. A:				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	1,145,363	1,347,641	
Basic grants	\$178,348,472	\$200,981,256	\$201,076,537	Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	1,010,377	1,431,949	
State administrative expenses	1,783,485	2,009,813	2,010,765	Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	339,615	439,501	
Pt. B: Special incentive grants		945,696	945,696	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	476,396	833,339	
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		2,049,980	2,049,980	State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	93,203	93,203	85,061
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	10,035,452	11,192,431	11,131,403	Vocational research:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	3,465,109	6,522,557	6,585,407	Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	198,538	635,037	
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)	88,416		
Grants to States	1,477,979	1,477,979	1,660,694	Research	52,134	2,409,923	
Grants for special projects	49,750			Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants to States	3,299,893	3,748,204	3,722,647
Grants to States	1,928,151	2,657,948		Special projects and teacher education	1,123,674		
Loans to nonprofit private schools	76,400			Subtotal, vocational and adult education	28,558,134	32,628,101	28,873,257
State administration	153,851	154,869		Higher education:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)	400,000			Student assistance:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)	1,494,060			Grants and work-study payments:			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	2,966,463			Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	202,197,172	227,392,529	225,460,482	Work-study	14,807,096	5,493,904	(*)
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Direct loans (NDEA I)	11,523,975	11,297,260	(*)
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	17,030,747	18,121,000	14,206,000	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):	15,023,262	19,643,969	
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	354,029	3,100,000		Talent search	314,901		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	17,384,776	21,221,000	14,206,000	Special services in college	1,902,593		
Emergency school assistance		208,236		Upward Bound	571,000		
Education for the handicapped:				Institutional assistance:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	2,331,331	2,621,564	2,706,577	Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	84,600		
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	289,068			Construction:			
Teacher education and recruitment	2,296,111			Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	340,172		
Research and innovation	3,859,112			Grants:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	8,775,662	2,621,564	2,706,577	Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	2,957,027	2,623,120	
				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	3,866,623		
				State administration and planning (HEFA I)	373,210	256,588	157,020
				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	2,052,201		



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	\$299,828			Subtotal, education professions development.....	\$8,540,981	\$889,739	\$242,595
University community services (HEA I).....	485,753	\$485,753	\$485,753	Libraries and educational communications:			
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Public libraries:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	549,067	360,619		Services.....	2,476,908	2,961,378	713,422
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	Construction (LSCA II).....	405,911	343,229	
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				College library resources (HEA II-A).....	815,863		
Television equipment.....		78,813		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	360,486		
Other equipment.....		551,692		Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....	185,506		
College personnel development.....	6,068,943						
Subtotal, higher education.....	61,270,251	40,841,718	692,773	Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	4,244,674	3,304,607	713,422
Education professions development:				Research and development.....	10,681,800		
Personnel training and development.....	5,734,681	889,739	242,595	Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	304,214		
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:							
Teacher Corps.....	1,529,251			Total, Office of Education.....	341,939,624	329,307,494	272,665,106
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	1,277,049						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$4,293,400	\$1,562,635	(?)
Pl. A:				Work-study.....	5,270,033	5,462,654	(?)
Basic grants.....	\$57,588,036	\$59,592,789	\$59,592,789	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	4,547,013	5,620,177	
State administrative expenses.....	575,880	595,928	595,928	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pl. B: Special incentive grants.....				Talent search.....	72,565		
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		756,205	756,205	Special services in college.....	550,847		
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	3,156,483	3,472,478	3,460,043	Upward Bound.....	390,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	993,278	1,869,699	1,834,155	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	3,344,778		
Grants to States.....	659,015	659,015	720,045	Construction:			
Grants for special projects.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States.....	1,130,562	1,542,773		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	1,301,786	1,368,374	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	884,270		
State administration.....	48,642	48,470		State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	177,684	120,512	\$72,968
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	86,924		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	14,196		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	1,099,346			University community services (HEA I).....	208,836	208,836	208,836
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	65,251,242	68,537,357	66,959,165	Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	258,341	207,180	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	12,001,820	13,117,000	11,819,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	12,001,820	13,117,000	11,819,000	Television equipment.....		24,631	
Emergency school assistance.....		7,690,720		Other equipment.....		172,419	
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development.....	1,586,039		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	805,195	905,436	934,798	Subtotal, higher education.....	23,036,712	14,797,418	331,804
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....	115,000			Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	506,903			Personnel training and development.....	1,971,910	326,380	139,715
Research and innovation.....	50,000			Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,477,098	905,436	934,798	Teacher Corps.....	381,373		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	804,090		
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development.....	3,157,373	326,380	139,715
State grants.....	10,190,085	10,662,796	12,490,939	Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	563,004	662,519		Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	496,651	703,970		Services.....	821,432	952,959	374,32
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	118,212	152,980		Construction (LSCA II).....	195,319	151,463	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	293,941	415,258		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	342,974		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	63,317	63,317	70,833	Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	103,876		
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	249,458	347,860					
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	1,463,601	1,104,422	374,322
Research.....	25,626	1,184,755	1,165,732	Research and development.....	1,698,699		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	620,859		
Grants to States.....	1,677,851	1,898,912					
Special projects and teacher education.....	395,000			Total, Office of Education.....	122,780,549	122,571,100	94,286,308
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	14,073,145	16,092,367	13,727,504				

Footnotes at end of table.

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A).....			
Basic grants.....				\$890,600			
State administrative expenses.....				Work-study.....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				780,361			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Direct loans (NDEA II).....			
703,528				943,419			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Special programs for disadvantaged students			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				(HEA, sec. 408):			
272,292				Talent search.....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				40,000			
Grants to States.....				Special services in college.....			
Grants for special projects.....				172,381			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Upward Bound.....			
Grants to States.....				15,000			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Institutional assistance:			
13,333				Strengthening developing institutions			
State administration.....				(HEA III).....			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				353,700			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Construction:			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
184,500				Grants:			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....			
6,309,594				46,800			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				265,145			
3,566,458				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				87,276			
74,367				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
3,640,825				113,236			
Emergency school assistance.....				University community services (HEA I).....			
Education for the handicapped:				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
109,151				165,039			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				50,000			
Research and innovation.....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
30,478				Television equipment.....			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				4,702			
304,308				Other equipment.....			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				262,300			
Basic vocational education programs:				College personnel development.....			
State grants.....				4,185,257			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				Subtotal, higher education.....			
66,697				2,748,354			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				Education professions development:			
58,837				Personnel training and development.....			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				468,571			
14,630				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Teacher Corps.....			
211,977				115,500			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
31,068				178,396			
Vocational research:				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				762,467			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Libraries and educational communications:			
15,000				Public libraries:			
Research.....				Services.....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				290,145			
Grants to States.....				Construction (LSCA II).....			
177,469				89,920			
Special projects and teacher education.....				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....				51,437			
1,989,173				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Total, Office of Education.....				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
17,558,755				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
				341,582			
				Research and development.....			
				25,549			
				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
				Total, Office of Education.....			
				17,558,755			

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....			
Aid to school districts:				1,201,890			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
Pt. A:				54,139,032			
Basic grants.....				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
\$40,363,720				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
State administrative expenses.....				39,595			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				10,570,372			
6,339,620				Emergency school assistance:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Education for the handicapped:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....			
2,234,209				1,519,923			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
Grants to States.....				25,000			
Grants for special projects.....				Teacher education and recruitment.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				988,067			
Grants to States.....				Research and innovation.....			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				119,467			
State administration.....				Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....			
101,499				2,652,457			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				1,709,142			
436,075				1,764,567			



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:</b>				<b>State administration and planning (HEFA I).....</b>			
<b>Basic vocational education programs:</b>				<b>Language training and area studies:</b>			
State grants.....	\$15,503,686	\$16,221,852	\$19,484,174	Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	509,013		
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	856,581	1,007,925		Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	34,485		
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	755,628	1,070,983		University community services (HEA I).....	325,054	325,054	325,054
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	222,768	288,289		Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	382,829	618,938		Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	380,809	271,816	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	93,203	93,203	85,062	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
<b>Vocational research:</b>				<b>Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):</b>			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	165,180	487,767		Television equipment.....		45,880	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	29,959			Other equipment.....		321,162	
Research.....	38,989	1,802,429		College personnel development.....	2,173,946		
<b>Adult education (Adult Education Act):</b>				<b>Subtotal, higher education.....</b>			
Grants to States.....	1,351,381	1,526,703	2,070,825		32,653,978	24,703,522	473,424
Special projects and teacher education.....	95,000			<b>Education professions development:</b>			
<b>Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....</b>				<b>Personnel training and development.....</b>			
	19,495,204	23,118,099	21,604,061	Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:	3,544,765	609,202	191,182
<b>Higher education:</b>				Teacher Corps.....	624,206		
<b>Student assistance:</b>				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	990,070		
Grants and work-study payments:				<b>Subtotal, education professions development.....</b>			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	7,617,048	13,079,326	(?)		5,159,041	609,202	191,182
Work-study.....	5,571,175	7,000,938	(?)	<b>Libraries and educational communications:</b>			
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	9,315,873	11,245,324		<b>Public libraries:</b>			
<b>Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):</b>				Services.....	1,518,798	1,799,001	516,951
Talent search.....	124,112			Construction (LSCA II).....	187,033	232,244	
Special services in college.....	1,339,374			College library resources (HEA II-A).....	428,345		
Upward Bound.....	457,000			Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	208,527		
<b>Institutional assistance:</b>				<b>Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....</b>			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	754,032				177,379		
<b>Construction:</b>				<b>Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....</b>			
Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	191,867				2,520,082	2,031,245	516,951
<b>Grants:</b>				<b>Research and development.....</b>			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	2,219,197	2,208,535			2,154,310		
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	1,401,955			<b>Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....</b>			
					168,306		
				<b>Total, Office of Education.....</b>			
					129,212,782	122,259,970	83,327,697

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:</b>			
<b>Elementary and secondary education:</b>				<b>Basic vocational education programs:</b>			
<b>Aid to school districts:</b>				<b>State grants.....</b>			
<b>Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):</b>				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	\$4,541,401	\$4,751,840	\$5,617,020
<b>Pt. A:</b>				Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	250,912	295,249	
Basic grants.....	\$18,736,899	\$19,485,325	\$19,485,326	Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	221,341	313,722	
State administrative expenses.....	187,369	194,853	194,853	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	52,864	68,412	
<b>Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....</b>				State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	242,666	297,767	
<b>Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....</b>					31,068	31,068	41,853
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	1,666,414	1,804,001	1,805,272	<b>Vocational research:</b>			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	507,271	954,862	956,738	Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	115,211	267,155	
<b>Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):</b>				Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	29,735		
Grants to States.....	440,485	440,485	488,416	Research.....	15,000	527,982	
Grants for special projects.....				<b>Adult education (Adult Education Act):</b>			
<b>Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):</b>				Grants to States.....	531,447	591,894	628,610
Grants to States.....	466,563	640,709		Special projects and teacher education.....			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				<b>Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....</b>			
State administration.....	22,483	22,546			6,031,645	7,145,089	6,277,483
<b>Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....	188,701			<b>Student assistance:</b>			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	703,433			Grants and work-study payments:			
<b>Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....</b>				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	2,505,600	1,994,003	(?)
	22,919,618	23,782,361	23,170,184	Work-study.....	2,570,138	2,394,519	(?)
<b>School assistance in federally affected areas:</b>				Direct loans (NDEA II).....	3,275,618	3,712,844	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	11,591,736	12,298,000	9,352,000	<b>Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):</b>			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Talent search.....	68,162		
<b>Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....</b>				Special services in college.....	651,364		
	11,519,736	12,298,000	9,352,000	Upward Bound.....	170,000		
<b>Emergency school assistance.....</b>				<b>Institutional assistance:</b>			
		296,486		Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	989,145		
<b>Education for the handicapped:</b>				Construction.....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	366,917	412,596	425,976	Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	29,482		
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				<b>Grants:</b>			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	355,085			Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	677,728	652,830	
Research and innovation.....	65,809			Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	357,431		
<b>Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....</b>				<b>State administration and planning (HEFA I).....</b>			
	787,811	412,596	425,976		86,359	81,125	48,203
				<b>Language training and area studies:</b>			
				<b>Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....</b>			
				<b>Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....</b>			
					39,000		

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	\$30,000		
Higher education—Continued				Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,560,264	\$215,613	\$102,716
Institutional assistance—Continued				Libraries and educational communications:			
University community services (HEA I).....	\$153,920	\$153,920	\$153,920	Public libraries:			
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Services.....	519,768	586,981	306,787
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	205,364	179,220	50,000	Construction (LSCA II).....	122,604	116,519	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	105,542		
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Television equipment.....		16,311		Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Other equipment.....		114,174		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	747,914	703,500	306,787
College personnel development.....	621,800			Research and development.....	35,742		
Subtotal, higher education.....	12,451,111	8,348,946	252,123	Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	709,098		
Education professions development:				Total, Office of Education.....	56,762,939	53,202,591	39,905,269
Personnel training and development.....	1,119,354	215,613	120,716				
Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:							
Teacher Corps.....	410,910						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$2,235,100	\$898,730	(?)
Pl. A:				Work-study.....	2,777,747	1,618,077	(?)
Basic grants.....	\$8,256,688	\$10,432,750	\$10,432,750	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	2,531,864	3,261,421	
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pl. B: Special incentive grants.....		265,434	265,434	Talent search.....	59,000		
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		32,688	32,688	Special services in college.....	343,739		
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	1,406,486	1,508,393	1,521,491	Upward Bound.....	175,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	426,653	803,112	776,894	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	129,000		
Grants to States.....	398,278	398,278	434,490	Construction:			
Grants for special projects.....	34,573			Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States.....	338,665	459,537		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	512,143	502,615	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	345,766		
State administration.....	18,340	18,172		State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	81,283	82,334	\$49,285
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	69,605		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....	90,000			Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	27,760		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	882,200			University community services (HEA I).....	142,508	142,508	142,508
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	12,001,883	14,068,364	13,613,747	Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	192,058	172,197	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	3,341,829	3,566,000	2,741,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	3,341,829	3,566,000	2,741,000	Television equipment.....		13,526	
Emergency school assistance.....				Other equipment.....		94,680	
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development.....	947,500		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	279,058	313,799	323,975	Subtotal, higher education.....	10,620,073	6,836,088	241,793
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	804,338			Personnel training and development.....	1,946,116	197,239	116,822
Research and innovation.....	881,657			Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	1,965,053	313,799	323,975	Teacher Corps.....	382,992		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	133,996		
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development.....	2,463,104	197,239	116,822
State grants.....	3,138,872	3,284,314	4,004,976	Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	173,422	204,067		Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	152,985	216,834		Services.....	433,022	495,055	293,402
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	42,525	55,032		Construction (LSCA II).....	120,000	107,742	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	234,994	280,186		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	139,754		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354	Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	39,015		
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....	16,842		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	218,424	255,079		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	748,633	602,797	293,402
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....	167,074			Research and development.....	3,995,669		
Research.....	15,000	364,924		Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	163,349		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education.....	39,790,890	30,537,612	21,832,369
Grants to States.....	241,935	261,821	468,300				
Special projects and teacher education.....	274,998						
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	4,691,297	4,953,325	4,501,630				



APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued  
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A).....			
Basic grants.....				Work-study.....			
State administrative expenses.....				Direct loans (NDEA II).....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Special programs for disadvantaged students			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				(HEA, sec. 408):			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Talent search.....			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				Special services in college.....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Upward Bound.....			
Grants to States.....				Institutional assistance:			
Grants for special projects.....				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Construction:			
Grants to States.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Grants:			
State administration.....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				Language training and area studies:			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				University community services (HEA I).....			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
Emergency school assistance.....				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....			
Education for the handicapped:				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				Television equipment.....			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Other equipment.....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				College personnel development.....			
Research and innovation.....				Subtotal, higher education.....			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				Education professions development:			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Personnel training and development.....			
Basic vocational education programs:				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
State grants.....				Teacher Corps.....			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				Libraries and educational communications:			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Public libraries:			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				Services.....			
Vocational research:				Construction (LSCA II).....			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Research.....				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
Grants to States.....				Research and development.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....				Total, Office of Education.....			

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....			
Elementary and secondary education:				Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....			
Aid to school districts:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
Pt. A:				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Basic grants.....				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
State administrative expenses.....				Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Emergency school assistance.....			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Education for the handicapped:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
Grants to States.....				Teacher education and recruitment.....			
Grants for special projects.....				Research and innovation.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....			
Grants to States.....							
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....							
State administration.....							

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	\$73,658	\$59,750	\$34,624
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....	80,912		
Basic vocational education programs:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....	11,000		
State grants.....	\$1,294,166	\$1,354,098	\$1,550,573	University community services (HEA I).....	119,260	119,260	119,260
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	71,503	84,135		Aid to land-grant colleges: Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	170,438	160,787	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	63,076	89,399		Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	18,141	23,477		Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	214,409	233,018		Television equipment.....		5,387	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354	Other equipment.....		37,708	
Vocational research:				College personnel development.....	557,289		
Innovation (VEA, p. D).....	105,137	222,680		Subtotal, higher education.....	4,338,429	2,875,488	203,884
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Education professions development:			
Research.....	15,000	150,455		Personnel training and development.....	337,940	140,984	107,449
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Grants to States.....	244,389	264,619	345,876	Teacher Corps.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	110,018		
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	2,056,889	2,452,949	1,924,803	Subtotal, education professions development.....	447,958	140,984	107,449
Higher education:				Libraries and educational communications:			
Student assistance:				Public libraries:			
Grants and work-study payments:				Services.....	320,887	345,699	263,670
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	893,300	1,352,922	(?)	Construction (LSCA II).....	90,693	93,481	
Work-study.....	583,283	658,598	(?)	College library resources (HEA II-A).....	69,728		
Direct loans (NDEA II).....	1,088,038	1,241,470		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Talent search.....	34,900			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	481,308	439,180	263,670
Special services in college.....	84,975			Research and development.....	135,400		
Upward Bound.....	60,000			Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	59,950		
Institutional assistance:				Total, Office of Education.....	17,851,614	16,828,295	12,576,252
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....							
Construction:							
Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	213,061						
Grants:							
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	180,445	189,606					
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	137,870						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Aid to school districts:				State grants.....	\$5,581,203	\$5,840,401	\$6,849,938
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	308,362	362,886	
PL A:				Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	272,021	385,590	
Basic grants.....	\$34,304,985	\$35,786,808	\$35,786,808	Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	66,128	85,578	
State administrative expenses.....	343,050	357,868	357,868	Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	252,397	320,064	
PL B—Special incentive grants.....				State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	34,679	34,679	38,844
PL C—Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		531,281	531,281	Vocational research:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	1,837,849	1,971,261	1,972,981	Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	227,586	282,471	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	542,285	1,020,771	1,008,460	Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....			
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				Research.....	15,000	648,933	
Grants to States.....	456,998	456,998	502,885	Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants for special projects.....				Grants to States.....	1,056,859	1,190,918	678,703
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Special projects and teacher education.....	170,000		
Grants to States.....	658,416	894,682		Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	7,984,235	9,151,520	7,567,485
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	26,879	26,671		Higher education:			
State administration.....				Student assistance:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Grants and work-study payments:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	1,578,400	1,634,131	(?)
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	1,314,388			Work-study.....	1,797,651	2,994,499	(?)
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	39,484,850	41,046,340	40,160,283	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	1,817,735	2,175,711	
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	8,634,413	8,916,000	7,454,000	Talent search.....	43,860		
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			1,000,000	Special services in college.....	262,926		
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	8,634,413	8,916,000	8,454,000	Upward Bound.....	245,000		
Emergency school assistance.....		5,439,667		Institutional assistance:			
Education for the handicapped:				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	1,227,613		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	448,822	504,698	521,064	Construction:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....	22,183		
Teacher education and recruitment.....	151,663			Grants:			
Research and innovation.....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....	750,494	758,609	
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	600,485	504,698	521,064	Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	294,365		
				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	64,594	78,163	46,079



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	\$788,832		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....				Subtotal, education professions development.....	1,522,912	\$223,593	\$121,836
University community services (HEA I).....	\$156,614	\$156,614	\$156,614	Libraries and educational communications:			
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Public libraries:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	206,656	179,902	50,000	Services.....	527,122	595,903	310,032
Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	Construction (LSCA II).....	103,226	117,371	
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				College library resources (HEA II-A).....	149,863		
Television equipment.....		9,791		Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	29,052		
Other equipment.....		68,539		Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....			
College personnel development.....	414,400			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	809,263	713,274	310,032
Subtotal, higher education.....	8,932,491	7,105,959	252,690	Research and development.....	245,240		
Education professions development:				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....	858,351		
Personnel training and development.....	542,719	223,593	121,836	Total, Office of Education.....	69,072,240	73,101,051	57,387,390
Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:							
Teacher Corps.....	191,361						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	\$940,400	\$298,163	(?)
Pl. A:				Work-study.....	777,246	804,128	(?)
Basic grants.....	\$6,138,638	\$6,484,106	\$6,484,106	Direct loans (NDEA II).....	922,164	1,093,570	
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pl. B: Special incentive grants.....		107,563	107,563	Talent search.....	59,000		
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....		64,882	64,882	Special services in college.....	160,626		
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	720,828	742,638	751,248	Upward Bound.....	75,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	150,552	283,393	279,069	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III).....	100,000		
Grants to States.....	279,034	279,034	308,322	Construction:			
Grants for special projects.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III).....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States.....	151,605	206,010		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....		219,374	
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....	352,469		
State administration.....	13,333	13,333		State administration and planning (HEFA I).....	59,166	58,641	\$33,607
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	220,000			Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....	652,856			University community services (HEA I).....	114,106	114,106	114,106
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	8,476,846	8,340,959	8,145,190	Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....	166,182	158,540	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	3,899,252	4,410,000	4,198,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	77,035			Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....	3,976,287	4,410,000	4,198,000	Television equipment.....		4,684	
Emergency school assistance.....				Other equipment.....		32,790	
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development.....	223,532		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....	113,577	200,000	200,000	Subtotal, higher education.....	3,999,891	2,833,996	197,713
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment.....	139,212			Personnel training and development.....	364,176	134,313	106,043
Research and innovation.....				Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	252,789	200,000	200,000	Teacher Corps.....	85,559		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....	126,215		
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development.....	575,950	134,313	106,043
State grants.....	1,228,372	1,285,372	1,508,620	Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....	67,867	79,865		Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....	59,870	84,862		Services.....	296,653	316,298	257,344
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....	15,215	19,690		Construction (LSCA II).....	362	90,674	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....	212,538	228,730		College library resources (HEA II-A).....	57,410		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....	31,068	31,068	28,354	Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	17,294		
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III).....	324,219		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....	104,470	219,734		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....	695,938	406,972	257,344
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Research and development.....	13,612		
Research.....	15,000	142,819		Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education.....	19,890,992	18,592,804	14,920,698
Grants to States.....	165,279	174,424	279,434				
Special projects and teacher education.....							
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion.....	1,899,679	2,266,564	1,816,408				

Footnotes at end of table.

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A).....			
Basic grants.....				\$3,628,700			
State administrative expenses.....				\$1,196,620			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				3,687,842			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				3,923,537			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				4,407,664			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				147,000			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				731,199			
Grants to States.....				196,000			
Grants for special projects.....				1,497,165			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Construction:			
Grants to States.....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III):			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Grants:			
State administration.....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				University community services (HEA I).....			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				Permanent (second Morrill Act).....			
Emergency school assistance.....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Education for the handicapped:				Television equipment.....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				Other equipment.....			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				College personnel development.....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				Subtotal, higher education.....			
Research and innovation.....				Education professions development:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				Personnel training and development.....			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Basic vocational education programs:				Teacher Corps.....			
State grants.....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				Libraries and educational communications:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				Public libraries:			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Services.....			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				Construction (LSCA II).....			
Vocational research:				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
Research.....				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Research and development.....			
Grants to States.....				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
Special projects and teacher education.....				Total, Office of Education.....			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				<b>Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....</b>			
Aid to school districts:				<b>Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....</b>			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
Pt. A:				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Basic grants.....				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
State administrative expenses.....				Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Emergency school assistance.....			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				Education for the handicapped:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....			
Grants to States.....				Teacher education and recruitment.....			
Grants for special projects.....				Research and innovation.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....			
Grants to States.....							
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....							
State administration.....							



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				State administration and planning (HEFA I)			
Basic vocational education programs:				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)			
State grants	\$19,648,794	\$20,559,899	\$24,509,736	Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	1,085,598	1,277,466		University community services (HEA I).			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	957,654	1,357,386		Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	240,910	311,766		Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	394,806	646,382		Permanent (Second Morrill Act)			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	93,203	93,203	85,061	Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Vocational research:				Television equipment			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	169,450	506,617		Other equipment			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)	21,161			College personnel development			
Research	49,414	2,284,433		Subtotal, higher education			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Education professions development:			
Grants to States	2,823,537	3,205,110	2,091,353	Personnel training and development			
Special projects and teacher education	385,000			Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion	25,869,527	30,242,262	26,686,150	Teacher Corps			
Higher education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs			
Student assistance:				Subtotal, education professions development			
Grants and work-study payments:				Libraries and educational communications:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)				Public libraries:			
Work-study				Services			
Direct loans (NDEA II)				Construction (LSCA II)			
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				College library resources (HEA II-A)			
Talent search				Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
Special services in college				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III)			
Upward Bound				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications			
Institutional assistance:				Research and development			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Construction:				Total, Office of Education			
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)							
Grants:							
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)							
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF UTAH

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Basic vocational education programs:			
Aid to school districts:				State grants			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)			
Pt. A:				Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)			
Basic grants				Work-study (VEA, pt. H)			
State administrative expenses				Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				Vocational research:			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				Innovation (VEA, pt. D)			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)				Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)			
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				Research			
Grants to States				Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants for special projects				Grants to States			
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Special projects and teacher education			
Grants to States				Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion			
Loans to nonprofit private schools							
State administration				Higher education			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Student assistance:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)				Grants and work-study payments:			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education				Work-study			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Direct loans (NDEA II)			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, Sec. 408):			
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Talent search			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas				Special services in college			
Emergency school assistance				Upward Bound			
Education for the handicapped:				Institutional assistance:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)				Construction:			
Teacher education and recruitment				Subsidized loans (HEFA III)			
Research and innovation				Grants:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)			
				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)			
				State administration and planning (HEFA I)			

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Higher education—Continued				Teacher Corps			
Institutional assistance—Continued				Career opportunities and urban/rural programs	\$114,715		
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	\$81,735			Subtotal, education professions development	579,731	\$157,143	\$110,146
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	56,275			Libraries and educational communications:			
University community services (HEA I)	121,869	\$121,869	\$121,869	Public libraries:			
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Services	325,104	350,814	267,146
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	171,178	161,177		Construction (LSCA II)	97,470	93,969	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	College library resources (HEA II-A)	70,634		
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				Librarian training (HEA II-B)	24,425		
Television equipment		10,851		Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)			
Other equipment		75,961		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	517,633	444,783	267,146
College personnel development	689,000			Research and development	367,595		
Subtotal, higher education	6,218,001	4,996,468	214,748	Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Education professions development:				Total, Office of Education	24,560,518	22,705,958	14,687,114
Personnel training and development	465,016	157,143	110,146				

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VERMONT

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	\$551,000	\$210,815	(9)
Pl. A:				Work-study	452,381	414,601	(9)
Basic grants	\$2,018,201	\$2,103,845	\$2,103,845	Direct loans (NDEA II)	608,630	745,324	
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pl. B: Special incentive grants		58,099	58,099	Talent search	19,050		
Pl. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		415	415	Special services in college	19,997		
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	593,728	600,498	602,767	Upward Bound	15,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	94,392	177,680	175,899	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	50,000		
Grants to States	254,064	254,064	281,355	Construction:			
Grants for special projects				Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	90,428		
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States	82,130	114,034		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)		112,256	
Loans to nonprofit private schools				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	210,097		
State administration	13,333	13,333		State administration and planning (HEFA I)	25,818	56,486	\$32,025
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Language training and area studies:			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)	60,403			Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	39,737		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	334,000			Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	20,675		
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	3,600,251	3,471,968	3,372,380	University community services (HEA I)	109,100	109,100	109,100
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	144,000	133,000	85,000	Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	159,271	154,893	
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	144,000	133,000	85,000	Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Emergency school assistance				Television equipment		2,983	
Education for the handicapped:				Other equipment		20,882	
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	100,000	200,000	200,000	College personnel development	121,900		
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	87,500			Subtotal, higher education	2,543,184	1,877,340	191,125
Teacher education and recruitment	114,660			Education professions development:			
Research and innovation	12,500			Personnel training and development	274,525	121,513	103,809
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	314,660	200,000	200,000	Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Teacher Corps	61,196		
Basic vocational education programs:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	40,000		
State grants	713,373	751,664	880,788	Subtotal, education professions development	375,721	121,513	103,809
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	39,691	46,704		Libraries and educational communications:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	35,012	49,626		Public libraries:			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	8,973	11,612		Services	257,300	268,555	251,321
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	207,298	216,723		Construction (LSCA II)	96,436	86,115	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	28,354	College library resources (HEA II-A)	51,932		
Vocational research:				Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	102,602	211,487		Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	405,668	354,670	251,321
Research	15,000	83,518		Research and development			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Grants to States	135,709	140,712	225,840	Total, Office of Education	8,672,210	7,701,605	5,338,617
Special projects and teacher education							
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	1,288,726	1,543,114	1,134,982				



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)			
Pt. A:				Work-study			
Basic grants				Direct loans (NEDA II)			
State administrative expenses				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				Talent search			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				Special services in college			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				Upward Bound			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)				Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)			
Grants to States				Construction:			
Grants for special projects				Subsidized loans (HEFA III)			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)			
Loans to nonprofit private schools				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)			
State administration				State administration and planning (HEFA I)			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)			
Follow through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))				University community services (HEA I)			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)				Permanent (Second Morrill Act)			
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas				Television equipment			
Emergency school assistance				Other equipment			
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)				Subtotal, higher education			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 625)				Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment				Personnel training and development			
Research and innovation				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped				Teacher Corps			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs			
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development			
State grants				Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)				Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)				Services			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)				Construction (LSCA II)			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)				College library resources (HEA II-A)			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)				Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)				Research and development			
Research				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Total, Office of Education			
Grants to States							
Special projects and teacher education							
Subtotal, vocational and adult education							

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)			
Elementary and secondary education:				Bilingual education (ESEA VII)			
Aid to school districts:				Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education			
Pt. A:				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Basic grants				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)			
State administrative expenses				Construction (Public Law 81-815)			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools				Emergency school assistance			
Supplementary services (ESEA III)				Education for the handicapped:			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)				State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 625)			
Grants to States				Teacher education and recruitment			
Grants for special projects				Research and innovation			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Subtotal, education for the handicapped			
Grants to States							
Loans to nonprofit private schools							
State administrative							

Footnotes at end of table.

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued</b>			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:			
Basic vocational education programs:			
State grants	\$4,779,695	\$5,001,295	\$6,174,641
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	264,079	310,748	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	232,956	330,191	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	72,370	93,656	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	258,011	332,928	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	35,015
Vocational research:			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	120,681	291,308	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)			
Research	15,000	555,699	
Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	333,131	365,793	632,732
Special projects and teacher education			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	6,106,991	7,312,686	6,842,388
Higher education:			
Student assistance:			
Grants and work-study payments:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	2,984,000	1,321,286	(?)
Work-study	2,584,301	2,460,216	(?)
Direct loans (NEDA II)	3,995,625	4,805,737	
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Talent search	110,000		
Special services in college	396,443		
Upward Bound	186,000		
Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	180,000		
Construction:			
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)			
Grants:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	719,018	709,565	
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	534,104		

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
State administration and planning (HEFA I)	\$95,494	\$94,766	\$58,092
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	492,917		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	91,264		
University community services (HEA I)	169,913	169,913	169,913
Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	217,847	185,808	
Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Television equipment		19,539	
Other equipment		136,773	
College personnel development	1,250,900		
Subtotal, higher education	14,021,826	9,953,603	278,005
Education professions development:			
Personnel training and development	1,185,599	259,877	128,788
Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Teacher Corps	738,277		
Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	230,866		
Subtotal, education professions development	2,154,742	259,877	128,788
Libraries and educational communications:			
Public libraries:			
Services	590,847	673,214	327,367
Construction (LSCA II)	54,296	124,752	
College library resources (HEA II-A)	177,248		
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	108,264		
Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)	32,969		
Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	963,624	797,966	327,367
Research and development:	317,356		
Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	87,459		
Total, Office of Education	56,797,818	53,519,268	39,186,010

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:			
Aid to school districts:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):			
Pt. A:			
Basic grants	\$19,517,670	\$21,101,305	\$21,101,305
State administrative expenses	195,177	211,013	211,013
Pt. B: Special incentive grants		60,538	60,538
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		278,998	278,998
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	1,313,050	1,399,228	1,376,322
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	345,700	650,730	630,804
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):			
Grants to States	368,640	368,640	403,150
Grants for special projects	29,000		
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):			
Grants to States	389,684	524,424	
Loans to nonprofit private schools			
State administration	16,718	16,429	
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	775,100		
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	22,950,739	24,611,305	24,062,130
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	577,833	531,000	336,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	577,833	531,000	336,000
Emergency school assistance		9,115	
Education for the handicapped:			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	314,074	353,174	364,627
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 625)			
Teacher education and recruitment	222,797		
Research and innovation			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	536,871	353,174	364,627

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Vocational and adult education Grants to States for vocational education:			
Basic vocational education programs:			
State grants	\$3,544,340	\$3,708,689	\$4,251,337
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	195,824	230,436	
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	172,745	244,851	
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	41,745	54,023	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	234,245	278,471	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	28,354
Vocational research:			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	112,209	253,901	
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)			
Research	15,000	412,077	
Adult education (Adult Education Act):			
Grants to States	550,582	613,710	582,735
Special projects and teacher education			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	4,897,758	5,827,226	4,862,426
Higher education:			
Student assistance:			
Grants and work-study payments:			
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,533,800	1,576,497	(?)
Work-study	1,938,919	1,992,155	(?)
Direct loans (NEDA II)	1,820,335	2,228,836	
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Talent search	57,870		
Special services in college	661,032		
Upward Bound	155,000		
Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	577,162		
Construction:			
Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	61,736		
Grants:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	96,676	608,986	
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	764,430		
State administration and planning (HEFA I)	64,279	65,642	37,839



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	\$319,250		
Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	\$41,494			Subtotal, education professions development	1,150,176	\$178,789	\$113,659
University community services (HEA I)	138,584	\$138,584	\$138,584	Libraries and educational communications:			
Aid to land-grant colleges:				Public libraries:			
Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	194,239	173,348		Services	456,418	510,124	287,139
Permanent (second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	Construction (LSCA II)	95,217	10,981	
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):				College library resources (HEA II-A)	93,775		
Television equipment		10,011		Librarian training (HEA II-B)			
Other equipment		70,079		Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III)			
College personnel development	121,900			Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	645,410	521,105	287,139
Subtotal, higher education	8,277,456	5,914,138	226,423	Research and development	1,133,893		
Education professions development:				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	63,500		
Personnel training and development	506,395	178,789	113,659	Total, Office of Education	40,233,636	37,945,852	30,252,404
Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:							
Teacher Corps	324,531						

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				Higher education:			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	\$4,619,000	\$1,725,664	(2)
Pt. A:				Work-study	3,127,576	3,346,154	(2)
Basic grants	\$17,432,234	\$17,919,429	\$17,919,429	Direct loans (NDEA II)	4,807,500	6,037,358	
State administrative expenses	174,322	179,194	179,194	Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants		310,421	310,421	Talent search	71,000		
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools		70,120	70,120	Special services in college	329,201		
Supplementary services (ESEA III)	2,674,997	2,918,623	2,908,343	Upward Bound	150,000		
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	982,463	1,849,342	1,861,488	Institutional assistance:			
Strengthening State departments of educa- tion (ESEA V):				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	178,400		
Grants to States	569,933	569,933	636,994	Construction:			
Grants for special projects	126,931			Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	77,385		
Acquisition of equipment and minor re- modeling (NDEA III):				Grants:			
Grants to States	781,646	1,062,970		Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)	1,075,884	1,032,197	
Loans to nonprofit private schools	40,967	40,682		Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	673,709		
State administration				State administration and planning (HEFA I)	143,157	113,409	\$70,216
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)	203,470			Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	664,246		
Bilingual education (ESEA VII)				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	55,762		
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2))	832,032			University community services (HEA I)	189,322	189,322	189,322
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	23,818,995	24,920,714	23,885,989	Aid to land-grant colleges:			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	243,969	199,595	
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874)	2,214,087	2,272,000	1,667,000	Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas	2,214,087	2,272,000	1,667,000	Television equipment		24,623	
Emergency school assistance				Other equipment	996,512	172,363	
Education for the handicapped:				College personnel development			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	625,438	703,300	726,107	Subtotal, higher education	17,452,623	12,890,685	309,538
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	152,680			Education professions development:			
Teacher education and recruitment	848,040			Personnel training and development	1,583,426	323,915	140,307
Research and innovation	307,046			Special programs serving schools in low- income areas:			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,933,204	703,300	726,107	Teacher Corps	282,458		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	347,667		
Basic vocational education programs:				Subtotal, education professions development	2,213,551	323,915	140,307
State grants	6,327,757	6,621,049	7,916,388	Libraries and educational communications:			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	349,608	411,391		Public libraries:			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	308,406	437,129		Services	739,596	853,676	350,191
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	88,951	115,113		Construction (LSCA II)		141,983	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	273,356	368,090		College library resources (HEA II-A)	250,326		
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	39,318	39,318	44,892	Librarian training (HEA II-B)	178,619		
Vocational research:				Educational broadcasting facilities (Com- munication Act of 1934, title III)	56,597		
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	126,152	315,460		Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	1,225,138	995,659	350,191
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)	15,913	735,672		Research and development	2,069,893		
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)			
Grants to States	600,765	670,924	919,143	Total, Office of Education	59,540,717	51,820,419	35,959,555
Special projects and teacher education	483,000						
Subtotal, vocational and adult educa- tion	8,613,226	9,714,146	8,880,423				

Footnotes at end of table.

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF WYOMING

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Higher education:</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Student assistance:			
Aid to school districts:				Grants and work-study payments:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Educational opportunity grants			
Pt. A:				(HEA IV-A).....			
Basic grants.....				\$398,700			
State administrative expenses.....				\$125,141			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				504,302			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				409,857			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				283,758			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				478,437			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):			
Grants to States.....				Talent search.....			
Grants for special projects.....				Special services in college.....			
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):				Upward Bound.....			
Grants to States.....				Institutional assistance:			
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....				Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III):			
State administrative.....				Construction:			
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....				Subsidized loans (HEFA III):			
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....				Grants:			
Follow Through (Economic Opportunity Act, sec. 222(a)(2)).....				Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I).....			
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....				Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I).....			
2,827,862				149,403			
School assistance in federally affected areas:				State administration and planning (HEFA I).....			
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....				51,493			
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....				Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI).....			
Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act).....			
1,885,899				University community services (HEA I).....			
Emergency school assistance.....				Aid to land-grant colleges:			
Education for the handicapped:				Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act).....			
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B).....				157,849			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623).....				Permanent (Second Morrill Act).....			
Teacher education and recruitment.....				50,000			
Research and innovation.....				Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....				Television equipment.....			
196,676				2,022			
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Other equipment.....			
Basic vocational education programs:				183,600			
State grants.....				College personnel development.....			
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B).....				2,100,312			
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F).....				1,353,413			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H).....				185,816			
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G).....				Education professions development:			
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B).....				Personnel training and development.....			
Vocational research:				295,672			
Innovation (VEA, pt. D).....				Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I).....				Teacher Corps.....			
Research.....				Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs.....			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				63,980			
Grants to States.....				Subtotal, education professions development.....			
Special projects and teacher education.....				359,652			
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....				116,701			
1,090,758				102,965			
				Libraries and educational communications:			
				Public libraries:			
				Services.....			
				249,201			
				Construction (LSCA II).....			
				86,474			
				College library resources (HEA II-A).....			
				26,723			
				Librarian training (HEA II-B).....			
				Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III).....			
				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications.....			
				362,398			
				343,906			
				248,549			
				Research and development.....			
				Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964).....			
				Total, Office of Education.....			
				8,823,557			
				8,324,933			
				6,430,953			

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>				<b>Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):</b>			
Elementary and secondary education:				Grants to States.....			
Aid to school districts:				\$83,393			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):				Loans to nonprofit private schools.....			
Pt. A:				13,333			
Basic grants.....				Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....			
State administrative expenses.....				Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....			
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....				405,500			
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....				Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....			
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....				7,931,462			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....				9,060,585			
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):				\$9,046,058			
Grants to States.....				School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Grants for special projects.....				Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....			
				5,506,724			
				Construction (Public Law 81-815).....			
				Subtotal, school assistance in federally affected areas.....			
				5,506,724			
				5,345,000			
				3,399,000			



## APPENDIX IV.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1972 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued

## OBLIGATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Continued

	Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request		Fiscal year 1970 actual	Fiscal year 1971 appropriation	Fiscal year 1972 budget request
Emergency school assistance				Construction:			
Education for the handicapped:				Subsidized loans (HEFA III)	\$48,138		
State grant programs (EHA, pt. B)	\$100,397	\$200,000	\$200,000	Grants:			
Early childhood projects (EHA, pt. C, sec. 623)	100,000			Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I)		\$74,111	
Teacher education and recruitment	1,065,715			Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I)	230,786		
Research and innovation	3,800,929			State administration and planning (HEFA I)	88,629	67,385	\$39,628
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	5,067,041	200,000	200,000	Language training and area studies: Centers, fellowships, and research (NDEA VI)	447,264		
Vocational and adult education: Grants to States for vocational education:				Training grants (Fulbright-Hays Act)	64,891		
Basic vocational education programs:				University community services (HEA I)	117,012	117,012	117,012
State grants	826,189	864,342	1,004,495	Aid to land-grant colleges: Annual (Bankhead-Jones Act)	168,166	159,588	
Programs for students with special needs (VEA, pt. B)	45,648	53,705		Permanent (Second Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, pt. F)	40,267	57,065		Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI):			
Work-study (VEA, pt. H)	13,655	17,671		Television equipment		7,067	
Cooperative education (VEA, pt. G)	211,041	225,299		Other equipment		49,469	
State advisory councils (VEA, pt. B)	31,068	31,068	28,354	College personnel development	1,037,280		
Vocational research:				Subtotal, higher education	6,676,945	3,529,286	206,640
Innovation (VEA, pt. D)	205,813	217,378		Education professions development:			
Curriculum development (VEA, pt. I)	29,838			Personnel training and development	1,004,026	131,765	105,610
Research	15,000	96,038		Special programs serving schools in low-income areas:			
Adult education (Adult Education Act):				Teacher Corps	613,833		
Grants to States	231,310	249,708	298,339	Career opportunities and urban/rural school programs	429,829		
Special projects and teacher education	460,000			Subtotal, education professions development	2,047,688	131,765	105,610
Subtotal, vocational and adult education	2,109,829	1,812,274	1,331,188	Libraries and educational communications:			
Higher education:				Public libraries:			
Student assistance:				Services	242,217	330,006	260,489
Grants and work-study payments:				Construction (LSCA II)		91,983	
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,172,800	1,485,881	( <sup>2</sup> )	College library resources (HEA II-A)	75,244		
Work-study	1,084,741	726,272	( <sup>2</sup> )	Librarian training (HEA II-B)	56,200		
Direct loans (NDEA II)	1,621,846	1,792,501		Educational broadcasting facilities (Communication Act of 1934, title III)	84,678		
Special programs for disadvantaged students (HEA, sec. 408):				Subtotal, libraries and educational communications	458,339	421,989	260,489
Talent search	86,000			Research and development	6,842,549		
Special services in college	223,800			Civil rights education (title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964)	184,975		
Upward Bound	160,000			Total, Office of Education	36,825,552	20,500,899	14,548,985
Institutional assistance:							
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	75,592						

<sup>1</sup> Initial year awards only.<sup>2</sup> New program does not have a State formula.

## APPENDIX V

## COMPARISON CHART OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FISCAL YEAR 1971 APPROPRIATIONS AND FISCAL YEAR 1972 BUDGET REQUESTS, BY STATE

State	Fiscal year 1971 OE appropriations	Fiscal year 1972 budget request	Difference
Alabama	\$86,069,460	\$65,216,933	-\$20,852,527
Alaska	25,102,721	23,632,280	-1,470,441
Arizona	39,707,618	33,835,072	-5,872,546
Arkansas	47,654,351	37,193,902	-10,460,449
California	315,673,258	235,440,060	-80,183,198
Colorado	40,894,907	28,390,937	-12,503,970
Connecticut	35,327,332	26,364,210	-8,963,122
Delaware	9,919,409	7,932,097	-1,987,312
Florida	103,606,307	72,594,965	-31,001,342
Georgia	101,579,518	74,851,804	-26,727,714
Hawaii	20,720,082	16,455,270	-4,264,812
Idaho	13,923,302	10,177,230	-3,746,072
Illinois	137,241,165	104,285,709	-32,955,456
Indiana	57,029,762	40,203,072	-16,826,690
Iowa	40,247,138	29,070,138	-11,177,000
Kansas	38,165,363	27,858,361	-10,307,000
Kentucky	72,956,904	59,914,211	-13,042,693
Louisiana	79,271,744	56,357,059	-22,914,685
Maine	18,105,893	14,233,646	-3,872,247
Maryland	70,998,064	51,338,805	-19,659,259
Massachusetts	79,300,321	56,533,772	-22,766,549
Michigan	111,351,479	84,851,922	-26,499,557
Minnesota	54,916,159	40,490,478	-14,425,681
Mississippi	73,809,151	57,266,784	-16,542,364
Missouri	68,979,028	51,657,528	-17,321,500
Montana	16,513,588	13,230,592	-3,282,996
Nebraska	27,797,201	19,291,405	-8,505,716
Nevada	8,894,103	6,710,418	-2,183,685
New Hampshire	10,757,335	7,436,433	-3,320,902
New Jersey	94,462,395	77,135,328	-17,327,067
New Mexico	33,640,147	28,166,956	-5,473,191
New York	329,307,494	272,665,106	-56,642,388
North Carolina	122,571,100	94,286,308	-28,284,792
North Dakota	17,028,741	13,815,073	-3,213,668

State	Fiscal year 1971 OE appropriations	Fiscal year 1972 budget request	Difference
Ohio	\$122,259,970	\$88,327,697	-\$33,932,273
Oklahoma	53,202,591	39,905,269	-13,297,322
Oregon	30,537,612	21,832,369	-8,705,243
Pennsylvania	149,337,086	112,353,859	-36,983,227
Rhode Island	16,828,295	12,576,252	-4,252,043
South Carolina	73,101,051	57,387,390	-15,713,661
South Dakota	18,592,804	14,920,698	-3,672,106
Tennessee	79,712,606	59,301,893	-20,410,713
Texas	204,937,622	150,866,363	-54,071,259
Utah	22,705,958	14,687,114	-8,018,844
Vermont	7,701,605	5,338,617	-2,362,988
Virginia	109,729,791	80,289,129	-29,440,662
Washington	53,519,268	39,186,010	-14,333,258
West Virginia	37,945,852	30,252,404	-7,693,448
Wisconsin	51,820,419	35,959,555	-15,860,864
Wyoming	8,324,933	6,430,953	-1,893,980
District of Columbia	20,500,899	14,548,985	-5,951,914

## THE TRAGEDY OF SIMAS KUDIRKA

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the recent and tragic incident concerning a Lithuanian seaman named Simas Kudirka compels many Americans to stop and reconsider the principles upon which our country is founded. America has always welcomed peoples from all over the world.

Our Nation has afforded them an opportunity to escape a life of hardship and misery under intolerable tyranny and pursue a free life in America. Under this most cherished ideal generations of Americans have achieved security and respectability, in turn welcoming millions of Americans in less fortunate positions than themselves and inviting them to share the bounty of the land.

Simas Kudirka was responding to that implicit invitation. He was seeking only the same opportunity to enjoy freedom that all Americans hold as a sacred privilege and to which all men are entitled. The brutal and inhuman treatment which Simas Kudirka received at the hands of his countrymen is indicative of the extremely oppressive conditions which exist in the captive nations.

The United States shares some of the guilt for this atrocity. Our Nation cannot proclaim its leadership in the free world until we willingly accept people who are merely looking for the right to live under freedom and democracy. I urge the President and the Department of State to act immediately and emphatically on behalf of Simas Kudirka. I also urge the Department of State to prevent future incidents of this nature by adhering to principles of American democracy.

LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM UNDER  
FIRE

## HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today's edition of the Washington Post carried an excellent article by David S. Broder entitled "The Battle Over California Legal Assistance." I am including this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe it so well portrays the activities of the California Rural Legal Assistance Agency, a legal services program funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the political pressures which have been exerted to destroy that program.

It is ironic that the administration has spoken so much of law and order, yet it rejects the utilization of the legal process when that process is serving the poor. Since its inception the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been acknowledged to be one of the most successful efforts by the Federal Government to help the poor and the disadvantaged. Because of that very success, the program has been strongly criticized by those who do not like to see the so-called "system" shaken.

Yet it is that very system which has made the poor victims of the welfare system, of landlord-oriented landlord-tenant laws, of unscrupulous business practices and exorbitant interest rates. The California Rural Legal Assistance Agency, along with many other of the legal service programs, has been in the vanguard in vindicating the rights of the disadvantaged. That is its "vice" in the eyes of some; it is its "virtue" in the eyes of many others of us.

I commend David Broder's article to my colleagues:

THE BATTLE OVER CALIFORNIA LEGAL  
ASSISTANCE

(By David S. Broder)

The President of the United States has never heard of Denny Powell, but Powell listens to the President, listens with the skill of a good attorney—which is what President Nixon prides himself on being—and with the intensity of a man who is accustomed to testing his own convictions by action.

On Jan. 14 of this year, in an address that was praised as one of the noblest of his presidency, Mr. Nixon told a University of Nebraska audience of his hopes for the youth of America.

"Young people," he said, "need something positive to respond to, some high enterprise in which they can test themselves, fulfill themselves . . . And we do have such great goals at home in America."

The President said, "I believe one of America's most priceless assets is the idealism which motivates the young people of America . . . I believe that government has a responsibility to insure that the idealism and willingness to contribute to our dedicated young people can be put to constructive use." And because of those beliefs, the President said, he was going to recommend coordination and expansion of all the government-sponsored volunteer programs for public service projects involving young people.

It was a generous and noble speech, and it sat well with Denny Powell, who at 33, married and the father of three children, may no longer think of himself as young, but who

knew from his own experience the rewards of the kind of service of which the President spoke.

In 1964, Powell, a graduate of Notre Dame law school, was working for the Internal Revenue Service and looking forward to a comfortable and prosperous career as a tax lawyer.

He and his wife were members of the Christian Family Movement in Alexandria, and when a fire swept through the nearby black community of Gum Springs, they were among the volunteers who went in to help. "I'd never seen anything like it," Powell recalled the other day. "A black lady with five quote illegitimate unquote children was living in a one-room shack. There was a pot-bellied stove and the windows were covered with rags to keep the wind out. Seeing that—it was almost like a religious experience. It was kind of hard to keep doing tax law after that."

Denny Powell quit his job, put aside his plans for a career and moved his family to California to join a just-starting federal program to provide legal services to the poor. He was one of the first men hired by the California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA) Agency, and of all the attorneys who were involved in launching it, he is the only one still serving in a field office. He is working in Salinas as head of a five-man staff that includes a Mexican-American lawyer from New Mexico and the son of a DuPont executive who is a graduate of Exeter Academy, Yale and the Harvard Law School. He prefers to remain in Salinas, Powell said, "because the people are here and working with the people is the real compensation."

CRLA has turned out to be the flagship of the national legal services program. In its first four years, it provided services to some 72,000 clients, but its greater fame rests on class-action suits which have obtained government food, housing, welfare and health benefits and services for needy persons who were previously denied them in many parts of California.

The program has aroused opposition from some local governing boards and, most notably, from California Gov. Ronald Reagan (R). It has been investigated repeatedly. The most recent study, in 1970, by a 14-man Office of Economic Opportunity advisory group headed by retired Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, concluded that "while not perfect, CRLA is an exemplary legal services program, providing a balanced approach between orthodox legal services and highly successful impact litigation."

On the basis of that finding, OEO director Donald Rumsfeld approved a 12 per cent increase in CRLA's funds in a new one-year grant, announced late last year just before Rumsfeld moved to the White House as a counselor to the President.

Last Dec. 26, invoking authority given governors by the federal anti-poverty act, Reagan vetoed the CRLA grant. He acted on the basis of a memorandum from Lewis K. Uhler, a former John Birch Society member who is the director of the California state office of economic opportunity, charging CRLA with assorted "gross and deliberate" violations of regulations, including "use of legal processes to harass public and private organizations."

Facing a confirmation hearing and under heavy pressure from Democratic Senators to override the veto, acting federal anti-poverty director Frank Carlucci decided to keep Denny Powell and his colleagues in business for 30 days while he made a new investigation of Reagan's charges.

There then occurred some mystifying events, not all of which have yet made their way into the public record.

For unexplained reasons, Carlucci's Washington office had great difficulty obtaining the bill of specifications supporting the Reagan veto.

After several days of wasted phone calls between Washington and Sacramento, an 8,000-page dossier from Uhler arrived, air express collect, in Washington. OEO attorneys reduced the maze of allegations to some 120 specific charges. Investigators sent to California had time to check out about 30 of them—all but five or six of which they "threw out of court," as one OEO official put it, for lack of any shred of supporting evidence. The other five or six, they said would require further checking. None were immediately verifiable.

With the 30-day temporary extension running out, Carlucci made his recommendation. It was for OEO to override Reagan's veto and reinstate the original CRLA grant, with two minor provisos. CRLA lawyers would not be allowed to accept criminal cases in their own free time, as some had done previously, and all class-action suits would need the personal approval of CRLA's director.

At this point, the record of events is further clouded by some vehement denials of what apparently took place. White House press secretary Ronald Ziegler has insisted that the CRLA decision was made not by the President but by Carlucci, who merely "kept the White House informed" on what he was going to do.

Some facts on the public record indicate the White House involvement was considerably more substantial than that. During a visit to Washington a week after Mr. Nixon's University of Nebraska speech, Reagan called on the President, the Vice President and the Attorney General. He discussed with them both the CRLA veto and the disposition of the California delegation at the 1972 convention, emphasizing, he told a subsequent press conference, "why we had taken the steps we had taken" on CRLA and also his willingness to guarantee California's support for Mr. Nixon's renomination.

Members of Reagan's staff sent the same message to White House aides in blunter terms—saying they hoped Mr. Nixon knew how strongly the governor felt about the veto and remembered Reagan would be leading the California delegation.

Meantime, in the White House, Rumsfeld and John Erlichman were marshalling arguments for alternative courses of action on the veto. There was heavy lobbying from congressmen and lawyers on both sides of the question. During the final days before the decision was reached, Reagan sent Uhler to Washington and someone sent Assistant Attorney General Patrick Gray to Sacramento to help along the negotiations between Reagan and the White House.

Gray's role in the case is particularly intriguing, because it was kept shielded from many of those involved. A newcomer to his Justice Department job, Gray had served previously as an aide to Robert H. Finch, when Finch was Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. As a former lieutenant governor of California and a frequent political antagonist of Reagan, Finch reportedly stayed out of the CRLA case in the White House, where he is now a counselor to the President.

Gray says he was called into the matter by OEO officials who feared the dispute might end in litigation. As head of the Justice Department's civil division, he would have had the responsibility of defending Carlucci against a suit brought by either CRLA or Reagan. He acknowledges participating in discussions on the CRLA grant but replies with a flat "no comment" when asked to explain why he went to California just before the decision was reached. "I was there in an attorney-client relationship," he says, "and I may very well end up myself in court on this thing." Others say, however, that Gray was the key man in the negotiations between Reagan and the administration.

On Thursday, Jan. 28, Carlucci met privately with leaders of the organized bar who



were urging him to override the veto. He was quoted as saying, "I sure as heck would hate to sustain a veto based on this report" (the OEO investigation of the Uhler charges).

That same day, the Los Angeles Times and other papers reported that the administration "will override" Reagan's veto. That was Carlucci's original recommendation, leaking into print. But by the time the story had appeared, the decision apparently had been reversed, and Reagan appeared to know it, whether Carlucci did or not.

Asked at a Jan. 28 press conference about that morning's Los Angeles Times story, Reagan said, "I still have to say I'm confident that they won't (override) . . . To do this, they'd have to be rather dishonest . . ."

"You look for a compromise?" a reporter asked.

"I'm quite sure it would not be simply to override . . ." Reagan replied.

Reagan was right. Two days later Carlucci issued a statement saying he would "not override at this time Governor Reagan's veto" of the CRLA program.

Instead, he said he would give CRLA a new grant, of six months duration, which would keep the program alive while it underwent yet more investigations—one by "a high-level commission" he would name, one by the Justice Department and one by the Civil Service Commission.

Reagan immediately issued a statement saying he was "very pleased and gratified" that his veto had been upheld. The governor said he had agreed to a short-term extension only to "permit a smooth transition" to a new and "more responsible" legal services program he said Uhler would set up with the help of local bar associations before "CRLA is phased out next July."

Carlucci then issued a second statement, denying this was "a phaseout or transition grant" and adding that "if the commission finds that CRLA is conducting its activities in compliance with the OEO statutes and guidelines, I will, of course, refund it in full." The White House said nothing officially, but presidential assistants called lawyers who had supported CRLA to offer private assurances that the agency was not under sentence of death.

Reagan, pleased with the outcome, went before the California Republican convention that night and publicly pledged to lead a pro-Nixon delegation to the 1972 convention.

All these events, of course, were being closely watched by Denny Powell and his colleagues in the CRLA office in Salinas. Their work is continuing and Powell said the other day, "we haven't slowed down or backed off a bit."

"In a way," he added, "I think the whole incident has been good for the program. It has forced us to go out into the community to explain to middle-class people why law reform is necessary, why we should take problems of the poor into the courts, rather than let them fester."

"On the other hand," he said, "what's happening is pretty frustrating for us. We think we're doing our level best to contribute to a reasonable solution of social problems which everybody knows exist. We've been audited, investigated and interrogated until we're blue in the face and every time the finding is that, not only are we not doing anything wrong, we're doing a lot of things right that no one else is bothering to do. And then, all of a sudden, some political fix is on, and we're on the defensive again."

There is a practical problem as well, which Mickey Bennett, a CRLA administrator, mentioned. "We can't hire any of the 1971 law school graduates we've been recruiting," he said, "because we can't tell them with any confidence we'll have a program for them to work in."

This is something that worries Denny

Powell. "Young people getting out of law school now are really concerned about these social problems," he said. "In our little county, alone, the legal defender's office has had 80 job applications in the past year. Now if CRLA and programs like it are killed, I don't know where these young lawyers will go. I'm afraid they will become totally alienated from the legal system, and I think we need them to make the system work."

## UGLY HATE FOR MAYOR STOKES

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday Congressman MINSHALL read into the RECORD a newspaper article by Mr. Phil Porter entitled "Cleveland—a Sad City." Mr. Porter, himself a suburbanite, concluded his article which maligned Mayor Carl B. Stokes and the city of Cleveland with the assertion that Cleveland is "the city gone to hell." Congressman MINSHALL's inclusion subsequently received further publicity in a Saturday article in the Cleveland Press.

Ironically, the same day the press story appeared, Cleveland Plain Dealer columnist Thomas Andrzejewski penned an article revealing the basis for many of Cleveland's current problems. He noted that community pride and responsibility in our city were being poisoned by the vicious racial hatred much of the majority white community holds for Mayor Carl B. Stokes. Andrzejewski points out the intense level of venom being directed against Mayor Stokes and his administration by white people and particularly suburban whites who have never taken any interest in city affairs. He describes for us both the volume and surreptitious nature of the hatred and accusations which he attributes to hearsay, fifth hand assumptions and unfortunately, pure racism.

Mr. Speaker, no one in Cleveland, least of all Mayor Stokes, is naive enough not to recognize that the city has problems other than racial hatred. Yet as Mr. Andrzejewski has perceived, no progress can be made in other areas until the civic paralysis white racism has engendered is eliminated. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland, Ohio, has the potential of being America's greatest city. Unfortunately racism has clouded the effectiveness, dedication, and achievements of the first black mayor of a major American city. This full potential will never be realized until Cleveland white residents and their suburban counterparts divest themselves of the last vestiges of racism. Thomas Andrzejewski has done our community a major service by giving public attention to this simple truth. It would have been easy for Mr. Andrzejewski to have remained a "silent majority reporter." His perceptive analysis of the cancerous racial climate in Cleveland could have been left unsaid. This courage in choosing not to be silent, which is to be commended, is a great service to his community. I sincerely hope that his fellow citizens in Cleveland and in suburbia were listening.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the aforementioned article here be made a part of the RECORD. I include the article as follows:

#### UGLY HATE FOR MAYOR STOKES

(By Thomas S. Andrzejewski)

About six years ago, there was a great concern here over a still timely topic, the "hate" for police. Now there is similarly pervasive "hate" which is more widespread and unfounded, and rooted not in black or young minorities, but in allegedly respectable circles: The "hate" for Mayor Carl B. Stokes.

The venom that flows daily against the man is unique in two ways—in its volume and by its surreptitious nature. It is also partly a racial hatred.

The mayor, who is only a man and not faultless, is blamed for more wrongdoing than he could possibly accomplish in a lifetime (the argument being that he is that sinister).

Accusations range from his being arrogant to his being a thief; from faulting him for the snow Monday to suspecting an inordinate amount of political deals.

It is naive, of course, to believe that a man whose instincts are basically political never made any political promises and has no particular allegiance to certain men and machines.

But the accusations from whites, in back rooms and out of earshot of even the most token blacks, are more than naive. They are based on hearsay, on fifth-hand assumptions and, unfortunately, on pure racism.

Why? There has been a great changeover in city jobs. Some posts, long held by Irish and Polish and Italian political hacks have gone to black political hacks. Key positions likewise are now held by blacks in the city administration, whereas whites had held them under previous administrations.

Said simply, white folk don't like their City Hall being run by black folk. And even white suburbanites have been equally vocal in their allegations against the mayor.

After the defeat, this month and in November, of proposals to increase the city income tax there was talk about "reprisals" by the mayor. White city residents talk about how their wards went unplowed and unsalted during the snowfall. Even side streets in black neighborhoods were cleared, they say.

(As I recall, the largest traffic jams on the night of Feb. 8 were in fact in black areas on the East Side, caused by suburbanites going home.)

Then there are the complaints about garbage collections. My councilman, Joseph M. Kowalski, D-14, was fuming the same night that garbage had not been collected for two weeks in our ward. He should have been aware that garbage on my street was picked up about 10 hours before he decided to complain. And that was only three working days after the weekly Wednesday collection had been missed.

Four years ago, before Stokes was elected, I can recall doing a story about how the twice-monthly garbage pickups in the Hough area were inadequate. In the face of massive spending cutbacks by the city administration, a little tardiness might be tolerated by whites who have had excellent weekly service for years.

The snow and garbage complaints from average white city residents are minor compared to the allegations of corruption from some suburban whites. These self-proclaimed cognoscenti have never taken interest in city affairs (except perhaps because their officers have been downtown) until Stokes became mayor. The complaints increased when Stokes became a black mayor.

Corruption in city government should not be tolerated. It should be pinpointed and prosecuted. By the same token, effectiveness in government should not be overlooked.

White city residents and suburbanites should abandon their racist vendettas.

## THE CULTURAL VOID RESULTING FROM FEDERALIZED EDUCATION

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, self-preservation is a fundamental principle in the life of a nation as well as in the life of an individual. The American system of education consisting of free public schools available to all citizens supplemented by private schools has from one generation to the next been a vital force in the preservation of the heritage of the Founding Fathers.

In the schools, the minds of the youth who will in a few years be directing the affairs of our country are being shaped. The schools are a most important factor of influence in fashioning the kind of society we will have in the future.

For over three centuries, the American system of education reflected and preserved the basic traditions upon which this Nation was founded—with special emphasis on the ideological principles which have always been basic to our constitutional Republic. Until the second quarter of the present century, education had traditionally been directed toward imparting the skills, knowledge, and ideals necessary to our free enterprise way—and not to socialist collectivism.

Since the 1930's, there has been a tendency to exploit the schools as an instrument for socializing America and destroying such time-honored attributes and virtues as patriotism, thrift, honor, duty, hard work, and individual responsibility.

Almost every day, we hear of new strange happenings in the Nation's schools which are destructive and evil—sex education, sensitivity training, biochemical experiments with drugs on innocent children, to mention a few.

The values of private ownership of property, understanding profit under the free enterprise system, the theory of constitutional government as well as the virtues of self-restraint and discipline are as if strangers to many children in the classrooms today.

The solution to this grave situation in the schools is for the Federal Government to abort themselves from officious intermeddling with the affairs of local schools and let people at the local level control their own schools.

The newscippings and reports which follow my remarks point out some recent occurrences in the Government schools and what can be done to restore our schools to sanity again.

The material follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Tribune, Oct. 22, 1970]

## UNIVERSITY OF THOUGHT

The University of Thought, sponsored by VISTA workers which in turn are sponsored by the ultra-leftist Houston Council on Human Relations, opened Monday, Oct. 5.

The University of Thought is an extension of the Free Universities being held by leftist "turn-on" groups all over the nation . . . except the local project is aimed at high school students. Last spring when it opened

parents throughout the city showed concern over the anarchistic type of sessions being held.

There are no grades, no specific texts, students plot their own way usually, and most sessions meet one night a week for 10 weeks, primarily at the University of Houston. Instructors are volunteers, according to the official brochure, "who have something to share with other human beings."

As Dr. Garver pointed out, the University of Thought also has such courses as photography, poetry, drama, leathercrafts, a session on Hemingway, and even conservative philosophy.

## SAMPLES

Here's a sample of courses as described in the official brochure:

A practical experiment in media—experiment with ways of manipulating the media to your ends.

Current black literature in the U.S.—Selected reading includes Lerol Jones, Ossie Davis, James Baldwin, Eldridge Cleaver, and others . . . the scope will be determined largely by the students.

Survival ethics—Libertarians and Randists welcome. Also anyone who questions current society's morals. U.S. Survival Society.

## CHRIST

The Radical Christ—The majority of beliefs commonly held about Jesus are not remotely connected with "what he taught or how he styled his life." The course will be a dialogue about these misconceptions and a hard look at what this victim of Israel's "piety" and Rome's "justice" really did and said. A. E. Greer.

Socio-Psychological Studies of the Black Experience—A reading and discussion course using the works of black social scientists . . . Cleaver, Malcolm X, Carmichael and Hamilton.

Women's Liberation—These discussions, led by different members of a radical women's liberation group, will cover such topics as abortion, sexual attitudes, . . . emphasis will be put on the need for a new social system beneficial to all people. Harriet Tubman Brigade.

Afro-American History—Current black political ideology. Eugene Locke.

Chicano Studies—Taught by Pete Vasquez, a member of the militant Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO).

Anarchy—Study of classic anarchists . . . from the IWW to contemporary anti-state thinkers.

Group Dynamics—This course has been described as not being sensitivity training because it does not employ the "touch" phase. It is being taught, according to the brochure, by "SIPOD."

There's Got To Be A Better Way—Takes a close look at what helps or hinders the learning process.

Creativity and Freakout—Class based on the principle of the Free U. Leathercrafts, kite construction, paper and/or liquid flowers—Taught by Susan and Cindy.

## NO GRADES

The University of Thought features no grades and the theory that students should develop their own "thing" or procedure in class.

A top ranking educator in the HISD commented, "Not giving grades can be equated to sharing the wealth, including the wealth of knowledge, without putting out effort to obtain it on your own."

"If you've noticed, every school which achieves the rank of quality in education which we are hearing so much about these days presents a challenge in the form of making grades. A student still does not obtain a National Merit Scholarship without grades."

## IMMATURE

This educator said that there are still those in the profession who feel that students do

not have the maturity to recommend what they will be taught in class.

"If you are going to let them direct themselves, why tag them children or teen-agers, why not tag them adults from birth?"

"We are seeing the results today of the lack of self discipline without authority due to this permissive attitude in education every time we experience student militant revolt. Yet many educators still cannot comprehend that the very students who are revolting never had discipline direction in a classroom."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Tribune, Sept. 10, 1970]

## COLLEGE ORIENTATION MAY SHOCK PARENTS

According to Dick West of the Dallas Morning News, this textbook—called "Phase Blue"—has been assigned to at least some of the freshmen at North Texas State University in Denton.

A woman who reported the matter to West said also that a few moments after her daughter sat down in a small auditorium for an orientation lecture, a militant student dropped a leaflet in her lap.

On the front of the leaflet was a clenched fist and the question: "What part are you going to play in a world in revolution?"

## LEAFLET

The leaflet went on to advise freshmen that they would be educated at North Texas State to play certain roles, including:

"Sucker—paying high tuition while the fat cats get fatter."

"Whore—selling your soul for a grade or degree."

"Ostrich—spending time with your head in a book learning irrelevant garbage while the whole world is erupting."

"Smack freak—addicted to the heroin of white, middle-class values."

## TRASH

What the next Legislature could well decide is "irrelevant" are the school administrators who permit distribution of such trash at orientation lectures and the assigning of such textbooks as "Phase Blue."

It is, to say the least, a most unusual English text. The headings of its 10 chapters include these: Violence in America, The Black Rage, Dialogue Between Generations, Religion and Philosophy.

Guest writers are included in each chapter. Among those in The Black Rage are Cleaver, with an article entitled "The Fire Now," and Malcolm X, who wrote something called "Message to the Grass Roots."

## OTHERS

Other articles in the book include "Why Students Seize Power," by Louis Levine; "I Am the New Black," by Thee Smith, and "God is Dead in Georgia," by Anthony Towne.

As if that were not enough, there also are articles in this so-called "English textbook" entitled "The Pill and the Modern Woman," "The Decline of Religion" and "Should God Die?"

Some legislators report that they are beginning to get the word from taxpayers that if the colleges intend to tear down our society, they don't want to help finance the demolition.

Thus, the legislators seem likely to ask some piercing, probing questions of college administrators who appear before them seeking increased budgets.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Tribune, Sept. 3, 1970]

## SHOWDOWN WITH TEACHER FEDERATION IS ESSENTIAL

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—According to the 200,000-member big labor organization, the American Federation of Teachers, "anything goes" concerning teachers' political membership and "anything goes" concerning students' dress and political activity. As a result of AFT



voting at a national convention in Pittsburgh, recently, there no longer is any political restriction on teachers' qualifications for membership in the AFT. An applicant may be an avowed communist, Nazi, Ku Kluxer or Black Panther—name it! The AFT also voted to give students—even secondary and high school pupils—total freedom of the press, including the right to publish or distribute literature on school grounds, and total freedom of association, that is, the right to join and to urge others to join any organization or group.

Okay, parents and civic authorities, now you know what the deal is for the school year 1970-1971. The deal is that anything goes. If you object to violence, pornography, firearms, arson, false fire alarms and sexual license on any campus—all of which are advocated by various radical student organizations—you won't be backed up by the teachers' union. So you can take it from there, and it doesn't require any imagination to foresee what will happen.

#### EVIL PROGRAM

The American Federation of Teachers describes its irresponsible and evil program as "democratization of the schools." According to it, there can be no bar to communist revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society distributing on campus the criminal pamphlet "High School Reform: Towards a Student Movement," which advocates arson and false fire alarms. (In New York City, since 1960, false alarms have risen by 400 percent, nearly all since 1968.)

In the name of "democratization of the schools," all professional political hate groups can now enter schools and enjoy teachers' consent to the kind of lawless terrorism advocated by the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, Black Panthers, SDS Weathermen, and other radical activist terrorist groups.

In the name of "democratization of the schools," all manner of vile language, spoken and written, may now be poured forth in the classrooms and on school grounds.

And so, as Professor Robert Nisbet of the University of California at Hillside puts it, "the life of reason is made insecure at best."

#### SOCIAL DYNAMITE

The American Federation of Teachers is resting all its arguments for "anything goes" on our First Amendment. Its words are being transformed, by means of satanic interpretation, into sticks of social dynamite.

Are we going to permit our First Amendment to blow our society to hell? I cannot believe we have become so degenerate as to allow it to happen. Certainly, the authors of our Bill of Rights never intended, when it was adopted in 1791, that it become an instrument for corruption of the young.

It is hard to believe that the majority of American Federation of Teachers members will go along with what their delegates did in Pittsburgh. If they do, then there ought to be a showdown in every community where the AFT functions. Parents, taxpayers and civic authorities ought to line up together against the AFT and force a showdown. Otherwise, our schools will become sites of infection for epidemic anarchy and terrorism, places to keep children out of, not to send them into.

[From Human Events Magazine]

#### MARYLAND'S READING LIST

Want to know why some of those college students turn into radicals? The University of Maryland provides a possible clue. Freshmen preparing to enter the university were recently furnished a booklet regarding Orientation and Registration which stated:

"Only three steps are necessary to arrange for attending Orientation and Registration.

"A. Fill out the four enclosed cards.

"B. Enclose a check . . . \$13 . . . to the University of Maryland. . . .

"C. Read at least one of the following books.

"The Autobiography of Malcolm X, by Malcolm Little.

"Black Power, the Politics of Liberation in America, by Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton

"Concerning Civil Disobedience, by Abe Fortas

"Crisis in Black and White, by Charles Silberman

"Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? by John W. Gardner

"Invisible Man, by Ralph Ellison

"The Other American, by Michael Harrington

"During Orientation you will informally discuss the issues raised in the book which you read."

How's that for objectivity? Not one of these authors is a conservative, nor even "middle of the road."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 19, 1968]

#### GUNS, DARTS AND BEATINGS IN 4TH GRADE BOOK

ORANGE.—The fourth-grader opened his remedial reading workbook and looked at the words illustrated by pictures showing what they mean:

To teach "slap," the picture showed a woman slapping a man, five times on one page. For "jaw," one man strikes another on same. And for "dart," one boy sticks a dart into another boy's hand. The victim runs off, warning:

"If Ned starts to toss more darts, I'll have to get a gun."

Not for our kids, you don't, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Hawbaker told the Orange Unified School District System this week, complaining that the workbook, used throughout the system, contained a pattern of violence.

The workbooks have been in use since 1967.

Dr. Allen Calvin, president of Behavioral Research Laboratories of Palo Alto, publishers of the workbook, said the book is less violent or anti-authoritarian than the Bible, Grimm's Fairy Tales or Tom Sawyer.

Calvin estimated that 5 million of the workbooks are now in use around the country, and the only similar complaint was resolved in Florida with a small amount of revision.

[From the Phoenix Republican Women's Club, September 1970]

#### AMERICANISM REPORT

On August 22, '70 the Arizona Republic carried a short review by columnist Paul Schatt of what he calls "possibly the most important book of the decade," Future Shock, by Alvin Toffler. The gist of the book according to the reviewer, is that "with all the uncontrolled technological, scientific, and social changes" (emphasis added) which will bombard our minds and lives in the future, we are in for "massive mental breakdown" because these changes are bound to "subvert the power of the individual to make sensible, competent Decisions About His Own Destiny". (Emphasis added). Fortunately for us, the smarties who envisioned this state of "future shock" know exactly how to handle the situation—and us. Just leave everything to them; they will manage change via "social futurism", defined as "the subjection of the process of evolution itself to conscious human guidance". Before that day comes when humanists believe they have convinced enough people that they have made God move over, individualists had better heed author Toffler's words.

This is not the first warning we have had concerning what the Orwellian People Planners have in mind for the rest of us. To avoid future shock, Americans had better face up to some of the present shock already wired to short circuit any plans they might have for their own futures. Roderick Selden-

berg's two books, Anatomy of the Future, and Post-Historic Man spell out their "Forward to the ant hill!" plans. Think-Tank Know-It-Alls have it all worked out by a genetic program to eliminate all those unwilling to adjust to the insect level of a "pure intelligence" Socialist society. (Theirs the "intelligence", yours "but to do or die".) Long range mongrelization should weed out the remnant of freedom-loving individuals who might rise against their betters. (Have you read the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights recently? No private property for anyone—but the bosses.) Sheer numbers of fast breeders (subsidized by government Welfare) can overwhelm the more intelligent level of population, who can be penalized with extra taxes if they have more than one child. (Anyway, you wouldn't want to add to the population explosion, would you? Oh, well—there is legal abortion!) Eventually all can be trained to perform routine tasks by mere automatic reflex. Conscious thought, deemed an impediment in this Socialist heaven, will have been bred out. Global society will be the ant hill run by the experts; man will have long since replaced Pavlov's dogs in the labs. (See Luria's Nature of Human Conflict for inducing nervous breakdown in pre-school children.)

Because this world is envisioned as having no past (having been erased from memory via textbooks) and no future (Who needs it?) it requires no art, religion, literature, philosophy, or science, and certainly no capitalistic free enterprise. Actually you will not even have to know you exist. What ant does? (Should you not want to contribute to author or publisher, University of North Carolina Press, you can get a good rundown on Seidenberg in Sara Watson Emery's Blood on the Old Well.)

It is natural that the "It can't happen here" die-hards will pooch-pooch: "How could all this be brought off?" The January '69 issue of the National Education Association's magazine, Today's Education contains a clue: Forecast for the 70's, by Harold and Jane Shane.

"Educators will assume a formal responsibility for children when they reach the age of two". Biochemical experiments (drugs) will be used on these tots, who can be whisked away from protesting parents and placed in mandatory boarding schools and foster homes. (Just as in Russia) "Cultural analysts" are to arrive at an "international consensus as to what is desirable in family life, art, recreation, education, diet, economic policies, and government".

Hawaii is already implementing this slave order education. Parents are already battling school administrators in California, who use such innocuous terms as Quest or Taxonomy for a system of indoctrination which will eventually remove all right of personal decision from our lives.

Taxonomy merely means classifying according to a system, but Dr. Bloom adds new dimensions in his text on the new Taxonomy. "What we are classifying is the intended behavior of students—the ways in which individuals are to Act, Think or Feel as a result of participating in some unit of instruction". Skills or knowledge are not important but the stages of Think-Act-Feel have a purpose. First, children are classified according to what Think-Act-Feel standards they acquired in the home, and tested for depth of belief and commitment. After each course of indoctrination, they will be reclassified according to how well they have been brainwashed of the old, and programmed for the new. Eventually they should be sufficiently reoriented to Think-Act-Feel as Masters have ordained. In addition to experiments with "learning" drugs Sensitivity Training (also called group encounter, human relations, sociometry etc.) will destroy free will and the faculty of critical analysis, unnecessary in a robot society. All this will simplify

detection and removal of obsolete material and people. Maximum, even universal, conformity of thought and beliefs, hence of behavior, is the goal of the totalitarian mind benders. Teachers become "clinicians," the instruments of Big Brother's programming for the future. (Do you begin to understand why NEA president, George Fischer, advocates control of teacher training, with "closed shop" unions?)

This process can go on indefinitely, depending on how quickly mind erasures progress. As New Think-Act-Feel takes over, children will be tested regularly to discover how dedicated they are to the new concepts. When they are considered "safe" they are transplanted to the "activist" category, where depth of commitment can be tested. This kind of brainwashing is expected to provide almost an unending supply of mindless bodies to man the activist mobs necessary for the overthrow of our government and society—a sort of Nihilist-while-you-wait goal requiring only patience from the world totalitarians above the U.N.

There is no element of chance in any of this. The Sixteenth Report of the California Senate Investigating Committee on Education ('58) devoted 100 pages to subversion in the schools via the so-called Mental Health Programs. (Sex Ed and Family Living sound modern today.) A good part of this investigation concerned Dr. Jacob Levy Moreno, "father of sociometry," meaning he hatched the techniques of "social doctoring" necessary for creating the one world collectivist society. Tied in with UNESCO, it is preoccupied with "social consciousness" and "human relations," which Moreno claims can be used to indoctrinate small groups with any ideology deemed useful, including Communism.

In his book *Who Shall Survive?* (Yes, the title is a question) he envisages the world as one vast psychiatric empire. And guess who God is. "The psychiatrist in charge!"

In the late Bertrand Russell's *Impact of Science on Society* ('52) he foretells, "... Advances in physiology and psychology will give governments much more control over individual mentality than they now have in totalitarian countries. (Fichte laid it down) that education should aim at destroying free will, so that, after pupils have left school, they shall be incapable throughout the rest of their lives of thinking or acting otherwise than their schoolmasters would have wished. . . . Diet injunctions and injections will combine from an early age to produce the sort of character and sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so. . . . Gradually, by selective breeding, the congenital differences between rulers and ruled will increase until they become almost different species. A revolt of the plebs would become unthinkable as an organized insurrection of sheep against the practice of eating mutton. . . . I do not see how any internal movement of revolt can ever bring freedom to the oppressed in a modern scientific dictatorship. . . . I do not believe that dictatorship is a lasting form of scientific society unless it can become worldwide." (Who ever heard of a revolt among ants?)

Dr. Bella Dodd, once the most powerful, resourceful and indefatigable commissar of Communist Party USA, later defected and testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952. She told how the Party worked for "progressive education" which was "eagerly championed by the Comintern as an ideal system for limiting the ability of children in capitalistic societies to read, write and think or act for themselves, and so to cause them to depend upon the state for a guaranteed livelihood and for protection against the hazards caused by their

inadequate training for the battle of life." The Welfare Rights groups are direct outgrowths of this deliberate short-changing in education. According to Guzenko, USSR's director of all this was Zharubin, U.S. Ambassador Julian Huxley, first Secretary General of UNESCO, in his *Evolution in Action* wrote of the need for a "psychosocial evolution" to gain control of all nations of the free world for totalitarian dictators of the U.N. Toffler writes of the "subjection of the process of evolution to conscious human guidance."

There is more than one degree of slavery. That of the soul is meant to be total. With such sophisticated techniques as Sensitivity Training and New Taxonomy, Future Shock is close to being Present Shock, right now. Just what do Americans need to wake them up? Who controls your thinking? Where do You stand?

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 15, 1971]

#### REPORTS ON EDUCATION

We have a supply of 17 Reports dealing with various aspects of public education in the United States. Together, they give a comprehensive picture of what has happened to our schools, and some concrete suggestions about what should be done.

Below are titles of these education Reports and brief synopses of each one.

#### TAMPERING WITH THE MINDS OF OUR CHILDREN

Ritalin is officially classified as a control drug, which is potentially habituating or addictive, and which can produce dangerous side effects. Psychologists discovered that Ritalin, advertised as a pep pill for adults, works on the central nervous system in children, with a tranquilizing effect. By the late 1960's, Ritalin was being used widely as a personality-changing, mind-controlling drug on small school children who were problems in classrooms. The drug makes these children feel happy, and thus makes them easier to handle. When you teach a child to seek self-confidence by taking happy pills, how can you keep him from seeking it later on by using marijuana, LSD, heroin?

#### TOWARD A ROBOT SOCIETY

Despite the fact that no one knows what mind-control drugs do to children, many recommend their use to calm problem children in school. The National Education Association magazine has published an article predicting that the results of brain-research on animals will be extensively applied for use on children within the next decade. A new Master Plan for Public Education in Hawaii predicts the same thing. Are the public schools to become clinics, or animal farms for producing a robot society?

#### NATIONALIZING EDUCATION

While saying federal aid does not mean federal control, proponents say federal aid to education is needed to create uniform national standards. Federally-imposed uniformity eliminates healthy rivalry among school districts for excellence: they become rivals chiefly for federal funds—sacrificing quality for ostentatious physical facilities and misleading statistics on mass accomplishments. The quality of education seems to decrease, as public spending increases. Once our educational system is totally controlled by a federal agency, that agency can surrender control to international authorities. A UNESCO Treaty providing for international control already exists. To stop the scheme, we must first stop federal aid.

#### UNLAWFUL LAW OF THE LAND

The Supreme Court desegregation decision of 1954 was called the "law of the land"—though no court has authority to make law—and was forced upon southern states, in some cases at gun point. Ten years after the Supreme Court decision—in 1964—Congress enacted a real "law of the land" dealing with segregation in public schools. The law is un-

constitutional, but southern states complied by adopting freedom-of-choice plans. Federal judges and officials approved freedom of choice, until they perceived that students and parents were not choosing to please Washington officialdom. Now, the federal government—in contradiction of Nixon's clear promises of 1968, and what he still promises—is violating the Civil Rights Act and the Supreme Court decision, to force racial quotas upon schools.

#### EQUAL TYRANNY IS STILL TYRANNY

On "Civil Rights" matters, the south has been treated like a conquered province, as in the days of reconstruction. Many southerners think that if other areas feel the iron fist the south has felt, others will understand and join resistance against federal tyranny. But one cannot eliminate evil by spreading it around, or abolish tyranny by imposing it on others. Instead of wrangling about sectional enforcement of illegal federal guidelines, Congress should stop federal aid to education, and reduce federal taxes accordingly. As long as the federal government illegally finances schools, it will illegally dictate school policies.

#### VIOLENCE AND CRIME IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Officials anticipate far greater disorders ahead in the public schools than we have ever seen in colleges. A report of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency subcommittee reveals that serious assaults on teachers in public schools occur daily throughout the country, and this is only one type of crime rampant in public schools. Most of the violence and turmoil are caused by forced racial mixing. Yet the Nixon administration and the federal courts are using the power of the federal government to force more and more integration, faster and faster. And, in doing so, they are violating the Constitution and the laws of Congress.

#### REAPING THE HARVEST OF FORCED INTEGRATION

Racial tensions, resulting from forced integration, have converted public schools into the most violent battlegrounds of American society. In many school systems, teachers carry guns to school and in class to protect themselves. During 13 weeks of one school year, in only 100 school districts, there were 250 injuries to students, teachers, and police; 900 arrests, on charges including murder, assault on police, arson. The Wichita Falls, Texas, high schools provide a rather typical example. When students had freedom of choice there, all was well. Forced integration has caused violence and turmoil. The situation is much more dangerous in many school systems, which have become lawless jungles. Instead of using their constitutional power to stop the senseless tyranny by federal officials and courts, Members of Congress appropriate our money to pay for it.

#### THE YORK CASE

A federal court ordered implementation of an HEW-school-board plan for busing in the Oklahoma City public schools, to achieve racial balance. Mr. and Mrs. Raymond York would not permit their son Ray to be bused, but continued sending him to the junior high school in his neighborhood. The school board confiscated the boy's books. The federal court issued an injunction against his parents. A U.S. marshal arrested 14-year-old Ray York for attending his neighborhood school. The federal court fined his parents and sentenced each to serve 30 days in jail, suspending sentences pending final appeal. Ray was sent to a private school, pending outcome of his case. The federal Congress should stop such senseless tyranny, by prohibiting federal courts (including the Supreme Court) from exercising jurisdiction in any case involving public schools.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUNGLES

Seventeen years ago, the District of Columbia had a dual school system: one divi-



sion for whites, one for Negroes. There was no discrimination in the financing and operation of the schools. The enrollment was about two-thirds white, one-third Negro. The system was rated academically among the best in the nation. In 1954, President Eisenhower urged instant integration of the District school system, to make it a model for the nation. Whites left; more Negroes moved in. Today, Washington schools are almost wholly segregated again, 92 percent of total enrollment being Negro. Congress has spent huge amounts to improve and expand facilities. Much more is spent on school operations than in 1954. Yet, today the District schools are rated academically among the worst in the nation. Many of them are stewards of crime and violence, where the educational process is virtually non-existent.

#### A GREAT TRAGEDY OF OUR TIME

Scholars have presented impressive evidence that the learning ability of white and Negro children is unequal, and that forced unnatural mixing in schools, far from helping Negroes, can have a most damaging effect upon them. Yet (the federal bureaucracy—cruelly indifferent to the basic welfare of the people, white or black, but greedy for the political support of organized Negro groups—is forcing upon school systems the most harmful kind of unnatural integration. Washington bureaucrats, in violation of law and with the threat of withholding all federal aid, force school systems to shuffle children around to achieve an undefined racial balance. We, the people, cannot control the Washington bureaucrats directly; but Congress and the President could control them—if we would elect men of sense and courage to Congress and the White House.

#### NEA'S MALIGN INFLUENCE

Since the mid-1930's, the National Education Association has worked to create an education program for a socialist America. The NEA now has a strangle-hold on public education. It also exerts a powerful and baneful influence on the White House, on Congress, and on the Supreme Court. Currently, NEA is lobbying for legislation to give itself a virtual monopoly to represent teachers in collective bargaining with school boards, and to legalize teacher strikes that NEA calls. The federal government should revoke the tax exemption of the NEA. This would so reduce NEA power that teachers could dare not to join and pay dues. We must restore traditional American education, which stressed discipline, hard work, honor, and duty. This cannot be done in an NEA-dominated school system.

#### BILLIONS FOR WHAT?

Education lobbyists claim that Americans are stingy about spending tax money on education. The truth is that more than half of our property taxes go to schools, in addition to the billions we pay in state and federal taxes. Spending of tax money on education in the past 20 years has increased more than tax spending for any other purpose. With only six per cent of the world's population, the U.S. now invests annually in education almost as much as all other nations on earth. What have we bought with these gigantic outlays? Thanks, in large part, to the education lobby—principally the National Education Association—our public education system has left a generation of Americans generally ignorant of the basic economic and political principles on which our nation was built, and has done a dismal job in teaching the basic skills of learning.

#### THE EDUCATION LOBBY

The power of the education lobby has become almost irresistible. But this is to be expected. Any amount of federal aid to education is illegal, because the Constitution does not authorize it. Having abandoned

this principle, we have lawless federal government. The dykes are down, and the only checkrein on the pillaging of taxpayers to buy political support for the pillagers is the uncertain balance of power between groups lobbying for their own self-interest. The illegal federal aid programs are always sold to the people as the only means of solving critical problems, but they always make the problems worse.

#### COMMUNISM AND THE COURTS HAVE WRECKED THE SCHOOLS

The so-called civil rights movement, spawned and led by communists, caused the drive for forced racial integration in public schools, which, in turn, is responsible for violence and turmoil in the schools. Communist subversion, through the SDS, is also responsible, in a more direct way, for much of the disruption in public schools. SDS strives to prepare high school students for communist revolution by corrupting them. One of its means of corruption is circulation of filthy underground newspapers; another is inducing students to adopt hippie hair and clothing styles. Local laws and school regulations could give adequate protection, if it were not for federal courts. Congress has constitutional power to control the federal courts, but will not use it.

#### MINDLESS POLITICS AND MINDLESS VIOLENCE

Local school districts and state courts—controlled by the same kind of mentality that oversees the federal establishment—have given non-southern communities a taste of what the south has gagged on. And in recent years, federal courts and bureaucrats have begun to do the same. Consequently, people throughout the nation have had enough of forced racial integration to savor the chaos that results. The mindless violence in and against the public schools is a product of the mindless political agitation which has substituted sociological experimentation for education.

#### IF M'GUFFEY'S READERS WERE IN OUR SCHOOLS

More than \$40 billion a year are spent on public schools, many of which are graduating children who cannot even read. The essentials for educating children are good teachers, comfortable rooms, and good textbooks. These are within the private means of the people, and would produce better education at less cost than expensive equipment and costly frills now produce in politically controlled government schools. The old McGuffey Readers point the way. A sixth-grade child, having been thoroughly drilled in all the work required in McGuffey's primer and six readers, would be better educated than most college graduates today. Throughout the country, people are building private schools that educate their young. We can and must give children the education necessary to preserve our heritage and save our civilization.

#### LET'S HAVE FREE SCHOOLS

We have the costliest, most elaborate educational system in the history of civilization; yet, it graduates young people who cannot spell, write a correct sentence, work simple arithmetic problems, or read with understanding. The reason is that the public schools, under influence of John Dewey's progressivism and now virtually controlled by federal courts and bureaucrats, have abandoned scholastic excellence and academic discipline, and have adjusted school standards to the lowest common denominator. What we call *free public schools* are *costly government schools*, which are using our children for social experimentation. Government schools are not answerable to parents, but to the dispensers of tax money. The remedy is to abolish government schools, leaving the billions they now cost in the hands of the people, who then have enough money to provide real education for children.

ORVAL L. DuBOIS MADE MARK AS CIVIL SERVANT AT SEC

## HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, a career public servant closed his desk and completed some 40 years of service to the Federal Government.

Orval L. DuBois, secretary, joined the Securities and Exchange Commission upon its creation and has served in exemplary fashion throughout the years as the agency's role developed.

He had started in Government as a clerk-typist and was on the staff of the Federal Trade Commission which was handling securities affairs before the SEC was established in 1934.

Mr. DuBois left the FTC to become secretary to the late James M. Landis who helped write the Securities Act and was one of the original SEC commissioners.

Mr. DuBois soon was named secretary of the Commission and has served in that position for 36 years. Additionally, for the last 28 years he has had the responsibility of serving also as press officer.

#### HELD IN HIGH ESTEEM

The esteem in which Mr. DuBois is held by present and former members of the Commission is pointed out in the article by Manuel F. Cohen, former SEC Chairman, in the February 21 edition of the Washington Post.

While I have not had direct association with Mr. DuBois, I am informed by many who have worked with him of his great devotion and efficiency at the Commission.

It is interesting to note that he combined the job of Commission secretary with that of press officer to the complete satisfaction of both the Commission members and the press—a feat in itself.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include an article by Sterling F. Green of the Associated Press, as well as the article by Mr. Cohen, both having appeared in the February 21 edition of the Washington Post.

I extend my personal congratulations and appreciation to Mr. DuBois for his long and devoted service to the Federal Government.

The articles follow:

MR. SEC STEPS DOWN AFTER 40 YEARS; ORVAL DuBOIS—CIVIL SERVANT'S CIVIL SERVANT

(By Sterling F. Green)

Orval L. DuBois left the Securities and Exchange Commission Friday. He joined it the day it was created—in fact, even before that—and some people claim he has held it together.

DuBois started in the government 40 years ago as a clerk-typist. He got \$120 a month and felt he was lucky. Then President Herbert Hoover cut his pay to \$100 a month in a government-wide retrenchment intended to help cure the Great Depression.

But the federal workweek soon was cut to 5½ days. The bright, discreet and hardworking farm boy from Agra, Kan., could hardly believe his good fortune at getting Saturday afternoon off with no further pay cut.

Still bright, discreet and hardworking, Du-

Bois is retiring at age 60 to close one of the most unusual records in the federal career service.

#### FIRST AT TRADE COMMISSION

A 90-words-a-minute typist and a graduate of the two-year "commercial training course at Grand Island (Neb.) Business College, DuBois passed a civil service exam and came to work in Washington for the Federal Trade Commission.

When the Securities act of 1933 was passed to protect investors—and to protect the securities market itself from any repetition of its own excesses, after the 1929 crash—the New Deal law was administered for a time by the FTC.

Then the SEC set up shop on July 2, 1934. DuBois was there, as secretary to the late James M. Landis, who helped write the securities act and was one of the original SEC commissioners.

He has been the SEC's secretary for 36 years and its press officer for 28. In the latter job he replaced three public relations men. During many of those years he also was the agency's acting chief trial examiner and its liaison officer with Congress. DuBois managed all four jobs with a staff of two—a secretary and a typist.

Along the way he has earned such tribute as the Washington Post's citation: "A civil servant's civil servant."

#### PLAYED WAR RULE WELL

Yet he never "leaked" or planted stories. Never a word-waster, DuBois could handle telephone calls from reporters while sitting in meetings of the five-man commission, keeping the official minutes. In whispered conversation he would take the inquiry and promise to call back. Then he would dial one of the SEC professional staffers who knew the answer; more whispering; then finally a whispered return call to the newsmen.

Misuse of information could mean the gain or loss of fortunes, the sinking or survival of business corporations.

Looking about a decade younger than his real years, DuBois plans a complete retirement. He and his wife Vera, whom he met at Grand Island Business College, will keep the family home in near by Arlington. But they plan much travel and a lot of fishing at a cottage they are building on the Shenandoah River near Luray.

It has been suggested that DuBois could make a handsome income as a business consultant. "Forget it," he says. "I won't have the time."

#### MODERN-DAY HORATIO ALGER STORY IS RELATED BY GRATEFUL STUDENT

(By Manuel F. Cohen)

Monday night, almost every living present and former member of the Securities and Exchange Commission will be on hand to pay homage to Orval Lee DuBois on the occasion of his retirement as Secretary.

In a sense the saga of Orval DuBois is a modern-day Horatio Alger story, not in the sense of rags to riches but rather the rise from humble position to one of the highest levels of government.

In February of 1931, in the depths of a depression brought on in part by excesses in the securities market, Orval DuBois went to work for the Federal Trade Commission. At a time when male stenographers were the rule rather than the exception, Orval joined the stenographic pool at FTC. He went to work for Baldwin Buckner Bane, director of the newly organized security division of the FTC, to which had been assigned administration of the first federal securities act of general application, the Securities Act of 1933. Not long thereafter, he was assigned to work for another man whose name became a legend in administrative law and in securities law, James Landis, then a commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission.

#### ON STAFF OF MR. LANDIS

When administration of the securities act was transferred to the newly-created SEC in 1934, Mr. Landis was named a member of that commission and he took Orval with him as his secretary.

It probably is not known to many that the selection of the person as the first chairman of the SEC was the result of some heated discussions among three gentlemen each of whom was persuaded that he should be and was intended to be the chairman of the SEC. (At that time and until 1950 the commission elected its chairman.) Orval has told me that upon the creation of the commission a stormy discussion took place among Joseph Kennedy, Ferdinand Pecora and James Landis. Eventually, Kennedy became the first chairman.

Orval has never told me what went on behind those closed doors or whether the President intervened. But that was not the last time there was a hassle within the Commission concerning selection of the Chairman.

A similar incident occurred during the Truman administration. At that time the argument raged for at least two days. The President's advice was sought. My understanding is that he indicated it was the decision of the Commission to choose the chairman.

#### WAS SIXTH COMMISSIONER

But this story is supposed to be about Orval. As one who learned the lore as well as the law at the feet of Orval L. DuBois, I can only describe his role at the Commission as that of a sixth Commissioner, a Commissioner who brought continuity to the work of the Commission and perhaps more important the dedication of a civil servant devoted to his colleagues; to the public policies which were behind the statutes administered by the commission; and to his colleagues on the staff and on the commission itself.

His memory was always phenomenal. He prevented many including me on many occasions from committing grievous error. He was the greatest advocate of the Commission. In many ways he was the SEC's most important enforcement person because he established a relationship with the press which was warm and trusting on both sides.

It is fitting, therefore, that the party honoring Orval L. DuBois Monday night will take place at the Press Club to which he has belonged for many years.

In my opinion, the American investing public owes Orval Lee DuBois a great vote of thanks and on behalf of that public I hereby express our gratitude for his great devotion and untiring efforts over a 40-year period.

#### NEW VOLUME ON JUSTICE HOLMES

#### HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention a recently published book about one of our Nation's greatest jurists, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.

The title of the book is "What Gusto," and it contains stories and anecdotes about this most distinguished American. The author of the volume is Harry C. Shriver, former General Counsel to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and now a trial examiner for the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Shriver was the Seaway Corporation's chief legal officer from 1958 to 1962 during the closing period of construction and the beginning of seaway operations.

This book, published by the Fox Hills Press, of Potomac, Md., is the author's third on Justice Holmes.

Stories in the book represent examples of the learning, wit, and wisdom and many facets of the character of Justice Holmes.

#### REPUBLICAN SPONSORSHIP OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

#### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of Congress, I introduced H.R. 15, the Consumer Protection Act of 1971. On the same day, Congressman HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Government Operations Committee, and Congressman ROSENTHAL introduced identical bills. This was done in the same spirit of bipartisanship that existed in the last Congress when a similar bill was reported by the Government Operations Committee by a vote of 31 to 4.

Today, I have reintroduced the bill and I am pleased to announce that, to date, I have been joined by an additional 21 of our Republican colleagues. I anticipate having more Republican cosponsors shortly, and I invite our colleagues to consider joining with us in a legislative endeavor which will mean so much to more than 200 million American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the names of the cosponsors: The gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. POWELL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. LENT), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MCKINNEY), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SANDMAN), the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'KONSKI).

As our colleagues will recall, through an unfortunate set of circumstances, a tie vote in the Rules Committee precluded a rule from being granted on this bill during the closing days of the last Congress. A possible factor in this failure was that a series of amendments worked out by the sponsors of the legislation designed to clarify the committee's intention to safeguard business interests, after the bill was reported, had not been formally incorporated into the bill at the time of its consideration by the Rules



Committee. This has now been corrected through the incorporation of such amendments into H.R. 15.

I am convinced today, as I was in the last Congress, that H.R. 15 is the most effective, reasonable and fair piece of legislation to protect consumers' interests, while safeguarding business interests, that can be enacted into law. Beyond a doubt, it is the most advanced consumer legislative proposal ever reported to the House and there is a compelling need to make it law.

Items currently in the news should convince us of that fact. The very life, health and well-being of the wives, children and relatives of all of us depend upon the sale of safe and reliable products under conditions of economic competition. Yet, in too many cases these conditions are not being met.

Inadequately inspected food products, unsafe and worthless drugs, faulty automobiles and tires, inflammable children's clothes and toys, and dangerous products of all types—these are just a few current examples of products that can impair our health and safety. I need not even discuss the times each of us has been bamboozled or defrauded in our purchases.

The Consumer Protection Act will help to remedy this unfortunate situation. This bill upgrades the consumer office in the White House to a statutory body for the purpose of providing a central, coordinating direction over existing consumer activities in the Federal executive agencies. By this means, Federal consumer policy will be effectively implemented, consumer education advanced, consumer information expanded, and consumer protection made a reality.

The bill also establishes an independent Consumer Protection Agency to provide objective and expert representation of consumers before Federal agencies making decisions which affect their interest; and to assume the duties of the National Commission on Product Safety which did more to get unsafe consumer products off the market than any other unit of Government.

It has been charged in some quarters that this legislation provides unnecessary duplication and unduly burdens the business community. Neither charge is true.

The new agency established by this bill and the present office upgraded by it perform separate, distinct, and unique functions. The only areas where they could possibly duplicate operations would be in the receipt and disposition of consumer complaints, the dissemination of consumer information to the public, and the submission of reports to Congress and the President. In each of these areas, the bill with its amendments restricts these functions to the carefully defined role of each organization.

As for charges that the bill is unfair to business, let me first say that in my 14 years in the House I have seldom seen legislation which is the product of more complete, careful, thorough, and bipartisan consideration than that given to the present bill. Extensive hearings were held. All points of view were considered. Administration officials, representatives of consumer groups and labor organizations, and representatives of

business and trade associations were consulted. Every suggestion and every witness was carefully considered and every reasonable effort was made to accommodate the views of all parties, consistent with the objective of protecting consumers.

Second, many provisions were especially included in the bill to safeguard legitimate business interests. In addition, a number of amendments are now incorporated in the bill, as indicated above, which were designed to clarify the committee's intention to protect business interests. Beyond this we must not go, however, or the means to protect consumers would be seriously undermined. It should also be stressed, I believe, that this bill can contribute significantly to safeguarding the interests of reputable businesses and can especially provide a means for enhancing the competitive stature of the small businessman.

I note with interest, Mr. Speaker, that Congressmen ERLBORN and BROWN of Ohio have also introduced a consumer protection bill. In examining this proposal I was pleased to discover that the sponsors adopted most of the provisions of H.R. 15. Regrettably, however, they did not incorporate certain key features which I believe to be essential if consumer protection is to be a meaningful reality. The most important difference involves the location of the representational functions. While H.R. 15 creates a separate Consumer Protection Agency to represent the interests of consumers before Federal agencies and the courts, the Erlenborn-Brown bill only confers such authority upon a bureau located within the Federal Trade Commission.

Representation is the heart of consumer protection. Time and again, we have witnessed Federal agencies—charged with the duty of safeguarding the consumer's interests in such areas as drugs, food, transportation, cars, toys, clothing, and so forth—failing and failing miserably at times to assume their responsibilities. As a result, H.R. 15 establishes a Consumer Protection Agency—Independent of all other Government agencies—to devote its complete, undivided attention to appearing before Federal agencies to speak for the consumer.

By way of contrast, the Erlenborn-Brown bill places this duty upon a bureau which is to be located within and under the direction of the Federal Trade Commission. This would have the effect of downgrading this vital responsibility by placing it within an agency which has many other duties, including some which could pose conflict of interest considerations. The FTC is charged with administering a number of consumer-related programs. It is difficult to see how an effective consumer oversight can be maintained over this agency when the one charged with oversight is placed under the one to be overseen.

In addition, new information has just come to light which supports the provisions of H.R. 15 over the Erlenborn-Brown bill. The President's Council on Executive Reorganization—the Ash Council—has recently announced the results of a comprehensive study it has

made of Federal regulatory agencies. The Council has recommended to the President and the President now has under active consideration the proposal to reorganize the FTC by dividing it into two separate units. One would become an antitrust board. The other would be established as an independent Consumer Protection Agency. This point should be emphasized: the President's chief expert advisory body on government organization has recommended the establishment of exactly the same type of consumer protection organization that is created by H.R. 15.

The Erlenborn-Brown bill has also failed to provide other important consumer protection provisions which are contained in H.R. 15. Among these are the apparent failure to confer specific complaint authority upon the Office of Consumer Affairs, the failure to continue the safety functions of the National Commission on Product Safety, the elimination of the requirements that Federal agencies must indicate publicly how their actions are being administered in the public interest, and the elimination of the Consumer Advisory Council which provided the one key means for private citizen participation in consumer protection activities.

Many significant safeguards have been incorporated into H.R. 15, as indicated above, to protect legitimate business interests. Beyond these we must go only with the greatest caution so that the interests of consumers will not be undermined.

Mr. Speaker, the principal responsibility of a legislative body is to exercise sound leadership on the basis of reasoned judgment in tune with the needs and aspirations of our constituents and our society as a whole. While it is self-defeating, even destructive, to act contrary to or in ignorance of these needs and aspirations, it is equally wrong and harmful to fail to act when a clear, compelling need and desire exist among a majority of society to do so. Such is the case today in the area of consumer protection. The consumers of the Nation are becoming increasingly fed up over a failure to be adequately and fairly represented and protected. The time to act is now. I urge every Member to cosponsor this legislation. I ask for early consideration and enactment of the Consumer Protection Act of 1971.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

**PRESIDENT HAS AMPLE AUTHORITY  
TO HALT CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE  
CANAL**

**HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been barraged in the past 2 weeks with accusations and statements triggered by President Nixon's decision to halt construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, one of the most glaring boondoggles in our recent history.

The assault is part of a slick, high-priced public relations effort aimed at convincing the Congress and the public that the canal will not harm the environment too badly, and the President did not have the power to stop it anyway.

It is time, I believe, that the other side—the side of those who would preserve our great natural resources for this and future generations of Americans—be heard.

First, let me answer the oft-repeated charge that President Nixon usurped his constitutional powers and trod on the rights of Congress in halting the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

My research reveals that there is ample legal authority for the President's action—not only in opinion by the U.S. Attorney General but in case law as well.

Quite simply, the Congress over the years has appropriated funds to continue construction of the barge canal. Neither the appropriations acts nor the legislation authorizing the canal can be interpreted as directing the executive branch to continue construction.

The appropriations were permissive; they did not mandate that the project be completed. So when faced with the evidence that the project would do irreparable damage to the environment, the President exercised his constitutional power and, acting in the public interest halted the canal.

I feel this was not only his prerogative but also his duty as our Chief Executive.

As we are all aware, it is far from unusual that projects are funded and later either modified or simply allowed to die on executive authority. The Congress must be ever watchful of efforts to erode its powers and authorities—and must be equally alert to preserve executive authority as well if we are to protect the essential separation of powers which has helped make our Nation great.

The Congress has been besieged with dire warnings from some of our colleagues in support of the canal that if the President can do this in Florida, he can cut off public works projects in any State.

So be it.

If a project cannot stand the test of review, if it cannot stand on its merits, if it is definitely adverse to the public good—then it should be discontinued, no matter where it is.

Canal supporters argue that the project must be continued because \$50 million in Federal funds already have been spent. Must we continue to throw good

money after bad? Must we run in the wrong direction simply because we started off that way? The answers are self evident.

I am delighted to note that the President's action in halting the canal has had one favorable effect on canal supporters—it has finally made conservationists of them. Canal proponents now agree that the Oklawaha River Valley, through which the canal would go, must be preserved for its unique natural beauty and wildlife. Instead, they are pushing for a new route taking the canal away from the Oklawaha.

However, the Council on Environmental Quality, in its interim report on the canal, also recommended against any of the alternative routes suggested by the Corps of Engineers on environmental grounds. There is simply no way to move the canal without severe damage to the environment.

The Council on Environmental Quality also challenged the canal's 1 to 1.4 cost-benefit ratio, noting that 25 percent of the alleged benefits are for reported recreational gains that will not result if the canal is constructed.

The Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, for example, stated that the previously assumed benefits from fishing and hunting will not be realized throughout the project life of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

What, then, are the benefits from a canal stretching 107 miles across the middle of Florida?

The Nation as a whole will not benefit. The canal will not reduce the price of groceries anywhere in America. No one suggests any longer that the canal is needed to protect American shipping from Nazi submarines.

The residents of Florida will not benefit. Nor will the State's coffers since the canal will not generate substantial tax revenues for Florida.

There can be no greater economic benefit to Florida and the Nation than the preservation of my home State's great natural resources.

These bounties are enjoyed by about 6½ million residents, as well as millions of visitors each year.

We owe it to all Americans to support President Nixon in stopping the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. We owe it, ultimately, to ourselves.

**BLUNDER AT CHEYENNE  
MOUNTAIN**

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, many Americans may be familiar with a certain amount of misinformation involving this Nation's nuclear defense system. Some proponents of unilateral disarmament, for instance, are quick to point to some sort of doomsday destruction system which they have seen dramatized in such movies as "Fail-safe" or "Dr. Strange-

love"—movies in which American nuclear forces were erroneously and irrevocably dispatched against Russia.

When these particular movies hit the screen, and despite governmental reassurances that the sort of disasters they depicted could not occur, there was an outcry that we guard against systems which could trigger automatically an unintended nuclear holocaust.

What disturbs me at present is the response by many persons who regard last weekend's NORAD—North American Air Defense Command—civil defense broadcast error as little more than a humorous and bureaucratic blunder.

The error at Cheyenne Mountain, Colo., where a tape announcing a Presidentially declared state of national emergency was broadcast to television and radio stations across the land, may actually have been a blessing. For the incident underscores the importance of this system's proper functioning as a vital link in America's national defense. The wrong tape alert indicated that our system which warns of a nuclear attack on the United States works fine so long as it is not needed. That is, if the sort of danger for which the warning alert and civil defense radio bands were initiated does not occur, the routine nonfunctioning of the system continues to operate like clockwork.

I am certain that our enemies are busy evaluating all aspects of the blunder at Cheyenne Mountain, and we cannot afford to be less inquisitive. We must guarantee that the civil defense warning system operates properly at all times. For if we do not take the proper corrective measures, our national survival may well be the stakes with which we are gambling.

**CLAY RESPONDS TO CRITICISMS  
ON BLACK BOYCOTT OF THE  
STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS**

**HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who participated in the "boycott" of the President's state of the Union address, I feel compelled to rebut the editorial criticisms by segments of the news media. Some newspapers and TV stations mildly disagreed—calling the boycott "immature," "short-sighted" and "negative." Others were more inflammatory in their attacks—calling it "racism in reverse," "ignorant" and "irresponsible."

Editorials of this type, whether willful or not, have the effect of emasculating the black leadership, even for some blacks. And the impressions created in the minds of whites are too frightening to ponder although their best interest would be served by justice and equality for all citizens.

The news media would be well advised to discontinue its calculated policy of trying to create black leaders it approves of—while emasculating black



leaders who attack gut issues. Black leaders are determined by the following they generate, not by appeasing the news media. In a frantic almost paranoid attempt to conceal racist attitudes, any black man who agrees with the views of the news media is immediately labeled a "Negro leader." The editorial response of many newspapers and TV stations suggested the black Congressmen bring changes through the legislative process—with 12 votes out of 435. Perhaps, if those same papers and TV stations would dedicate their facilities in an effort to create a climate which would make racism unpopular—black Congressmen might be successful in their efforts to achieve total equality for all. To my knowledge, not one of the mentioned media editorialized against President Nixon for refusing to discuss the grave problems of black America with us. Why?

I am certain that President Nixon knew for a fact that America's news media would not criticize him for refusing us an audience for the purpose of laying the common concerns of black Americans before him from the perspective of black elected officials. It is apparent that his legislative programs thus far indicate he needs such consultation. Block grants, revenue sharing, voting rights revisions are cases in point. How then can our elected representatives be heard?

If we must become "irritants" in order to prick the consciences of all Americans—then "irritants" we must become.

Had the news media reexamined the plight of black Americans, and the frustrations of the hopelessly outnumbered black leaders it would have realized that the "negative act" engaged in by the 12 black Congressmen was the most "positive" step forward taken by any Members thus far in this new Congress.

#### THE CHOICE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I once again rise to express my serious doubts concerning our national policies in Southeast Asia.

These reservations stem initially from what seems unquestionably to be an escalation of U.S. military involvement in Indochina. Within the past 9 months we have invaded the Cambodian sanctuaries, increased our bombing in North Vietnam, and afforded total combat air support to ARVN troops operating in both Cambodia and Laos. Whether these latter actions do or do not violate the Cooper-Church amendment can be argued endlessly. What the Congress must do is amend that law and eliminate disagreement. This is why I have sponsored amendments to Cooper-Church which would specifically prohibit U.S. activity outside Vietnam.

But we should recognize that the most serious aspect of these escalations is the

underlying policy which they represent. It is now perfectly clear that while the President may be interested in withdrawing from Indochina, he is more concerned with the political destinies of pro-American governments in that area of the world. We have encouraged and heavily supported South Vietnamese operations aimed, at least in major part, at shoring up friendly regimes in both Phnom Penh and Vientiane.

This is a policy of confusion and failure. If the 1 million man ARVN cannot now protect our withdrawal, they will certainly not be strengthened by forcing major battles and taking heavy casualties throughout Southeast Asia. The President will soon face a choice. We must abandon either our withdrawal plans or our dreams of leaving Indochina firmly in the hands of our supporters. Time is waning. The facade of accomplishing both of these aims cannot last much longer. We must get out soon or confront another interminable and intolerable involvement. That decision should be an easy one.

#### LETTER FROM CAPTAIN CLACK

### HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I know that you and the other Members of this body recently received a copy of a letter from John Thomas Clack, captain, U.S. Army, retired. When so many in our land are crying out for peace at the price of surrender, the courage of this young man comes through with a refreshing reassurance that there are some among us who still take great pride in our country and in her endeavors.

As you know from his letter, Captain Clack is a triple amputee having lost both legs and his right arm in Vietnam. I met him at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Atlanta last fall where he is receiving treatment for his wounds, and I truly believe that there are few people who display the courage in the face of physical handicaps that is displayed by Captain Clack.

In his letter, he makes some pertinent observations regarding current trends in our country as to medical care for our veterans as well as the treatment of some of our military men who have served in Vietnam. I commend his letter to your reading, and I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that everyone in our country will have the privilege of seeing it. Long after Vietnam has ceased to be a political issue, our country, if it is to survive, will be dependent upon young men of the courage and ideals of Captain Clack.

The letter follows:

ATLANTA, Ga., January 20, 1971.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter to you because I care, and I am concerned about what is happening today and feel something needs to be done. I hope to bring several points to your attention, which you may or may not already be aware of.

First, let me explain my situation. I am 23 years old and have been fortunate enough to see a lot in those 23 years. I was wounded May 29, 1969, in Viet Nam, fighting for a just cause. I lost both legs and all of my right arm. I feel no remorse about what I did in Viet Nam, nor do I feel sorry for myself or others in similar situations. I have been in the hospital recovering since that day, and have met some of the greatest people in the world. But it is what is happening outside that needs to be acted upon.

I am very pro-military. In fact, I'm probably "Hawkish" in my ideals; but the military has made a grave mistake. Lt. Calley and his men should not be tried for what they did in Viet Nam. True, Viet Nam is an undeclared war, but our men are being killed over there; and we all know, as long as man exists, fighting will exist; and as long as fighting exists, people are going to be killed. It is a shame that a country as great and resourceful as the United States, has to stoop so low to charge one man with an event in history. Did the United States charge the two men in World War II for dropping atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and killing 66,000 and 39,000 respectively? No!!! So, why single out one man? Why not charge everyone who has fought and killed? The sixth commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill." I sincerely hope more people will speak up and support Lt. Calley and his men.

Another area more people need to be aware of is the Veterans Administration Hospitals and other veterans affairs. I have been in the Atlanta VA Hospital for 17 months, and have seen it go from good to better; then drop downward because of deteriorating budget support. Congress passes very beneficial bills which will assist in the recovery of our veterans. However, the money to support these bills is not always made available at the time these bills are passed; therefore, this makes it necessary for the stations to absorb these expenditures from the Primary Fund Allocation. How can a hospital, with money dwindling, but workloads and patient loads increasing, function properly and give the best care. It cannot do this!!!

While the United States keeps building and spreading, it is ignoring those who fight to keep it free. I am not worried about myself, but what about those who are waiting to come to a Veterans Administration Hospital, or those who will be wounded in the future? America's greatest resource is her veterans, so why not give them the best medical care in the best hospital system? It could be that if more influential people cared.

Along that same line, the military is getting short-changed. Earlier, it may have sounded as if I were cutting down the military system, but I was not. True, the military has its faults, but so do all large organizations. It seems as if every year the military gets less and less money for operation and to progress toward the future. Our military has made us what we are. It has defended freedom worldwide, and it is about time the people quit being anti-military and anti-involvement, especially when a people's freedom is at stake. So let us go all out for victory and stay ahead of our foes.

I do hope this letter does not cause any ill-feeling. I do not mean to be disrespectful and accusing to any one person. I am just very "American". My motto is "America, Love It OR Leave It", which I proudly display on both sides of my wheelchair. If I could grow two legs and an arm, I would go back to Viet Nam to fight for freedom; but since I cannot, I will settle for saying what I think and feel.

I do hope this will reach some. Please pass it on down the line. I have sent out 915 copies of this letter in hope that others will speak up. I sent the following number of copies:

President Nixon and Staff.....	14
United States Senators.....	100
United States Representatives.....	438
State Governors.....	50
State Lieutenant Governors.....	50
State Service Officers.....	50
Veterans Administration Facilities.....	166
Commanding Officers of Military Installations.....	36
Regional Medical Directors, Veterans Administration.....	5
WSB, WAGA, WQXI, Atlanta TV Stations.....	3
The Atlanta Journal and The Atlanta Constitution—Newspapers.....	2
So, please excuse the duplicated letter! Thank you!	
Your truly,	
JOHNNY THOMAS CLACK,	
Captain USA (Retired.)	

## FASCELL OCEAN-DUMPING BILLS GAIN SUPPORT

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 10, I introduced three bills designed to promote a national and international policy and regulation of ocean dumping. This legislative package includes:

First. A concurrent resolution calling for an international agreement, under the auspices of the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, to prohibit dumping in the waters of the world.

Second. A bill requiring an immediate inventory by the Department of Defense of all munitions and chemicals on hand whose retention or ultimate disposal present a potential hazard to mankind or the environment, for the purpose of determining a date and means of disposal to be certified by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Third. A bill providing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency with the final authority within the executive branch for approval of any plan to discharge military or waste material in international waters.

I was very pleased that more than 50 Members joined me in cosponsoring this vital legislation. Today I am introducing all three of the measures with additional cosponsors.

Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. RYAN of New York, Mrs. ABZUG of New York, Mr. HANNA of California, Mrs. GRASSO of Connecticut, Mr. DOW of New York, Mr. HATHAWAY of Maine, and Mr. STEELE of Connecticut, are cosponsoring all three of the bills. In addition, Mr. PIKE of New York, Mr. FRENZEL of Minnesota, and Mr. HORTON of New York, are cosponsoring the first and third parts of this legislative package.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our other colleagues to join with the more than 60 Members backing this important attempt to stop the pollution of our oceans.

## THE ROLE OF THE LAW AND THE NEW CONSUMERISM

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was recently privileged to address the Queens County Bar Association on the topic "The Role of the Law and the New Consumerism." As a longtime member of that association, I was honored to respond to the invitation of its President Bernard M. Eiber, Esquire, and its program chairman, Jules J. Haskel, Esquire, to discuss some significant trends in legal education and practice which respond to the growing evidence that our legal system has too long and too exclusively served the interests of those corporate and affluent interests of society and too little and too seldom those of the individual citizen and the poor.

My address, which follows, also cites some specific evidence of this healthy development which is visible in Washington:

#### THE ROLE OF THE LAWYER AND THE NEW CONSUMERISM

(By Benjamin S. Rosenthal)

In the fall of 1970, 15 law students associated with Ralph Nader, picketed one of the nation's most prestigious law firms, Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering, in Washington, D.C. The students' signs protested that firm's handling of a Los Angeles auto pollution case on behalf of the Automobile Manufacturers Association; their actions suggested the words of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, 65 years ago. In a speech at Harvard University, Justice Brandeis said: "The leading lawyers of the United States . . . have, to a large extent, allowed themselves to become adjuncts of great corporations and have neglected their obligation to use their powers for protection of the people."

Former Chief Justice, Harlan Fiske Stone, sounded a similar theme when he said: "Before the Bar can function at all as a guardian of the public interests committed to its care, there must be appraisal and comprehension of the new conditions, and the changed relationship of the lawyer to his clients, to his professional brethren and to the public. That appraisal must pass largely beyond the petty details of form and manners which have been so largely the subject of our Codes of Ethics, to more fundamental considerations of the way in which our professional activities affect the welfare of a society as a whole."

That quotation, which is printed in the preface to the American Bar Association's "Code of Professional Responsibility and Canons of Judicial Ethics," is especially relevant at a time when our institutions and political processes are under persistent attack.

Those who criticize our system sound a common theme: the blacks, the feminists, the dissident students, the migratory workers, the angry consumers, and others, give evidence to the determination of people to participate meaningfully in the decisions that affect their lives. The day is over when public policy is established by a handful of Government officials who receive a vague mandate at the polls every two or four or six years; or by Government bureaucrats and corporation managers who receive no mandate at all. The freedom marches and peaceful sit-ins in the early 1960's, the deliberate

destruction of food products by militant farmers, the grape workers' strike in California, the supermarket boycotts of the late 60's, all testify to the growing frustrations of citizens over the dehumanization of our political processes and institutions.

#### THE SIGNS ABOUT US

My purpose tonight is to examine with you the "state of the legal profession" and the role of lawyer as social architect, particularly as that role affects the right of consumers to justice in the marketplace. Quite frankly, there is urgency to my message. For the reality of life as I have seen it, both as a lawyer and a United States Congressman, is that the political and corporate institutions in our Nation—and the public policy they create—have exhausted the patience of great masses of Americans.

The signs are all around us, in the anguish of low income Americans, the frustration of middle Americans, the desperation of elderly Americans, and in the alienation of young Americans. The consequences can also be seen in the decay of our cities, the desolation of our rural areas, the break-down of our medical care programs and in the callous gamesmanship which too often characterizes our free enterprise marketplace.

But I see hopeful signs, too, that the malady is creating its own antibodies. I speak chiefly of young lawyers and law students—the promising new generation of our profession.

Last fall, 40 students from Harvard Law School picketed recruiters from the Wall Street firm of Cravath, Swaine and Moore, on the grounds that the firm defends the apartheid practices of its South African clients; Harvard law students also picketed the University's own law firm, alleging that one of its clients is a West Virginia coal mining company which ignores the health and safety conditions under which its miners work.

The University of Michigan Law School has reported that 26 of its graduates entered Wall Street law firms in 1969 as compared with an average of 75 in preceding years. Harvard Law School reported that the percentage of its graduates entering private law practice declined from 54% in 1964 to 41% in 1968, with a more significant decline expected. Moreover, one out of every 16 law school graduates in 1969 applied for the VISTA lawyers program and hundreds of law students and recent law graduates have applied to Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law.

I think I understand what these young lawyers are saying. They see that our institutions are failing because the legal profession has not taken seriously its responsibility to serve all segments of society. They are failing because the public and private persons who make the decisions that create public policy must deal in competing ideas—and we, as lawyers, are not representing competing ideas evenhandedly. Our profession, traditionally, has served the "have" and ignored the "have-nots"; and those representing the "have-nots" frequently do so in an inferior fashion.

#### CORPORATE REPRESENTATION

Public policy is determined like decisions made in a court of law: in an adversary setting—and one set of adversaries is not getting a fair shake. Let's look at whose interests are represented before the three branches of government and in the private sector dominated by corporate America.

What we see, of course, is that with certain rare exceptions, narrow special interests are well represented—and the public interest is not.

If we wish to understand why only these special interests are represented, we need only look to the typical lawyers conception



of his role in society. That conception begins with the proposition that the interests of a private client are paramount and only incidentally related to the interests of the public-at-large. Some lawyers may believe that because the adversary system, like the Tango, requires two parties, the other party will necessarily represent the public interest. Others may believe that the public interest is inevitably served by the outcome of any fair legal proceeding. Neither belief is valid.

Given this narrow orientation, "justice" is nothing more or less than success on behalf of a client's cause, even though that cause leads to the perpetuation of bad law or bad public policy.

Whatever their rationale, lawyers for years have saved their consciences with the belief that the defense of indigent criminals fulfills all the requirements one may owe to the public interest. Much progress has indeed been made in securing proper representation for indigent defendants in criminal matters and even, through contingency fee procedures, for private litigants in certain civil matters. But the need to represent the rights of private parties in commercial law has not been similarly recognized. And, in a very real sense, public policy in this country—the totality of the programs and policies of our most important governmental, social and political institutions—is influenced far more by civil than by criminal proceedings.

It is disturbing to me that lawyers have failed to recognize the relationship between these single-minded services to their private clients and the breakdown of our court system, of the marketplace, and of our governmental institutions.

What we have, according to Ralph Nader, is "lawyers who labor for polluters not anti-polluters; for sellers, not consumers; for corporations, not citizens; for labor leaders, not rank and file; for, not against, rate increases or weak standards before government agencies; for highway builders, not displaced residents; for agricultural subsidies to the rich but not food stamps for the poor; for preferential business access to government and against equal citizen access to the same government."

#### BASIC CHANGES NEEDED

To this sad bill of particulars we here could quickly add: For landlords' and not tenants' rights; for "holders-in-due course" and not those who cannot get performance on their contracts; for tax loopholes for business and not tax uses for the public; for "sewer service", not due process of law.

The important question for us tonight, then, is what changes you and I can make in the rules of the game and how we can achieve them.

I respectfully suggest that two basic changes are needed:

First, lawyers themselves must recognize that their activities have a rippling social effect which extend far beyond an individual client's cause;

Second, the institutions which make public policy must be restructured to encourage and take account of public-interest considerations.

I think we are very close to achieving the first change. We are very far away from achieving the second.

One striking example of this heightened social consciousness is the growth of public interest law firms. There is mounting evidence that public interest lawyers are beginning to neutralize the monopoly of private interest firms in Washington, D.C. By my latest count, there are 14 public interest law firms or standing law groups now active in the nation's capital.

There is, for example, the Center for Law and Social Policy which recently obtained a preliminary injunction from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to prevent the Department of the Interior from

issuing right-of-way and special-use permits for construction of an 800-mile pipeline across Alaska.

The Center for the Study of Responsive Law successfully petitioned the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for the immediate suspension of registrations for all pesticides containing 2,4,5-T. The Center also successfully petitioned the U.S. District Court for an order requiring the National Highway Safety Bureau of the Department of Transportation to reopen hearings on allegedly defective wheels installed on 200,000 General Motors trucks; last November, DOT ordered General Motors to issue notices of defect for these trucks.

A group of law students working under the direction of a George Washington University Law professor successfully petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to require that free anti-smoking commercials be broadcast by stations that carried cigarette commercials. This group has also convinced the Federal Trade Commission to open most of their proceedings to public interest groups.

The public interest law firm of Boasberg, Granat and Kass filed in court an action which ultimately resulted in a lowering of Interstate Commerce Commission tariff rates for shipments of vegetables and melons from the West coast to the East coast.

#### PUBLIC INTEREST PROGRAMS

Another Washington public interest law firm, Berlin, Roisman and Kessler, played a major role in getting the Department of Agriculture to lower the fat limitation in hot dogs from 33% to 30%.

In addition, many of the major corporate law firms across the country have now authorized *pro bono* ventures. Arnold and Porter, Washington, D.C.'s second largest law firm, recently launched a public interest program under which all of their lawyers can spend up to 15% of their time on public interest cases.

Hogan and Hartson, the third largest D.C. firm, is getting up a "Community Services Department." Piper and Marbury, a Baltimore, Maryland firm, has announced that it will establish a branch office in ghetto areas to serve the needs of the poor.

We can only hope that this trend toward public interest representation will be continued and even accelerated across the country.

The second major change mentioned earlier—the need to restructure our institutions to accommodate public interest views—is hardly underway.

In the private sector, a few corporations have become more tolerant of consumer legislation which has been proposed in Congress, but opposition is still the normal response of most. My own bill to establish an Independent Consumer Protection Agency at the federal level was violently attacked by the chief business groups, as were bills to provide for consumer civil class actions in federal courts in cases of fraudulent or deceptive practices.

It is my judgment that the single most divisive influence in corporate and consumer relations is the Washington-based trade association. It has been my experience during the past four years as Chairman of the Special Consumer Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations that trade associations, particularly those identified as part of the "food lobby", are highly antagonistic to consumer reforms because they service their most conservative and reactionary members. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for example, reported to its thousands of members throughout the country that enactment of the Consumer Protection Agency bill would "destroy the free enterprise system." I think that the democratizing of Washington's many trade associations and business group would go a

long way toward normalizing relationships between consumer interests and producer interests.

But Congress must also participate in enacting reforms. The first priority, as I see it, is to amend the tax laws which now prevent most public interest groups from substantial lobbying activities. The right to lobby Congress, which is grounded in the First Amendment's guarantees of free speech and right to petition for the redress of grievances, should be extended to representatives of all points of view in our society, including those who represent the public interest.

Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code exempts from federal income taxation organizations which are operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes. If the net earnings of such an organization do not benefit any private individual and if "no substantial part of the activities" involve "attempts to influence legislation," then it acquires not only tax exempt status but also the status of an organization to which tax deductible contributions can be made. Suffice it to say, that almost all the public interest groups operating in Washington are dependent on tax deductible contributions and would be loath, therefore, to violate the proscription against substantial lobbying.

On the other hand, a 1962 amendment to the Code allows corporations a deduction, as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, on the cost of preparing and presenting testimony, statements, or communications before Congress or other legislative bodies on legislation of direct interest to the taxpayer.

#### INFLUENCING LEGISLATION

What this means, is that the representatives of private enterprise in Washington are permitted to lobby the Congress and deduct the cost of that lobbying on federal tax returns. The inequity is obvious. The special interest representatives of the oil, steel and automobile industries, for example, are permitted to influence legislation where it counts—not at public hearings, but in the back rooms of committees and in Members' offices—with the public footing the bill. But those who lobby for the public are prohibited from this type of activity if they wish to maintain their tax exempt status.

Congress somehow must also regulate—perhaps by public disclosure—the frequent *ex parte* communications between groups interested in influencing legislation and the Members of Congress who pass on that legislation. While the substance of *ex parte* communications should be held confidential, there is no reason to prevent disclosure of the fact that a contact or a communication for the purpose of influencing legislation has been made.

In addition, in order to insure that the consumer's voice is heard before federal agencies which make countless decisions affecting health, safety and economic well-being, I have urged the establishment of a Consumer Protection Agency. Its responsibility would be to serve as a sophisticated advocate for the consumer in Washington—something consumers do not have now.

In fiscal years 1969 and 1970, for example, three federal regulatory agencies—the Federal Power Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission—approved increases in rates and tariffs to private industry in excess of \$4 billion. In almost every instance these approvals were rendered without consumers being represented.

I would also urge the enactment of federal class action legislation to permit persons similarly involved in deception and fraud to combine their resources for a single suit. Present federal law gives private citizens no real standing to sue for fraudulent or deceptive marketplace practices, and state

laws are often inadequate. But even if private citizens could sue, the damage suffered by any one consumer would not ordinarily be great enough to warrant a costly judicial proceeding. By consolidating numerous claims of consumers injured in substantially the same manner, actions can be economically brought and sound judicial administration promoted.

Finally, let me address myself to reforms needed within the American Bar Association itself.

Last April, I wrote to the President of the American Bar Association regarding a report to Congress critical of a major consumer bill, and submitted by the Special Committee on Consumer Legislation of the ABA's Section on Antitrust Law. This critical report was drafted by a committee composed of members who did not represent the interest of consumers. Moreover, the report was not submitted for approval to the members of the Section, the Board of Governors, the House of Delegates, or other sections of the Association which might have had an interest in the legislation. While I understood that the report did not formally represent a position of the full Association, the impression generally created was that this was the prestigious ABA itself speaking.

#### CORPORATE EXAMPLES

I have since learned that members of that Special Consumer Committee and units of other American Bar Association Sections frequently represent special interest clients who have a substantial economic stake in the reports and recommendations of those Sections. Let me note the 1970 affiliations of the members of ABA's division of Food, Drug and Cosmetic Law of the Section on Corporation, Banking and Business law:

At that time, the Vice-Chairman of the division was General Counsel and Vice President of the manufacturer of Hellman's Mayonnaise, Mazola Corn Oil and other food products; the secretary was Vice President and General Counsel for a major drug manufacturer; the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Food Additives was employed by a manufacturer of food additives and pharmaceuticals; the Chairman of the Food Law Committee was employed by Coca-Cola; the Chairman of the Drug Law Committee was employed by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association; the Chairman of the Committee on Beverage Law was in the legal department of Coca-Cola.

A few additional examples are in order:

The Chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulations Affecting Advertising of the Antitrust Law Section was a partner in a law firm whose clients included the Association of National Advertisers, the Advertising Research Foundation and the Direct Mail Advertising Association.

The Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Utility and Holding Companies was Executive Vice President of the American Electric Power Service Corporation.

The Chairman of the Aviation Law Committee of the Section on Insurance, Negligence and Compensation was a member of the law firm whose clients included Trans World Airlines.

The Chairman of the Environmental Quality Committee of the same section was in the legal department of Continental Oil Company.

The Chairman of the Communications Committee for that Section was Vice President and General Counsel for the Bell Telephone Company.

It is my judgment that where lawyers serving on Sections of the American Bar Association represent, for profit, special interest groups, groups which might have a stake in decisions and recommendations made by those Sections, an "appearance of impropriety" is inescapable. This is especially true if the fact and nature of a possible conflict of interest are undisclosed.

CXVII—221—Part 3

Moreover, in appointing members to serve on committees, the ABA should take far greater cognizance of the existence of public interest lawyers and legal experts from the academic community. Of the 410 lawyers who were members of consumer-related ABA committees in 1970, only five derived their principal income from the academic community and none, to the best of my knowledge, were members of public interest law firms. Certainly, it would seem to be desirable to utilize the considerable talents of academicians and public interest lawyers whose economic interests are unlikely to be in conflict with the public interest responsibilities of the Bar Association.

Professor Charles Reich of the Yale Law School comes very close to expressing my vision of what the emerging lawyer should be like: "It is important to recognize explicitly that whether he is engaged publicly or privately, the lawyer will no longer be serving merely as the spokesman for others. As the law becomes more and more a determinative force in public and private affairs, the lawyer must carry the responsibilities of his specialized knowledge, and formulate ideas as well as advocate them. In a society where law is a primary force, the lawyer must be a primary, not a secondary, being."

We can be assured that the public interest is being served only when public policy reflects a balance between the wants of the few and the needs of the many. But in the final analysis, individuals control institutions and individuals make public policy. It is individuals, therefore—and, in this society of laws that we have created, lawyers especially—who must ultimately take a private oath to maintain that vital balance between private gain and public good. What we must do, and quickly, is to get "people to the power."

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent—more than 1 million of them—commemorated two very important anniversaries. February 16 marked the 53d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania in 1918, and this month also marks the 720th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State, when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

Unlike our own Fourth of July, however, these anniversaries were not occasions for celebration or joy. Rather, they were observed solemnly in recognition of the tragic fact that Lithuania has lost its independence and today survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain.

During 30 years of Soviet occupation, the Lithuanians have waged an intensive fight for freedom. Despite the fact that the U.S. Government has each year reaffirmed its policy of nonrecognition of Lithuania's forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, many members of the American public are unaware of the plight of the Lithuanians, and of our Government's official policy.

I therefore hope that the President and the Department of State will take

advantage of the observances this month to make a public statement of policy toward the Baltic States. This would do much to increase public awareness of the plight of these captive peoples, and would hopefully lead to increased pressure by the nations of the free world on the Soviet Union. If the pressure of world opinion became strong enough, the day might even come when we could once again truly celebrate the independence of Lithuania and the other captive nations.

#### REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—FEBRUARY 22, 1971

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the following: The first three reports on the Nation's growing welfare crisis.

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Lee Hamilton)

EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the first of three reports on the Nation's growing welfare crisis.

Recent issues of three national news magazines carried lengthy descriptions of the country's growing welfare crisis under ominous headlines which read: "Welfare—The Shame of a Nation," "Welfare: Trying to End the Nightmare," and "Welfare Out of Control."

The welfare system was created by the Congress in 1935 to provide assistance to the "deserving" poor—the aged, blind, disabled and the dependent children of fathers who were dead, absent or disabled. For 35 years, the Nation has limped along with this system. Why—all of a sudden—has it gone out of control and become the shame of the Nation? The answer, in a word, is the exploding numbers of welfare recipients and the staggering cost.

Today, there are some 13.5 million Americans—more than 6 percent of the population—on welfare. Ten years ago, only 6.8 million were on relief. While our population increased by about 13 percent in the last decade, our welfare rolls increased by 94 percent. There are now more persons on relief than at any time since the Great Depression. Equally distressing is the fact that only about half the number of needy Americans who are eligible are on welfare rolls today.

The Nation spent nearly \$15 billion on welfare last year, roughly half coming from the Federal government and the remainder from State and local governments. Ten years ago, the Nation's welfare bill was \$4 billion. Looking to the future, many experts anticipate that nearly 8 percent of our population will be on welfare by 1975, pushing the total annual expenditure to \$25 billion.

Under the present system, welfare funds are earmarked for six basic programs: Medicaid, Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanent and Totally Disabled, and General Assistance, a locally-allocated catch-all category. At the heart of the welfare crisis today, however, is the Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) program, which has literally exploded while the other categories of assistance have remained relatively stable within our population growth.

In the last 10 years, the number of people on AFDC has risen from slightly more than 3 million to 9.5 million. The cost has skyrocketed from slightly more than \$1 billion to nearly \$5 billion—about a third of all



welfare expenditures. Seven out of every 10 welfare cases are now AFDC cases, and they are increasing at an accelerating rate. Four out of every five families receiving AFDC benefits are fatherless through death, divorce, desertion, or illegitimacy.

The reasons for the burgeoning AFDC rolls are many and varied, but the major causes seem to be:

1. **Eligibility Rules Have Been Liberalized.** Recent Federal court decisions have abolished the one-year residency requirements for welfare, ruled that a stepfather no longer is responsible for his stepchildren unless they have been adopted, refused to allow assistance to be cut off because of a non-related male in the house, invalidated the "unsuitable home" provision for shutting off benefits.

2. **Change in Economic Conditions.** Rising unemployment rates have caused many formerly employed persons to go on welfare rolls because of layoffs.

3. **Changes in Values.** Welfare is losing its stigma and being considered a "right" of the poor. Increased divorce rates among all classes has been a fact in putting many mothers on welfare rolls. Changing attitudes toward religion, sex and illegitimacy also have had an effect.

4. **New Activist Programs.** Increased efforts by welfare rights groups have made growing numbers aware of the availability of welfare and have helped to form an increasing vocal force for benefit improvements.

5. **New Regulations.** New regulations by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now permit AFDC mothers to disregard the first \$30, plus work-related expenses and one-third of the balance of net income without benefit reductions. Other regulations have increased benefits to reflect cost-of-living increases, and require action on welfare applicants within 30 days of the date of application, which has added to administrative costs.

**NEXT:** Facts and myths about the welfare system.

#### ANOTHER FIRST FOR JULIA

### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and most admired Members of the House is our distinguished colleague from Washington, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee and a subcommittee chairman, she has added significantly to her laurels as a Congresswoman. I take pride in the fact that Mrs. HANSEN has been named a member of the Military Construction Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman. This subcommittee, with its great impact on the future and permanence of America's military base complex, has a singular opportunity to bring modernization to the country's military installations. In particular are we interested in military housing with its important bearing on morale and retention in the services. The Bremerton Sun, published in Mrs. HANSEN's home State, has commented effectively on the subject of Mrs. HANSEN's service. I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### ANOTHER FIRST FOR JULIA

Washington's Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen has added another first to her impressive legislative record: She has been

named the first woman to serve on the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

The appointment was announced yesterday in Washington, D.C., and Mrs. Hansen said she was "Delighted to be named to a subcommittee with such important bearing on the affairs of western Washington and especially Kitsap County."

The committee concerns itself with all kinds of military construction including: ships, shore installations and housing for the Navy.

Rep. Hansen said she "always has one eye on Kitsap County and I'm always interested in the Navy. One of my major efforts now will be to get our sea defenses into proper order."

Mrs. Hansen is the second woman ever to be appointed to the House Appropriations Committee and she was the first woman to be named chairman of an Appropriations subcommittee, that of Interior and Related Agencies. To be named to the Military Construction Subcommittee, she relinquished her membership on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Mrs. Hansen was elected to the Congress 10 years ago after service of more than 20 years in the Washington House of Representatives.

#### APOLLO 14

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in Aviation Week by Mr. Robert Hotz, reviews the outstanding accomplishments of the Apollo 14 mission and compares it with the recent Soviet space efforts. As the Congress and the Nation prepares to review the future of our national space program, I believe that Mr. Hotz' editorial provides insight into the significance of our space effort and the need for an aggressive and productive program in the 1970's. The editorial follows:

#### APOLLO 14

(By Robert Hotz)

The successful manned lunar landing mission of Apollo 14 accomplished many things. Among them are:

Validation of the Apollo system hardware which now has logged six out of seven successful missions on its lunar explorations. The relatively minor glitches that developed during Apollo 14 did not prevent any essential achievement of the mission. With the background of the major crisis and long emergency return to earth of Apollo 13, everybody's heart naturally skipped a bit when each new glitch appeared during the Apollo 14 mission.

Further evidence of the superiority of manned space exploration over remotely controlled robots. The three Apollo 14 astronauts produced more useful data on the lunar environment than all of the U.S. and USSR robots that have landed on the moon.

Heartening evidence that stout-hearted middleaged men can still do more than hold their own in strenuous activity. The performance of 47-year-old Alan B. Shepard, Jr., on Apollo 14 combined with the heroics of 43-year-old George Blanda on the professional football gridirons, the rugged play of 42-year-old Gordie Howe, the National Hockey League's all-time leading scorer who is still denting the net regularly, and the knuckleball relief pitching of 41-year-old Hoyt Wilhelm provided a fine spiritual lift for those hard-pressed breadwinners in that

age group that have had a little more than their fill lately of crass youth.

The national space program, and, indeed, the whole U.S. aerospace complex, badly needed another demonstration of its basic technical competence that Apollo 14 provided in contrast to the steady spate of sad management news that has monopolized the headlines for so many months. It should again remind all Americans and particularly their political leaders that this nation has a unique and vital asset in its aerospace technology as solid and valuable as coal, oil, gold or any other natural resource. It should remind them that continuation of the poor management of this vital resource from the top down will produce economic disaster and national infirmity.

We emphasize again that Apollo cost just half of its original estimates principally because it was pushed hard with adequate funding forthcoming to support the maximum technical pace. It was not stretched, delayed and finally canceled as so many other programs of great technical promise have suffered. It is axiomatic in technical development that every dollar cut by program stretch-outs at key development stages simply adds three dollars farther down the line. This is how false economy has inflated so many technical development programs to a fiscal bloat that has invited cancellation as the only cure.

Apollo 14 also demonstrated the steadily expanding capabilities for scientific exploration available from its now thoroughly flight-tested spacecraft and equipment. The scientific achievements of the Apollo 14 mission—both on the lunar surface and in weightless experiments on the return voyage to earth—probably will exceed the accomplishments of both previous lunar landings combined. This is simply because once the feasibility of the lunar landing was demonstrated and the reliability of its equipment proven, the emphasis could be shifted from flight testing to scientific accomplishment.

It was hard for anybody long familiar with the flight test cycle of new aircraft to understand the spoiled-child petulance of so many otherwise mature scientists over the character of the early Apollo missions. We hope that they now understand that the flight hardware has to be proved first before it can be adequately utilized for its primary mission of scientific exploration.

The Soviets were also a bit miffed over the success of Apollo 14. Their propaganda mill dropped all pretense of the spirit of international goodwill that was the official party line on Apollo 11. The fact that the United States has now landed three crews of astronauts on the moon, where they performed incredible scientific research and planted equipment to continue these experiments, has scaled the Soviet lunar robot program down to its proper perspective. The simple fact is the Soviets are forced to conduct their lunar exploration with these remotely controlled, minimal-data-yielding devices because they do not yet have the capability of putting men and equipment on the moon and returning them to earth. The Moscow press commentary on the Apollo 14 mission was sour and denigrating and once again emphasized that neither accuracy nor the human spirit have much value in the Soviet system.

Apollo 14 also demonstrated that man still has much to learn about the moon. Even with the ability to land in relatively rough areas and to extend useful working time on the moon, the experience of the Apollo 14 duo in the Fra Mauro area indicates that better new equipment is needed to extend the range and accuracy of their explorations. And once the various typical areas of the lunar surface are reached it is obvious that vehicles with payloads much larger than Apollo will be required to haul the equip-

ment needed to establish permanent scientific working stations on the lunar surface. For not until that is accomplished will man really begin to reap the full harvest of knowledge from his lunar capabilities.

## CONGRESS MUST END RUSSIAN MONOPOLY OF WORLD CHROME MARKET

**HON. JAMES M. COLLINS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today that gives Congress the opportunity to stop a gross mistake in our country's foreign policy. The cries of protest that this error should provoke have been muffled in stacks of bureaucratic papers and reports. Yet, when this issue is brought into focus, the glaring error in judgment is magnified and we must demand a return to practical commonsense in this phase of our foreign policy:

First. Are you aware that the United States is cutting itself off from a vital strategic material, chromium, through its economic sanctions against Rhodesia?

Second. Are you aware that we are dependent on Russia for 60 percent of our supply of this strategic material?

Third. Are you aware that the Office of Emergency Preparedness is preparing to ask you, in this session of Congress to release 30 percent of our chromium for the Nation's strategic material stockpile in order to meet the demand for this vital metal? At this rate our stockpile will be completely depleted in just 3 years.

You may wonder why chrome ore is so important. Chromium is essential in the production of our military jet aircraft, missiles, and satellites. Commercially, chromium is the ingredient that makes stainless steel "stainless." Therefore, it is essential in the production of everything from industrial tools, to automobiles, to home construction, to kitchen items, and to multiple other areas.

Let us compare the statistics on chrome ore before the embargo went into effect. According to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Rhodesia supplied us with 37 percent of our total chromium import prior to the sanctions. At the same time Russia was supplying us with 27 percent of our chromium at a healthy competitive price of about \$30 to \$33 a ton. At this time, there was no shortage of this strategic metal. Russia had bought her way into our market by the good capitalistic method of pricing her chrome at slightly below Rhodesia's price.

But when the United Nations, with the compliance of our Government, put economic sanctions against Rhodesia, look at what happened in the free market. American-owned chrome-producing mines in Rhodesia became semidormant. I was interested to discover that the two largest chrome mines in Rhodesia were owned by American companies. Any profits were accruing to Americans. But with the economic sanctions we began channeling the same money that had

gone to these American firms into the hands of the Russians. We do business with the Russians who are the major material support for our enemies in Vietnam. Hence, the United States is in the uncomfortable position of having to rely upon the Soviet Union for more than 60 percent of its chrome requirements.

What is more, the Soviets, taking advantage of the stranglehold they have on us, have skyrocketed the price of the ore to almost three times the presanction costs. Russia's presanction prices were lower than Rhodesia's. Today, we pay Russia approximately \$28,000,000 a year when we could be receiving the same amount from American firms in Rhodesia for approximately \$17,000,000. One American company which buys from Russia reports that it has been forced to accept 1 ton of substandard ore for every ton of high-grade ore purchased.

Understandably enough, the State Department has realized this embarrassing situation and has now quietly recommended to Congress that we supply the deficit in our need for chromium from our emergency stockpile instead of becoming more dependent on Russia. If our rate of dependency on Russian sources continues to increase as it has so far, in a few short years we would be 95 percent dependent on Russia for this strategic material.

To become this dependent on Russia is bad enough but let us take a look at the alternative offered by the OEP. We retain our 60 percent dependence on Russia without increasing it. At the same time we take 30 percent chromium ore out of our stockpile on an annual basis. In 3 short years our stockpile is depleted and if the Russians cut off our supply, we are left with extremely inadequate sources of import, with no reserves in our stockpile, and with no more stainless steel. I am assuming that this is in time of peace. In the case of a national emergency, I do not need to tell you how crucial this would be.

To bring the issue more sharply into focus, let us listen to the warning of a past Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, Mr. Fred Fussell, in his testimony before the Digg's committee on October 31, 1969. Mr. Fussell said:

Further sales from the stockpile would only serve the need for the relatively short time it would take to exhaust the stockpile excess. Assuming that the U.S.S.R. would continue to ship chrome ore to the United States at the present level indefinitely, realizing that the other known amounts of chromium ore elsewhere in the world gradually are becoming exhausted, and knowing that the United States chrome ore needs are increasing each year, there is no way to see the chromium ore needs of the United States being met without chromium ore from Rhodesia.

Let us review a few other curious facts. Communist China imports no chromium ore from the U.S.S.R. I quote from a London Times article entitled, "Who Buys Rhodesia's Chrome?":

It has been going to Communist China. Because she is not a member of the U.N., China is not bound by the resolution. Peking Radio calls Rhodesians "fascist aggressors" but Peking buys Rhodesia's chromium. China

uses it in her defense industries and it may well have accelerated her progress towards becoming a nuclear power.

Another curious incident is to be found in the case of the Japanese, who, like the United States, support the U.N. trade sanctions against Rhodesia. Japan has substantially reduced her chrome imports from Russia but has moved ahead of the United States in her production of stainless steel. Is Japan buying Rhodesian chrome?

Our last startling fact is that the U.S.S.R. is self-sufficient in 29 major industrial raw materials whereas the United States is only self-sufficient in 10. The more dependent we become on Russia for our resources, the more vulnerable becomes our national security. We must not be blind to the fact that this fits right into the Russian General Logarski's theory in his book, "Strategy and Economics," in which he expounds his "weak-link commodity" theory. This theory explicitly calls for Russia to develop strategic material markets until other countries slowly develop a weak link in their own supply line thus becoming completely dependent on Russia. We are doing just this and handing Russia a powerful weapon.

Congress is the only governmental body that can change this state of affairs. It is obvious that the State Department must place the needs of the United States uppermost, and no longer continue to weaken our national security. Why we should try to hurt the small country of Rhodesia and help Russia is beyond my comprehension. And at the same time we are seriously impairing our national economy.

Gentlemen, the issue is quite clear. Will the United States buy chrome so as to profit Russia, or will we buy chrome so as to build national security for the United States?

## POSTAL REFORM

**HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Postal Reform and Reorganization Act was passed last year, there were many of use who shared some hope that this would give the Post Office the flexibility and opportunity to improve the mail service.

Unfortunately, there is little appearance that this is being done. Before the reorganization, the northern panhandle of West Virginia was plagued by a practice in selecting a city in every State to which mail was directed as a center point. In the case of West Virginia, the mail was sent to Charleston, and then redirected to Wheeling from there rather than being sent directly to Pittsburgh which had been previously done. Wheeling and Weirton, W. Va., are much closer to Pittsburgh and our roads between these cities are better than the transportation between Wheeling and Weirton and Charleston.



This has accounted for a rather uniform 1-day delay on all mail coming from the East. The other problem that has plagued us is the very slow service in the large city centers of the East, particularly New York City.

Combined, these two practices, the slow and inefficient work in the East, and the insistence on using State rather than regional distribution points, have had substantial impact on mail service in northern West Virginia.

It is my hope that the Post Office will reexamine these practices. It is my hope that in this reexamination, they will be willing to institute new methods where they will serve to deliver the mail more efficiently.

For, Mr. Speaker, this was the purpose of reorganizing the Post Office. The people of the United States have grown weary of paying more and receiving less from the post office, and justifiably so, for there is no doubt that they are not receiving the quality of service they had received in the past.

I will, at this point, insert a news article and an editorial from the Wheeling News Register which document the case I have just presented. The news article appeared in the February 15 edition of the paper, and the editorial appeared 2 days later on February 17:

MAIL LATE? DON'T BLAME CITY POST OFFICE  
(By Charles Callaway)

It can happen to anybody.

You are in your home or your place of business when the postman delivers your mail.

The first letter, sent by first class mail, that you open may be dated as having been written four, five, even six days ago.

The first reaction you may have is: "Has the post office gone back to the days of the Pony Express?"

Or: "What have the boys been doing down at our post office? Are they playing chess instead of sorting mail?"

Before you fly off the handle the next time this happens to you, take a look at the postmark on the letter.

The chances are it has been on its way from New York or some other city for three, four or even five days.

A News-Register investigation shows the fault does not lie in the Wheeling Post Office.

First class mail coming into the Wheeling Post Office today is delivered no later than tomorrow. That's a requirement of law and it is lived up to.

The trouble is a breakdown in service somewhere along the line before your letter reaches Wheeling. More about that later.

First, the News-Register made a random survey to hear what heavy mail-users think about the postal service. The answers varied.

At Horne's, Fred Horne said the service "hasn't been what it used to be. It takes us much longer to get mail from other cities into Wheeling."

He said his firm has found it takes from three to six days to receive mail from New York. "You pay more and you get less and they still want to raise the rates," he said. "It's ridiculous!" he exclaimed.

On the other hand, Frank Cerutti, manager of King's Jewelry, said "we really haven't had too many problems."

He said the store receives two deliveries a day as do other business houses in the business district. "The New York mail is all right. We order things and get them in two or three days. I think that is pretty good. Only in a rare case is there a delay."

He left the interview for a moment to find the store's copy of the previous day's Wall

Street Journal. It had arrived at 10:30 a.m. that day. "I would say we have no complaints," the manager said.

Rudy Roth, who is in charge of the mailing department at Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp.'s Wheeling office said that, while he believes the federal setup of having mail from Pittsburgh go to Charleston and then sent back to Wheeling causes some delays, "we have what I consider normal service. We have got used to it. If something comes up that is out of line we make a call and it is straightened out quickly."

Roth, who is chairman of the Upper Ohio Valley Mail Users Council, says few complaints about service have been received from the members representing business and industry.

"I'm really amazed sometimes when I hear people tell how long it takes them to receive mail. I don't know what the story is."

He sorted through mail received that day and found out that letters mailed two days before had been received from such places as New York, Atlanta, Houston, Kansas City, Indianapolis, Richmond, South Hampton, Buffalo, Dayton and Chicago. "And all of them had been mailed in the evening after the close of the business day," he said. He even found mail that had been delivered in one day from Louisville and Columbus. "There is such a thing as overnight service," he commented.

Robert Levenson, president of Reichart's Furniture Co., said slow mail service is being encountered "all over the country."

"Some times we get very good service, while at other times it is bad," he said.

Levenson said he believes part of the trouble lies in other cities where "hard core" unemployed are being employed in post offices.

"I don't think our problem is the local post office," he said. "I think we have one of the best post offices in America."

Minter Bliss, head of the sales and merchandising department of Stone & Thomas said, "We don't have any more problems than in years past with first class mail." He said it takes about three days to receive a letter from New York.

"It has been that way for some time," he said.

Bliss said the handling of promotional mail by the post office "has been generally good. We have a feeling that the post office staff are very desirous of pleasing us if we have problems. They are very cooperative."

Bliss said Stone & Thomas would be happier if there were air freight service coming into Wheeling. He said the lack of fast air service in delivering special orders from New York and other cities hampers the store in giving top service to its customers at times.

At the Post Office, the last stop in the investigation, it didn't take Postmaster George Fahey long to reach the subject of Wheeling's lack of air service.

He winced when he said "we have air mail letters received here all day long and they don't go out of here until 9 o'clock at night." That's when a contract truck takes the day's receipt of airmail to Pittsburgh. When it leaves that city is questionable—probably some time the following day.

Fahey quickly pointed out that the Post Office Department is not responsible for the delay in air mail letters leaving here, or arriving here. There is no longer airline mail service coming into the Wheeling-Ohio County Airport.

But other than that, the Wheeling Post Office is a well-coordinated team effort to sort the mail quickly and get it on its way not only to residents in the city but to all other post offices in the Northern Panhandle.

Wheeling's Post Office is one of 15 sectional centers in West Virginia.

It is fed incoming mail primarily from the Charleston Post Office, a National Transportation Center.

It serves West Virginia and recently was rated the top center in the Washington-Baltimore Region.

Wheeling's Post Office is buzzing with activity early in the morning while the city sleeps.

About 2:30 a.m. a load of mail comes in from Pittsburgh carrying mail from points in Pennsylvania and contiguous states.

But somewhat later the "big load" comes in on a tractor-trailer carrying Panhandle mail received in Charleston and processed there at the rate of 360 first class letters a minute through a bank of machines that can outdistance human hands by many minutes—and minutes are what count in this profession.

When the big loads of mail are dumped out on sorting tables at the post office the "unknown" men hidden in the rear reaches of the building quickly go into action. They are the clerks who with sure hands and almost infallible memories begin putting the letters exactly where they should go. This is done at the top possible human speed because trucks are waiting at the docks.

Those trucks are driven up or down the Valley, their drivers seeing to it that the mail is delivered on time at post offices from Newell in the northern tip of the Panhandle to Proctor, just south of the Mason-Dixon line.

But, as Fahey and Superintendent of Mails Virgil Thompson admit, there are letters coming in here that were postmarked in some other city four, even five days earlier.

"There had to be a breakdown in service somewhere," said Fahey, and Thompson nodded in agreement.

Thompson put his finger on several possible causes.

"Some of the bigger offices haven't had the space or the money with which to expand to take care of the heavier volume of mail that has come about over the years. He pointed to the outmoded conditions in Chicago where mail is handled in a building about 12 stories high. The mail often has to be kept running back and forth between floors before it is finally processed.

"We don't have that problem," said Thompson, a 25-year veteran. Wheeling's modern post office at Twenty-fifth and Chapline streets is on one floor and is laid out for top efficiency.

Jammed-up traffic in New York plus a terrific turnover in personnel are contributory factors to slow mail in that city, the local officials believe.

The manpower problem in New York where postal workers receive less pay than garbage men is complicated by an average of 300 absentees a day for one reason or another.

New York is not alone. Postal workers don't last long on temporary jobs in California. They leave for greener pastures at a high rate—and the mail lies unattended. The turnover is 40 per cent a year in California.

Fahey doesn't have that problem. The turnover here is about three persons per year.

"These people are dedicated," the postmaster said of the workers who sort the mail and deliver it. "It's a team, all right. When one does the job right it is a pat on the back for all of us."

Then he added, "When a goofup occurs, it's a black eye for all of us."

#### WHY THE SLOW MAIL SERVICE?

Trying to find the reason for slow mail service here is not the easiest assignment a newsman can draw. News-Register Reporter Charles Callaway was the latest newsman to get this frustrating assignment and he turned up the usual reasons given to explain why it sometimes takes five days to get a letter from New York or Chicago to Wheeling.

For example, much of the mail coming into Pittsburgh for our area first is sent

to Charleston where the post office has been designated a National Transportation Center. Then it is hauled into Wheeling on a tractor-trailer where it is sorted for distribution to other post offices throughout the Northern Panhandle. Postal officials may argue that this is a more efficient operation but the trip from Pittsburgh to Charleston and back to Wheeling from our experience hasn't worked satisfactorily.

Other reasons for the breakdown in mail delivery service here as learned by Reporter Callaway include traffic jams in New York, outmoded post office conditions in Chicago and other cities, terrific turnover in personnel in the big city post office and high rates of absenteeism among postal employees in the larger cities.

Reporter Callaway did agree that his investigation showed that Wheeling's post office is not to blame for tardy mail delivery. He watched the postal employees at work here and reported they were very efficient in moving the mail out quickly. He noted also that in Wheeling the turnover of postal employees runs about three persons per year, thus we have the advantage of skilled workers on the job.

If it is any comfort to know, others around the country also are at wits' end trying to figure out what is happening to the mail service. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch bemoaned the other day that it took six days to deliver a letter from St. Louis to Pittsburgh. The newspaper said it is a base canard that mail between that city and Pittsburgh is carried by a little old man on a bicycle. "We are confident," the Post-Dispatch said, "that Postmaster Blount put our letter aboard a towboat as it passed under the Popular Street Bridge and sped it up the Ohio at 10 miles an hour."

Taking note of the expected rise in postal rates this spring the newspaper said that once Mr. Blount starts getting eight cents instead of six cents for a letter, he is going to investigate reports that faster means of transportation have been developed. We certainly hope so.

#### REVENUE SHARING ON SHAKY LEGS

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we in Washington think that we are the only ones who are concerned with complicated national issues, and that our constituents back home do not give much thought to such things as revenue sharing, budget deficits, and similar topics.

Recently, a reporter in my district, in a weekly newspaper column, commented with great insight and perception on the philosophical and financial fallacies in President Nixon's so-called revenue-sharing proposals.

Writing in the weekly Observer Newspaper, reporter Tim Richard analyzed the revenue-sharing idea and concluded that it "rests on a pair of fundamentally shaky legs."

I include a copy of the article in the RECORD at this point, and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### REVENUE SHARING ON SHAKY LEGS

The notion behind revenue sharing is a laudable one. The idea is to get more money into the coffers of state and local govern-

ments, which after all are closer to the people and satisfy most of our domestic needs.

The case for revenue sharing, however, rests on a pair of fundamentally shaky legs.

First, there's the false theory that the federal government has "pre-empted" the most productive tax of all, the graduated-rate income tax, and that the state-local units are doomed to fall behind because they have less productive sources of revenue.

The truth is that there's nothing in the U.S. Constitution restricting the graduated-rate income tax to federal use. The states and to some extent local units, are perfectly free to adopt it as their legislatures and voters see fit. If they fail to do so, that's not Washington's fault, and Washington shouldn't be accused of hogging all the money.

While this observer shares with the Nixons, the Millikens, the Rockefellers and that crowd that hopes that the state-local units be invigorated and strengthened, I don't think their getting a share of federal revenues is the way to do it.

Indeed, that would be an admission of failure. Revenue sharing would make our states not vigorous solvers of problems, but hollow shells, through which the juices of fiscal life would pass on the way from Capitol Hill.

The states should—and can—put their own houses in order. Michigan got halfway there financially under the 1963 constitution that has enabled us to multiply the aid to universities and local school districts, take many giant steps in mental health, do an impressive job of improving our recreational sources, and even begin granting aid to urban centers and public transportation. The job should be completed.

The second fault with revenue sharing is that it puts the responsibility of collecting the money at one level (the federal) and the fun of spending it at another (the state-local units).

The most fundamental law of economics is that our needs always outstrip our resources, that we never have enough money to do all we need to do, let alone want to do. Imagine the spectacle of state and local officials constantly concocting new schemes for spending it and hollering to Washington to put the squeeze on the taxpayer.

One thinks inevitably of the hippie who has rejected work and capitalism but is always hitting mom and pop for some "bread" so that he can travel across the country to a peace demonstration.

Our state and local units aren't like the unfortunates on ADC. If the state-local units want more tax money, let 'em face the voters themselves.

Those are the big arguments against revenue sharing. There are all sorts of little ones—e.g., it will perpetuate regressive state-local tax patterns, it will probably discriminate against some states (those things always do), and current federal controls on how aid is spent aren't all bad, and so on.

If, when our Vietnam adventure is over, we begin running surpluses at the federal level, we should do what Eisenhower did following the Korean war: cut federal taxes and let the state-local units raise theirs. It's a proven idea, and it won't subvert our entire federal-state-local system of government.

PERU, IND., CIRCUS CITY, U.S.A.

### HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, a city in my district, Peru, Ind., has long been known as the circus city of our Nation. For

years all the major circuses used Peru as their off-season quarters.

Many of the circus performers have become valued residents of this community and add a great deal of useful color to the Miami County town. The arts of acrobatics, juggling, high wire walking, and other skills are commonplace among Peru residents.

This Saturday, at 11 a.m., the National Broadcasting Co., will feature an hour long special on Peru. It is my hope that every Member of Congress will find time to watch this program.

I want to include a letter from John R. Nixon, president of the Peru, Ind., circus city festival and the request that my colleagues take the time to read this letter:

NIXON NEWSPAPERS, INC.,

WASBASH, IND., February 19, 1971.

Representative ELWOOD H. HILLIS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HILLIS: I write you, Senator Hartke and Senator Bayh as Executive Vice-President of the Peru, Indiana Circus City Festival and as a newspaper man who competes in the normal sense with television.

I am aware of the criticism given to the television industry for some of the industry's shortcomings.

By the same token I am aware of much of the fine work that television does.

I most urgently request that you and your congressional associates take the time to view the NBC program, Circus Town, at 11 a.m. EST, Saturday, February 27. We of Peru and Miami County consider this as television at its very finest.

It is an hour-long story about the amateur Circus City Festival and circus which we stage here each year.

I don't ask you to watch this because it is about Peru or its festival, necessarily, but because it is an extraordinary and extremely accurate capture by NBC of a unique effort undertaken annually by a small community.

I hope this letter might be included in the Congressional Record if it will be a means of encouraging people to see this most constructive effort by NBC.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. NIXON.

#### TRIUMPH: MANNED SPACE FLIGHTS

### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Americans have become somewhat cosmopolitan about their space program. The launchings of our Apollo missions have been fantastic achievements in technology and mark the highest scientific accomplishments in the history of man.

The Evening Star of Washington, D.C., published an editorial on February 10, 1971, which points out most vividly my personal feelings about the value of the manned space flights.

Apollo 13 and Apollo 14 were triumphs of man's ingenuity and his ability to cope with technical problems which would have ended unmanned flights in utter failure.

The editorial follows:



## TRIUMPH—THE HARD WAY

The Apollo 14 moon mission, which ended yesterday with a fiery plunge through the atmosphere and a gentle drop into the South Pacific, will go into the record book as a triumphant vindication of manned space exploration.

Surely it was a triumph. The observations of the moon-workers during their two long lunar outings, the bags of moon matter they collected, the battery of scientific experiments they left in place, will contribute more to man's knowledge about the moon and the earth than all the centuries of theorizing have produced. But it was a triumph made the hard way.

Apollo 14 was a succession of technological failures and mechanical problems adding up to a spectacular man-made success. There was the docking problem on the way to the moon. There was the indication of an electrical problem in the lunar lander, the brief failure of the landing radar, the problem with Alan Shepard's portable radio, the evidence of a slow leak in Edgar Mitchell's moon suit. And there was the final, disappointing pullback short of the Cone Crater rim after a two-hour struggle up the boulder-strewn slopes.

All of those problems, including the turn-back from Cone Crater necessitated by the limited oxygen supply, were caused by technological hitches. In every case, disaster was averted and the mission salvaged by human ingenuity, guesswork and luck. The result was the successful completion of the first major scientific exploration of the moon.

The flight of Apollo 14 is certain to rekindle the debate over manned versus unmanned space exploration and over the relative merits of the Russian and the American routes into space. The Soviet Union and the United States seem determined to argue, even when no valid argument exists. The Apollo program has demonstrated, beyond any reasonable doubt, the value of putting man's flexible intelligence on the spot. The small sample of lunar material returned to earth by Lunar 16 and the sporadic automated wanderings of the Lunar 17 vehicle cannot be compared to the wealth of information, material and continuing data gained from a single Apollo landing. The landing by the Soviets of an instrument package on Venus, on the other hand, has

provided the only direct knowledge man possesses about the forbidding planets that share the sun with us.

The resolution of the argument is obvious: Both methods are valid. For the present, only the moon is within man's grasp and should be explored for the information it can reveal about the origin of the solar system. The Soviets have demonstrated the practicality of instrumented landings on those regions that still lie beyond man's physical reach. Both countries should continue their work in space. And both should move to end the pointless and expensive rivalry, to begin an era of cooperation so that all knowledge can be fully shared and every achievement can be hailed in the name of all mankind, to whom it belongs.

## SHOE IMPORTS CONTINUE TO INCREASE

## HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, for still another year footwear imports have increased at an alarming rate. The American Footwear Manufacturers Association reports in the following tables that during 1970 shoe imports increased 27.8 percent over the 1969 level.

This unregulated dumping of foreign imports continues to cost American workers their jobs. In my State of New Hampshire first quarter 1970 employment in the shoe and textile industries was down some 4,000, representing a wage loss of over \$2 million. And that is just one small State. The loss to the entire country is staggering.

We cannot continue to subsidize dollar-a-day wages abroad at the expense of the livelihood of thousands of American workers and their families. I urge prompt consideration of orderly marketing legislation, such as my bill, H.R. 4276,

which passed the House and is similar to the Mills bill of last year but without disc or oil import concessions. The time is approaching when we will have no shoe or textile industries left to protect without reasonable restrictions on imports.

## AMERICAN FOOTWEAR MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, New York, N.Y., February 5, 1971.

IMPORTS: JANUARY-DECEMBER 1970 NONRUBBER FOOTWEAR TOTALLED 235 MILLION PAIRS

With 19,730,800 pairs of nonrubber footwear imported into this country in December, the year of 1970 totaled 235,583,600 pairs—a 20.4% increase over 1969. The f.o.b. value of this footwear amounted to \$549,140,500 for the year representing a 27.8% increase over last year. At the wholesale level the value was estimated to be worth \$889,607,610 which ultimately means that at the retail level the American market absorbed more than \$1,779,200,000 worth of nonrubber imported footwear in 1970.

Following is a summary by major types and by principal sources comparing 1970 with 1969.

## TYPE OF FOOTWEAR

	1970 (thousand pairs)	1969 (thousand pairs)	Percent change, 1970/1969
Men's, boys' leather.....	33,463	28,974	+15.5
Men's, boys' vinyl.....	16,264	9,744	+66.9
Women's, misses' leather.....	75,941	59,658	+27.3
Women's, misses' vinyl.....	77,288	70,777	+9.2
Children's, infants' leather.....	6,743	5,151	+30.9
Children's, infants' vinyl.....	8,347	8,111	+2.9

## MAJOR SOURCES (10 LARGEST)

	1970 (thousand pairs)	1969 (thousand pairs)	Percent change, 1970/1969
Italy.....	80,035	60,535	+32.2
Japan.....	57,630	63,463	-9.2
Taiwan.....	40,414	24,320	+66.2
Spain.....	21,130	20,690	+2.1
Hong Kong.....	4,562	3,356	+35.9
Mexico.....	3,836	2,396	+60.1
France.....	3,061	2,509	+22.0
India.....	2,921	2,096	+39.4
United Kingdom.....	2,759	3,117	-11.5
West Germany.....	2,744	1,923	+42.7

## IMPORTS BULLETIN—TOTAL IMPORTS OF OVER-THE-FOOT FOOTWEAR

Type of footwear	December 1970 pairs (thousands)	1970/1969 (percent)	12 months, 1970			Percent change, 1970/1969	
			Pairs (thousands)	Value (thousands)	Average value per pair	Pairs	Value
Leather and vinyl, total.....	18,856.1	+26.2	223,437.4	\$531,643.5	\$2.38	+19.2	+26.6
Leather, excluding slippers.....	10,711.2	+45.0	119,640.0	427,535.4	3.57	+24.0	+24.2
Men's, youths', boys'.....	2,966.5	+34.8	33,463.1	151,493.9	4.53	+15.6	+19.1
Women's, misses'.....	6,786.5	+46.5	75,941.2	252,661.1	3.33	+27.3	+29.5
Children's, infants'.....	639.7	+61.9	6,743.1	10,202.8	1.51	+30.9	+24.4
Moccasins.....	38.4	+11.3	535.9	616.5	1.15	-14.1	-18.1
Other leather (including work and athletic).....	280.1	+125.3	2,956.7	12,561.1	4.25	+39.3	-3.1
Slippers.....	34.1	+107.9	312.7	808.3	2.58	-12.4	+5.3
Vinyl supported uppers.....	8,110.8	+7.6	103,484.7	103,299.8	1.00	+14.3	+38.1
Men's and boys'.....	1,330.3	+55.6	16,264.4	21,589.7	1.33	+66.9	+75.6
Women's and misses'.....	6,109.5	+2.9	77,288.2	73,756.5	.95	+8.9	+32.1
Children's and infants'.....	596.9	-11.1	8,346.9	6,835.4	.82	+2.9	+18.8
Soft soles.....	74.1	-0.1	1,585.2	1,118.2	.71	-7.7	+22.3
Other nonrubber types, total.....	874.7	-0.9	12,146.2	17,497.0	1.44	+46.7	+80.6
Wood.....	203.9	-36.3	3,891.7	9,958.3	2.56	+155.3	+162.7
Fabric uppers.....	605.9	+15.4	7,255.6	6,073.3	.84	+23.2	+28.8
Other, not elsewhere specified.....	64.9	+75.4	998.9	1,465.4	1.47	+15.0	+24.3
Nonrubber footwear, total.....	19,730.8	+24.7	235,583.6	549,140.5	2.33	+20.4	+27.8
Rubber soled fabric uppers.....	4,495.2	+35.1	47,806.8	45,097.9	.94	+7.4	+35.8
Grand total, all types.....	24,226.0	+26.5	283,390.4	591,819.1	2.09	+18.0	+27.9

Note: Details may not add up due to rounding. Figures do not include imports of waterproof rubber footwear, zories, and slipper socks. Rubber soled fabric upper footwear includes non-American selling price types.

Source: American Footwear Manufacturers Association estimates from census raw data. For further detailed information, address your inquiries to the association, room 302, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

**"HUCK" BOYD RECEIVES W. A. WHITE AWARD****HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, in rural and smalltown America, we are especially aware of the vital role our community newspapers play in providing community leadership, informing the people, and perhaps most important in being the conscience of a community. I am proud to say that in the "Big First" District of Kansas, our editors and news directors not only report the news but are actually a vital part of the community.

Kansas enjoys this kind of "grass-roots" journalism at its best. For years, Kansas has had a proud tradition of newspaper editors second to none and exemplified by the famous William Allen White. Mr. White, the editor of the Emporia Gazette, was a smalltown newspaperman whose commonsense and down-to-earth editorials received world-wide attention.

This year, McDill "Huck" Boyd, editor and publisher of the Phillips County Review of Phillipsburg, Kans., received the William Allen White Foundation's Kansas Award for Journalistic Merit. This is an honor held in high esteem by every newspaperman. Huck Boyd is more than worthy of this honor. Like most outstanding newspaper editors, Huck's contributions to his community, his State, and Nation cannot be measured only in newspaper terms. His record of selfless public service stands as an example for the "William Allen Whites" of the future.

As Huck Boyd's friend and admirer, I am most proud to commend the following Associated Press article from the February 10 edition of the Salina Journal to the attention of my colleagues and that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks:

**"HUCK" BOYD RECEIVES W. A. WHITE AWARD**

LAWRENCE, KANS.—McDill "Huck" Boyd of Phillipsburg received the William Allen White Foundation's Kansas Award for Journalistic Merit today and was lauded as a man who is "living proof that everyone does not have to go to the city to become successful."

The presentation, at the foundation's meeting held each year on the birthday of the late William Allen White, editor of the Emporia Gazette, was made by Henry B. Jameson, editor and publisher of the Abilene Reflector-Chronicle.

Boyd's mother, Mrs. Mamie Boyd of Mankato, received the foundation's award in 1967.

Boyd is editor and publisher of the Phillips County Review and a member of a family that operates newspapers at eight places in Kansas. He is a Republican national committeeman from Kansas and is a former member and chairman of the Kansas Board of Regents.

Jameson referred to Boyd's "many and varied accomplishments" and described him as a man who is "indeed a credit to the profession of journalism."

"Our citiee today is a past president of the Kansas Press Association, has received other newspaper honors and held numerous other high offices," he said.

Jameson recalled that Boyd was named by the Republican national committee to be in charge of the Midwest regional GOP conference at Des Moines a year ago, and added:

"Just last summer, he brought great credit and honor to the United States, and to Kansas, as a lay member delegate to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. This was a presidential appointment, the same chair once held by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The council met in Geneva, Switzerland, for a month or more."

Jameson said that while at the meeting, Boyd "did not forget he is a newspaperman, first" and wrote a series of articles on the conference.

"Officials thought they were so good they were then compiled into pamphlet form for further distribution," Jameson said.

Accepting the award, Boyd said he learned a simple creed from his parents—"You worked hard, you paid your bills and you never forget that your newspaper was a show window for your community."

"I have enjoyed my political experience—the disappointments, the failures, the successes," he said. "I am proud of the friends I have made, and do not begrudge one minute of my affliction."

"But in retrospect, I am not too sure that a newspaperman should become this closely involved in politics. It becomes most difficult to remain objective. I can easily see the good points of a Bob Dole or a Jim Pearson (Republican senators) but (Democratic Gov.) Bob Docking's admirable traits are more obscure. I can find many fine things to write about our senators, but acknowledge some difficulty in accepting at face value the Docking version of an inflated state budget."

"I am careful, however, to editorialize on the editorial page, and to treat both parties equally in our news columns."

**RESOLUTION OF SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL****HON. PHILLIP BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, recently the San Francisco Labor Council passed a resolution directed to the Congress and I feel that it is important that it be inserted in our RECORD so all Members may be aware of it.

I include the article as follows:

**RESOLUTION**

Whereas, the time has come for the Labor Movement and all working people to denounce prejudiced conduct and penalties imposed by the courts and by the National Labor Relations Board, and

Whereas, in such situations as the present Independent-Journal labor dispute in San Rafael, the institutions and courts of this country are increasingly being used as partners of management against laboring men and women, their organizations and representatives, and

Whereas, we charge the Superior Court in San Rafael, at the instigation of a reactionary National Labor Relations Board, with interfering with Labor's rights to engage in free speech and to picket and to protest against an evil employer who refuses to accept Labor's offer to mediate or arbitrate an amicable solution to a lengthy dispute, and

Whereas, decent and responsible labor leaders with long records of participation in mediation, conciliation and other means of promoting industrial peace in this San Francisco Bay Area have been sent to jail in an un-

precedented demonstration of pro-management bias, and

Whereas, a review of the facts in this case indicate a reprehensible viewpoint on the part of the Judge and the NLRB that we can only believe constitutes anti-labor conducts which must have been militated by conflict of interest

Be it therefore resolved, that the San Francisco Labor Council, in session assembled this 8th day of February, 1971, does call upon the State Bar of California and upon our legislative delegates in the Congress and in the State Legislature to thoroughly examine and evaluate the actions and motives of these purported public servants in their reprehensible activities and demonstrations of anti-labor bias and to initiate needed and necessary corrections.

Adopted by the San Francisco Labor Council at meeting of February 8, 1971.

**THE PANTHERS, THE POLICE, AND THE PRESS****HON. ROBERT MCCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, no area of legislation has received more thoughtful and more soul-searching consideration than that affecting civil rights. The tensions which have developed from time to time resulting in militant and sometimes violent action evidence the deep-seated nature of this problem.

Straightforward and honest delineation of the problem is essential. In addition, progress (a) in reducing prejudice and (b) in expanding educational and job opportunities deserves public notice and appropriate coverage by the news media.

The inexcusable disservice to the entire cause of civil rights by the leveling false charges against our Nation's police—and the irresponsible and inflammatory repetition of the false claim that our Nation's police "had shot to death 28 members of the Black Panther Party" require both a full airing and an appropriate repudiation by both the news media and those prominent individuals who have echoed this vicious and false charge.

The informative and responsible editorial which appeared in the Sunday, February 21, issue of the Washington Sunday Star elaborates on this subject and represents the kind of journalistic and leadership soul-searching which must be carried on if true and honest civil rights progress is to be achieved.

I congratulate the editors of the Sunday Star, and I commend to my colleagues and to the people of the Nation this thoughtful and illuminating article which suggests the strong need for responsible and factually accurate reporting. Only in this way can the wounds inflicted during our centuries of racial prejudice be assuaged—and genuine progress toward brotherhood, mutual understanding, and racial equality be achieved.

The editorial follows:

**THE PANTHERS, THE POLICE, AND THE PRESS**

Rumors are to the newspaperman what weeds are to the farmer.



Unwanted seeds, falling on the fertile soil of preconditioned public opinion, take hold, spread and threaten to choke out the truth. It is the duty of the newsman to identify the falsehood and to uproot it before it becomes firmly implanted. It is a duty that is not always fulfilled. There is, for example, the matter of the Black Panthers and the police vendetta.

On December 4, 1969, the Chicago police staged a pre-dawn raid on the Illinois headquarters of the Black Panther Party in a search, according to their warrant, for illegal weapons. The Panthers' state chairman, Fred Hampton, and a party member, Mark Clark, were shot to death. Four of the seven other Panthers present and one member of the 13-man police raiding party were wounded. Less than a week later, three Panthers were seriously wounded in a similar raid on the Los Angeles headquarters.

The press dutifully reported the facts and quite properly started asking some questions. Was the similarity between the raids a coincidence, or did it indicate a federally orchestrated assault on an organization that preaches race hatred and revolution? Was the gunfire a justified response, or was it an inexcusable use of police power? Had the Panthers, in fact, been marked for extermination?

In the prolonged journalistic debate that followed, one very specific item of information was repeated time and again. The police, it was said, had shot to death 28 members of the Black Panther Party. The figure appeared in news stories, columns and editorials, sometimes qualified by attribution to Panther sources, sometimes stated simply as a fact. But, in effect, the press accepted the figure as a fact, contributing to the growing suspicion that the Panthers were the victims of police persecution.

Now we know that the debate was unnecessary, that the figure was a phoney, and that the press as a whole failed in an important part of its job. We know because of an article in *The New Yorker*, a magazine noted for its wit and its literary quality, written by Edward Jay Epstein, who is teaching fellow at Harvard working for a Ph.D. in political science.

The original source of the figure was readily identifiable. Charles R. Garry, the chief lawyer and frequent spokesman for the Black Panthers, was interviewed shortly after the Chicago and Los Angeles raids. Hampton and Clark, he announced were "in fact the 27th and 28th Panthers murdered by the police" within the year. There was, he said, "a national scheme by various agencies of the government to destroy and commit genocide upon members of the Black Panther Party."

That quotation, Epstein notes, was widely reported. So it should have been. The statements and opinions of a recognized spokesman for the Panthers constituted a legitimate part of a major news story. But within the week, Epstein discovered, two journalistic giants—the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*—had reported that figure as a fact, without attribution or qualification. The first assertion that 28 Panthers had been killed by police during 1969 was, Epstein said, sent by those two newspapers to hundreds of clients of their wire services. Civil rights leaders, on the basis of the stories, took up the cry: Roy Innes of the Congress of Racial Equality demanded an investigation into "the death of 28 Black Panther members"; Whitney Young of the National Urban League spoke of the "nearly 30 Panthers . . . murdered by law-enforcement officials"; Ralph Abernathy of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference talked about "a calculated design of genocide"; Julian Bond of the Georgia State Legislature said that the Panthers "are being decimated by political assassination."

The rumor—or, more properly, the flat mis-

statement of fact—began to fatten on itself. The newspapers now could quote those civil rights leaders (who were commenting on the press statements), lending still more credence to the picture of wanton police murder and widespread guerrilla warfare in the streets of the inner cities.

There were some attempts to verify the facts and some questioning of the Garry figures, primarily by individual columnists. James J. Kilpatrick, in a column that appeared eight months ago, challenged the Garry figure and suggested that a top investigative reporter should be assigned to digging out the truth.

But no major newspaper, it seems, did what Epstein did. None of us asked Garry just who those 28 victims were. And so none of us found out, as Epstein did, that the Garry indictment was a work of fiction.

When Epstein asked for the names, Garry amended the total number of victims to 20. Of these, 19 were actually members of the Black Panther Party. Nine of these were killed by non-policemen: One by a store owner during a holdup, one by his wife, one died in a shootout with an acquaintance, four were killed by a rival black-militant organization, one—according to three confessions—was tortured and killed by fellow Panthers, one was shot by an unknown gunman using a foreign-made pistol that was not a police weapon.

That leaves 10 Panthers who were, in fact, shot to death by police. Six of these, Epstein's investigation disclosed, were killed by policemen who had been seriously wounded by those they subsequently killed, or by an accomplice. Two were shot after threatening the police with a gun. One was shot while running from the scene of a gun battle in which three policemen were wounded. One—Fred Hampton—was killed in what must, on the basis of the official inquiries into the case, be termed unnecessary, uncontrolled and unjustified police gunfire.

A reading of Epstein's documented indictment of the press led, as might be expected, to a quick check of *The Star* files. We had, it developed, avoided the obvious trap. The figure of 28 police killings was, in observance of the first law of cautious journalism, always attributed to Garry or to a Panther spokesman. Our first instinct was to congratulate ourselves for being less embarrassed than our competitors on the Post, who ran a forthright editorial last Friday confessing their error. We were technically clean.

But, in this case, technical cleanliness is not enough. The ritual handwashing of attribution may suffice the first time a statement is reported. But when the statement is repeated, as it was in *The Star*, more than a dozen times over the course of a year, the covering phrases just won't do. The failure to check a statement so shocking in its implications from so obviously biased a source was a cardinal sin of omission. Indeed our own measure of blame is increased by the fact that Kilpatrick, in his column of June 18, had cited many of the facts later verified by Epstein's research—including the conclusion that the Chicago shootout was the only case of suspect police action. Kilpatrick's column appears in *The Star*, and is distributed by *The Star* syndicate.

But we failed to take the hint and went on repeating the lie. And the repetition, even with the qualifying clichés, must be counted as a contribution to the climate of uncertainty and fear in a society that was already dangerously divided. It fed the myth that the Panthers are the targets of a police vendetta—a myth that has, with the passage of time, become a fixed part of American thinking, and that has contributed to the distorted picture of the police in the minds of much of this country's youth, both black and white.

Garry has been frank about his role in the affair. He picked the figure 28, he said, because "it seemed to be a safe number." He was, he said, justified in using any figure, however inflated, if it focused attention on even one improper killing of a Panther by police.

Epstein tends to clear Garry of blame for the fiasco. "I think a lawyer has a license to exaggerate," he said. "It's the press that should be suspect of Garry."

Epstein is correct—at least in his condemnation of the press. We should have learned to suspect the casual statistic from the bitter history of Senator Joseph McCarthy, who transformed the numbers game into an impure art.

The charge is justified. The plea is guilty. The pledge is to sharpen the instinct for skepticism that is the first requirement of responsible journalism.

## NEW MEXICO'S WINNING ESSAY IN THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is the winning essay in the State of New Mexico in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. It was written by Miss Arlene Brown, a student at Los Alamos High School and I think her essay represents the true spirit of America. We can all be proud of Arlene.

The essay follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST BY MISS ARLENE BROWN

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

If you happened to come upon a person, standing on a street corner and holding a petition containing these words, would you sign it? This is exactly what happened in a recent poll taken by a prominent magazine. The results were startling. Of the hundreds of people questioned in the poll, one in fifty agreed to sign the petition. Nineteen called it a Communist plot, three threatened to call the police, four refused to sign, and the rest simply didn't have the time to even read it. I say the results were startling because the so-called petition was, of course, the preamble to our own Declaration of Independence.

Two hundred years ago our "Founding Fathers" fought a war in order to establish a new form of government based on the principles of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press. In order that this might truly be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, they laid the foundation for a free education for all citizens. Their philosophy was, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." Today, thanks to our universal, free educational system, the United States has one of the highest literacy rates in the world. But just because our citizens can read and write does not necessarily mean that we are educated. The magazine poll shows that.

We here in the United States have inherited the greatest gift of all—freedom. We

are free to formulate and express our own opinions about anything and everything. We are also free to express our ignorance, as the magazine poll also shows. Unfortunately, too many of us are perfectly contented with our ignorance and never stop to ask questions. We are like the Scotty in James Thurber's fable, "The Scotty who Knew too Much."

"Several summers ago there was a Scotty who went to the country for a visit. He decided that all the farm dogs were cowards, because they were afraid of a certain animal that had a white stripe down its back. 'I can lick the little animal with the white stripe,' he boasted. 'Show him to me.' 'Don't you want to ask any questions about him?' said the farm dog. 'Now,' said the Scotty. 'You ask the questions.'

"So the farm dog took the Scotty into the woods and showed him the white-striped animal and the Scotty closed in on him, growling and slashing. It was all over in a moment and the Scotty lay on his back. When he came to, the Scotty said, 'He threw vitriol, but he never laid a glove on me.'

"A few days later the farm dog told the Scotty there was another animal all the farm dogs were afraid of. 'Lead me to him,' said the Scotty. 'Don't you want to ask any questions about him?' said the farm dog. 'Now,' said the Scotty. . . and he closed in, leading with his left and exhibiting some mighty fancy footwork. In less than a second the Scotty was flat on his back, and when he woke up the farm dog was pulling quills out of him. 'He pulled a knife on me,' said the Scotty, 'but at least I have learned how you fight out here in the country, and now I am going to beat you up.' So he closed in on the farm dog, holding his nose with one front paw to ward off the vitriol and covering his eyes with the other front paw to keep out the knives. The Scotty couldn't see his opponent and he couldn't smell his opponent and he was so badly beaten that he had to be taken back to the city and put in a nursing home.

"Moral: It is better to ask some of the questions than to know all the answers."

We need to apply the same moral to ourselves. We need to ask ourselves a few questions. Why is it that we Americans claim to be educated, but so few of us know anything about our heritage of freedom?

Why is it that of us educated Americans only one in fifty would agree to sign the Declaration of Independence—one of the three documents which guarantees us our heritage of freedom?

Why is it that fewer than one in fifty of us even recognizes the Declaration of Independence when we read it?

And most importantly, what can we Americans, as a nation, do to correct the situation?

Because if we don't correct the situation we'll find ourselves in the same situation as the Scotty. That is, we'll be fighting to preserve our heritage of freedom with one hand covering our nose and the other hand covering our eyes. As the Scotty found out, it can't be done. Thomas Jefferson's words keep echoing back from the past. "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

## VITAL HO TRAIL RIVALS THAT OF GREAT HANNIBAL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Plain Dealer readers are indebted to that outstanding journalist, George J. Barmann, for his consistently excellent reporting,

most recently a concise and excellent description of the Ho Chi Minh Trail. He has written one of the best articles I have seen in the public news media on this critical supply artery and I want to share it not only with my colleagues in the Congress but with the widespread readership the RECORD enjoys:

### VITAL HO TRAIL RIVALS THAT OF GREAT HANNIBAL

(By George J. Barmann)

In the Second Punic War (218-201 B.C.), between Rome and Carthage, the great general of antiquity, Hannibal, marched his forces up through Spain and crossed the Alps "to arrest the destiny of Rome."

The Romans controlled the sea, and Hannibal decided on the overland route, taking battle elephants across incredibly rough terrain. Imagine the astonishment of the Romans as he suddenly appeared on the plains of northern Italy!

In the war in Indochina (1946 —), the longest war of the 20th century, which involved first France and then, after 1954, America, the North Vietnamese have managed to build a series of amazing jungle routes to supply the fighting in the south.

The United States controlled the sea, and the enemy, who first used a water route, had to abandon it. So the jungle line grew in savage mountain country. When U.S. pilots first discovered it and saw whole columns of trucks rolling south, they were as astounded as those Romans.

"None of the American generals believed the Reds could build this kind of highway undetected in the jungle," a Frenchman said some time ago in Vientiane, the dusty administrative capital of the kingdom of Laos. "No one knows to this day how they did it," he said. "But there it is."

This is the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

In World War II, there was the Burma Road, over which Allied supplies flowed to China.

Now, in this endless war in Indochina in the panhandle of Laos, a gentle little landlocked country—but a tremendously important little country in Southeast Asia—there is the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

South Vietnamese soldiers, backed by American aircraft, have moved into Laos and, according to reports from Washington and Saigon, have blocked a section of the trail network, cutting off some of the flow of enemy troops and supplies to the south.

It is said that the operation, known as Lam Son 719—the name of an area where the Vietnamese won a decisive victory over the Chinese in the 17th century—involved an estimated 15,000 combat troops from South Vietnam.

The operation in South Vietnam—until it reached the Laos border—involved 9,000 American troops. But Americans have been forbidden to cross that border—the help to Saigon comes from furious U.S. bombing of the trail. By agreement, no foreign troops can cross.

What is this Ho Chi Minh Trail?

First of all, it is not a trail.

It is a network.

It's a trail in the same sense that Lake Erie is a river.

It is a series of roads of mostly dirt, jungle paths, river crossings, bridges, streams, pipelines and tunnels. Some of the roads are gravel surfaced with timber corduroy topping. Width is generally about 10 feet.

A U.S. Air Force officer once described it this way: "It is a spider web and another spider web lying on top of it and another and another."

On a detailed map of this area in Laos, the road network, in the last three years or so, has grown to resemble the Los Angeles freeway system. Except that you don't

have signs saying, "Glendale. Next five exits," and it is not so comfortable to ride.

One military man said the trail had absorbed more bombing from the air than Nazi Germany did in World War II.

Still, it's there. In the thick jungle shrouding the red earth. In trackless barely explored country. In mountains that go as high as 6,000 feet. In the rain forests. Under a maze of natural vegetation and clever camouflage.

A few days ago, after troops cut across the trail, the South Vietnamese opened about a mile of it for inspection to western correspondents. It turned out to have painted traffic signs and a lattice work roof covered with camouflaging vegetation.

In places, the newsmen said, the concealment gave the impression of a roof garden.

Part of the system they saw led into three circular supply depots. A sign in red paint on a rough wooden board said, "Dong Ra," an exit. Another sign warned workers not to loiter, but to unload quickly and move on. Another directed them to food and rest.

In one of the searched areas, military spokesmen said, South Vietnamese troops found 2,000 chickens, ducks and cooking pots.

How long the Ho Chi Minh Trail is depends upon who measures it. And measuring it is difficult.

One source said the trail runs 200 to 300 miles and is 30 or more miles wide.

Another put the serviceable network at 1,500 miles, including at least three north-south routes and connecting links.

Still another totals the jungle arteries at 6,000 miles.

An Austrian writer, Kuno Knoeb, in a book called "Victor Charlie," said, without qualification: "The total length of the paths, trails and roads, collectively described as the Ho Chi Minh Trail is greater than 12,500 miles."

He said the trail "runs through a territory that stretches from the Chinese frontier to Cambodia." Of course, the trail was not used nearly so much in the days when the French were fighting there because that war was going on largely in the north.

"It is impossible to control this enormous, almost unpopulated area for long with ground troops," he wrote, "unless whole armies are deployed."

"Paratroopers could seize sections of the trail, destroy them or control them for a while. Yet, a few miles from their area of operations, behind the next mountain ridge or through the next ravine, there is possibly another trail running south, and patrolling forces may not even know of its existence."

"It is impossible to make combat contact with Communist troops on the trail; an attack force could wander for weeks through the jungle without actually coming across a single enemy soldier."

The full extent of this system—which, like the war itself, is constantly shifting—may not be known for some time.

Hanoi operates freely in this mountainous panhandle area of the kingdom of Laos. This area is controlled by the Pathet Lao, which means "Free Laos." The Pathet Lao has been mainly interested in keeping the troops of the Laotian government in check, but the Pathet Lao is a Communist regime and, therefore, works closely with the North Vietnamese.

Laos is in the heart of Southeast Asia. It is the keystone of the entire peninsula.

Laos was carved out of the French Indochina empire. It is small, having a population (there never has been a census) of about 2.5 million. North Vietnam's population is 19 million. South Vietnam is 17 million.

If you look at the map of Southeast Asia you see at once the strategic position of Laos—it borders on every nation of the area:



Burma, China, North Vietnam, Cambodia, South Vietnam and Thailand.

In this country, which is about the size of Britain, the principal cash crop is opium, legal opium. The airlines there, such as they are, have been known collectively, because of their cargo, as "Air Opium." Vientiane has become a bit of a hippie haven recently.

A strange country it is—it doesn't have a single mile of railroad track, but they used gunpowder rockets 300 years before Cape Kennedy. And in Vientiane you can buy French wine in flip-top aluminum cans.

The Ho Chi Minh Trail was named by the French, back in those days when they were still unaware that, figuratively, it was going to take them right back where they came from, Paris.

Ho Chi Minh became the president of North Vietnam. Sometimes he was known as "Uncle Ho." He died in September 1969.

In North Vietnam, the name for the trail is Duong Tuyen Dau, which means "the road to the front."

But whatever they call it, the Ho trail does not show up on standard U.S. military maps of eastern Laos, the Associated Press finds.

Scattered throughout the maze of alternate routes are uncounted depots and transfer points where weapons, ammunition, food and other supplies are unloaded and redistributed for shipment toward the Vietnam border or reloaded for the continuing trip south.

There are also hospitals along the route. And the North Vietnamese have also built a pipeline of undisclosed length through the mountains from their country into Laos. The line carries oil. About a dozen waterways are used to float barrels and waterproof bags south. Sometimes pilots have fired bursts at these barrels and bags.

At one place, a river crossing, the Reds built a bridge with the roadway a few inches below the surface of the water, making it almost impossible to detect from the air.

Even bomb craters are often utilized by the ingenious North Vietnamese. Supplies are sometimes put into the craters and covered with netting and a thin layer of soil and foliage, another indication of the enemy's masterful use of concealment.

Until recently, according to the AP, major enemy ground units were not needed to defend the mountain trail system. The North Vietnamese positioned hundreds of sophisticated antiaircraft weapons along the ridges, along with radar, and built bunkers as much as 10 feet thick to protect the gunners from U.S. bombs and rockets.

U.S. fighter-bombers roam over the trail and the B52 strategic bombers hammer the entry points from North Vietnam day and night. Supersecret B57 bombers and C119 and C130 gunships, with special electronic equipment to peer through the night skies, range across the trails at night.

A type of sensor device, which is dropped by parachute, registers and records sounds of the movement of people and vehicles—a voice or one footstep. The data are stored and planes fly over and collect the information by electronics and send it to computers in Thailand, which then report on the locations of convoys and troops.

Penetration bombs are dropped on underground fuel lines. Combat aircraft drop mines into the numerous navigable waterways.

Between 300 and 400 combat aircraft have been in action over the trail every day—probably many more now that the South Vietnamese offensive against the trail is under way.

Intelligence sources say North Vietnam has a fleet of about 5,000 trucks. Most of them are Zils, which are Russian; they are similar to the American Ford truck. A single truck rarely makes the full run on the trail. Instead, there is a system of transfers

from point to point, with these gray-green trucks, bicycles, oxcarts and human backs all bearing the burdens of war. Even elephants, reminders of Hannibal, are often used.

As many as 20 transfers may take place on the trail. For instance, a box of ammunition may move on one truck at night. It goes eight miles. Then it pulls into one of the camouflaged parks and unloads. The next day another truck takes the box over, moving it on to another point, and so on. Because of the bombings, most of this driving is done at night.

One source said there are about 1,500 of these truck parks and storage areas along the trail. And there are also dummy trucks to fool pilots.

The first transports from the north started as far back as 1959. They used old colonial routes and paths through the mountains and the jungles. As noted, the trail played a lesser role back in those days; it grew to increasing importance as the fighting in the South became more intense.

Maintaining the Ho Chi Minh Trail is a back-breaking job any time of the year.

When a portion of the road is knocked out by bombs, an army of "ants," workers with shovels, hoes and picks and wicker baskets and small wheelbarrows, work frantically and silently to make the repairs.

An estimate some time ago said that about 75,000 persons work on the network, including a coolie force of Laotian tribesmen and villagers. During the wet season, which is May to October, rains wash out roads and floods them. Again the coolies and the tribesmen, called the montagnards, who build their bamboo huts in a circle to ward off evil spirits, go to work.

Now, with the South Vietnamese cutting into Laos and swarming astride the Ho Chi Minh Trail, watching from the dark palms and the blue-green elephant grass, a decisive moment of the war may be at hand.

The premier of Laos, Prince Souvanna Phouma, has said: "If Hanoi loses the Ho Chi Minh Trail, they would lose the war in a few weeks."

But then, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who is now army chief of staff in Washington, once was quoted as saying: "There is very little, almost nothing, we can do about the Ho Chi Minh Trail."

A curious war in a strange setting, with elephants completing the bizarre scene—and the guns never tiring.

#### CONGRESSMAN McCLORY REPRESENTS PRESIDENT NIXON AT LINCOLN MEMORIAL

#### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Illinois, Mr. McClory, represented the President of the United States on February 12 at the Lincoln Day ceremony at the Lincoln Memorial. To select Congressman McClory, a native son of the State of Illinois—the "Land of Lincoln"—and the president of the Illinois State Society, was a logical choice, and his assignment was carried out with poise and dignity.

Accompanied by Maj. Gen. Roland Gleszer, commanding officer of the Military District of Washington, Mr. McClory laid a wreath—on behalf of the President—at the foot of the Lincoln statue.

Following an introduction by Mr. Fred Hunt, president of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion—descendants of Civil War veterans—Mr. McClory spoke briefly in these words:

#### REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN McCLORY

On this occasion of calm reflection in respect to the memory and the unique greatness of Abraham Lincoln, it is entirely appropriate that we should gather here together at this historic shrine and pay tribute not alone to Abraham Lincoln's memory but also the principles which he courageously embraced in holding our turbulent and restless Nation together, and in directing our path toward understanding and compassion, one for the other, to the end that we might achieve both material and spiritual greatness.

President Nixon, whom I have the privilege to represent, declared in his Lincoln's birthday message:

"As we observe the anniversary of his birth . . . we think again about the principles he observed and how they can be implemented in our time."

"Lincoln knew that free people and open opportunities were the driving force of America: Today we must protect individual freedom and expand individual opportunity . . ."

On an earlier occasion, President Nixon declared:

"I believe that a nation, like a person, has a spirit."

"I believe that a national spirit comes to the fore in times of national crisis."

"I believe that each time a national spirit makes itself felt, it speaks to its own time with a different message directed to the problems of that time."

President Nixon now occupies the same Executive Mansion where Lincoln lived during his final years and where the deep thoughts and wise decisions were formulated resulting in both preserving the Union and in mapping its growth.

Today, we humbly pray that that same spirit which directed Lincoln as he appealed on bended knee for guidance from above may guide and direct the spiritually minded man who now occupies the White House—and that this great inspiration of Lincoln may cause Americans throughout the Nation to be motivated by those words we heard just a few moments ago—and that we may "be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us . . . and that this nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Also participating in the impressive wreath-laying ceremony were the new Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, and the "dean of the diplomatic corps," Ambassador Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, of Nicaragua, and representatives of the District of Columbia government, and the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all who participated in the celebration at Lincoln Memorial in the city of Washington—and particularly our colleague from Illinois, Mr. McClory.

#### POOR MAN'S ARMY

#### HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' at-

tention an excellent article which appeared on the editorial page of the February 21 Washington Post, pointing up, as the "critical defect in the proposal for the volunteer army," the relative ease the proposal would afford national leaders in making the initial decision to wage war.

This valuable essay is entitled "The Case Against an All-Volunteer Army," and is the product of the most impressive mind of Joseph A. Califano, Jr., former Special Assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense and Special Assistant to President Johnson.

The article follows:

#### THE CASE AGAINST AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

The decision to wage war is usually the most serious that any national leader makes during his public career. True as this has been throughout history, in the age of nuclear weapons any such decision is fraught with catastrophic undertones. It is thus important that every reasonable inhibition be placed on those who have the power to make the decisions of war and peace. There should be no cheap and easy way to decide to go to war in the 1970's.

The greatest inhibition on the decision of a democratically elected leader to wage war is the need to have the people's support. It took Roosevelt years of persuasion and the Japanese sneak attack at Pearl Harbor to bring the nation to a point where they were willing to wage war in the South Pacific, North Africa and Europe. Truman's decision to fight in Korea was one he had to make with the knowledge that as the war progressed, it would likely be unpopular and costly to the political fortunes of a party that depended upon the support of the American people in order to retain control of the White House.

The concept of a volunteer army—paid at a rate just high enough to attract those at the lower economic levels of our society and ending a draft which exposes every economic and social level to possible military service—lifts from the President the most inhibition on a decision to wage war. It is likely to produce a poor man's army fighting for decisions made by affluent leaders. It is unlikely that many of the senators, congressmen, presidents, cabinet officials and national security advisers who, in the first instance make the decision to wage war, will have sons who will choose a military career because it pays more. The economic incentives put forth by proponents of the volunteer army proposal are unlikely to attract many, if any, middle and upper class Americans with higher paying, less dangerous career alternatives.

It is remarkable to me that so many doves on both sides of the aisle have joined in support of President Nixon's proposal for a volunteer army. Indeed, some wish to put it into effect even faster than the President suggests. The broad base of support against the Vietnam war has come from those college students and their middle and upper-middle class American parents who are personally affected by the cold fact that the draft is color blind as far as economic and social status are concerned. These Americans simply will not permit their sons to die waging a war in which they do not believe.

Moreover, any President or national leader must constantly reassess his position today on the Vietnam war and any future adventures in armed conflict to make certain he can continue to make his case to the American people. He must have some hope that they will be with him, as President Lyndon Johnson used to say, on the landing as well as on the take-off.

This is the critical defect in the proposal for the volunteer army: It could make it too cheap and easy for national leaders to make the initial decision to wage war. It is from that initial decision of one or a few men that it is so difficult for subsequent leaders and an entire nation to retreat, as we have seen through the administrations of four presidents who have struggled with the problem of Southeast Asia.

Much of the attitude of supporters of the voluntary army is similar to the thinking that has degraded the original concept of foreign aid. Our AID programs were begun as an act of magnificent humanity after World War II, when former enemies were accorded dignified treatment as human beings and given the assistance to rebuild their societies, preserve their national integrity and live in human decency. Piece by piece and chip by chip, foreign aid finally reached the point epitomized by Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott's statement late last year in support of President Nixon's \$255 million request for aid to Cambodia: "The choice here is between dollars and blood." Put another way, we can buy a war that others will fight for us; in Scott's case, the Cambodians. In short, let's make it *their* blood and our money.

It is largely this attitude which has permitted the Russians to be so adventurous since the end of World War II with few internal repercussions. The Chinese and North Koreans fought, with Russian financing, in the early 1950's. The North Vietnamese fight with Russian and Chinese aid in Southeast Asia. The Egyptians and Arabs fight with Russian arms in the Middle East. The Soviets in effect buy mercenary "volunteer" armies of citizens of other countries, just as our AID program has often been used to buy foreign mercenaries for us.

There are other problems with the volunteer army, not the least of which are the enormous financial costs and the dangers to a society of harboring 2 or 3 million men dependent solely for their livelihood on the most powerful military establishment in the history of mankind.

According to the report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force, chaired by former Defense Secretary Thomas Gates, to attract a volunteer force of 2 million men, the nation would have to pay \$1.5 billion per year in addition to what it is now paying. To support a volunteer force of 2.5 million men, the nation would have to pay \$2.1 billion per year in additional pay and allowances. To add an additional 500,000 men and support a volunteer force of 3 million men, the taxpayers would have to put up an additional \$4.6 billion per year. That 20 per cent increase in manpower from 2.5 to 3 million men requires a staggering 100 per cent plus increase in the cost to the nation, from \$2.1 billion to \$4.6 billion each year.

In an age of urgent domestic needs, I would prefer to spend that \$4.6 billion (or the lesser amounts) on any number of needs at home—improving the delivery of medical services, housing, job training, anti-pollution efforts, education.

There also should be some concern in any democratic society at putting 2 or 3 million men throughout the most productive years of their lives in professional military careers. Several military officials have expressed precisely that concern to me. At the policymaking level, civilian control of the military is no easier than civilian control of the civilian bureaucracy or mayoral control of a local police force. As powerful and well connected as the military establishment is in the business community and in the Congress, there is at least the continuing check of a turnover in both the officer and enlisted corps of scores of thousands of men who enter and

leave the military each year and make their careers in a variety of civilian professions. To take an extreme but actual case, what would the chances have been of exposing the My Lai massacre if the only Americans present had been soldiers who were totally dependent on the Army for their career and their retirement?

This is not meant as a commentary *a la* Eisenhower on the military-industrial complex. For the dangers of parochialism and stagnation from having the same people in the same job too long are apparent throughout our society: in the steel industry, the seniority system in the Congress, some labor unions and even an automobile assembly lines. Moreover, the learning process goes both ways. If any good can be said to come out of war, it is from the survivors (in and out of the military) whose experience tempers their willingness to wage war again and makes them reluctant to permit their sons to wage war. Finally, there is more truth than most people would like to admit in the affirmative aspects of discipline and training that a military organization provides not only for many enlisted men, but for a significant number of relatively affluent college graduates from middle America.

The arguments propounded for an all-volunteer army are not convincing to me. True, as the Gates Commission points out, we have had volunteer armies for the greater part of our history except during major wars and since 1948. But those volunteer forces were substantially smaller than they are today. The power and longistic capability of Presidents to station them in any part of the world and intervene in any war is markedly greater today. And hydrogen bombs were not an integral part of the military establishment before World War II.

True, as Senator Goldwater contends, it is increasingly difficult to make deferment determinations in conscientious objector cases since the Supreme Court decision last June. But judgments concerning a man's intent are made every day in the courts of our land and there is nothing so special about judging the sincerity of a man's intention in the context of the draft.

True, as so many liberal supporters of the volunteer army argue, this proposal would relieve the burden of military service from young men who prefer not to have their careers interrupted by even a few years service in the military. But I, for one, do not wish to lift from the President and the Congress the substantial irritant and inhibition of young men who do not want to be drafted to fight in a war unless they are convinced the cause is just. Most presidents are both lions and foxes and their decisions to make war, while founded in conscience for the good of the nation, are not taken without significant measures of shrewd calculation.

What are we to say of a society that can no longer inspire its young men to fight for its national security policies? Not simply (I hope) that it's fortunate that we have enough money to buy mercenary volunteers.

The very concept of a high paid volunteer army reflects the continuing erosion of the will to sacrifice, particularly on the part of our affluent citizens. The prosperity of the 1960's certainly must increase our concern with the impact of affluence on the fiber of our society. Along with its vast benefits, the economic prosperity of the 60's brought self-centered cries of more and better and a greater reluctance on the part of the affluent to sacrifice for public purposes and the needs of our disadvantaged citizens. The wealthy have been able to leave the center city or to live there in such protected cocoons that they are immune to the dangers of crime and the human indignities of congestion and filth. The more affluent are able to hire the talent to avoid payment of fair shares of income taxes; indeed, many



pay no taxes at all. To say to them that now we will lift from you any concern that your sons might have to fight a war is further to pander to the more selfish, baser instincts of their human nature.

What is of profound concern is that so many of our leaders eagerly support any move to ease the burdens of the affluent and make it easier politically to engage in military adventures abroad at a time when the nation desperately needs a real measure of sacrifice at home and the strictest kind of inhibitions on further military adventures in far-off lands.

#### PROJECT MAST—MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

**HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Project MAST—Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic—is a test program, initiated through the efforts of the Secretary of Defense and Department of Transportation, designed to test the feasibility of a helicopter ambulance rescue service for use in rural and isolated areas. Secretary Laird deserves to be congratulated on this achievement.

Originally scheduled to end on December 31, 1970, the program was extended until March or April of this year.

The first MAST program was initiated at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to serve San Antonio and the 10 surrounding counties which make up the Alamo Area Council of Governments. Since that time, MAST programs have been put into operation at four additional sites: Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho; Fort Carson, Colorado; Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.; and Fort Lewis, Wash.

Since the inception of the program on July 15, 1970, MAST crews at Fort Sam Houston have responded to 135 calls for assistance—as of February 8—71 missions during the day and 64 night missions.

Of these 135 missions, only one was aborted due to weather conditions. An additional seven were canceled while the helicopter was en route due to death of the patient or arrival of ground ambulance.

On the 135 missions, 159 patients were transported to medical facilities. Thirty-four were taken to military hospitals and the remaining 125 to civilian hospitals. One mission transported medical personnel and supplies from Santa Rosa Medical Center in San Antonio to a local Air Force base to be flown to the disaster area caused by Hurricane Celia.

Twenty-five of the missions involved onsite pickup of patients and subsequent transport to a medical facility. The remaining 110 missions were interhospital transfers.

The majority of the patients transported were suffering from fractures and/or lacerations incurred in various types of accidents—mostly automobile accidents. Other types of injuries and illnesses represented include heart attacks and cardiac strokes; severe burns;

gunshot wounds; and coral snakebite. Several newborn infants were taken to San Antonio hospitals for intensive medical care. Only four patients were dead on arrival at the receiving medical facility.

Medical personnel and equipment, including portable incubators, were present on many of the flights.

The average mission took 49 minutes from the time the call was received at MAST operations until the patient was delivered to a medical facility. Patients were transported from distances ranging up to 100 miles.

Total flying time to date on missions is 126 hours and 45 minutes.

Emergency resuscitative care administered enroute by the medics includes bandaging of wounds, applying splints to fractures, and administering oxygen, intravenous fluids and antishock treatment.

Of the 18 hospitals within the Alamo Area Council of Governments which are participating in the project, all have utilized the services of the MAST rescue team. An additional 9 hospitals in adjoining communities have requested and received assistance from a MAST unit.

The rescue missions have aided persons of all ages, both military and civilian, suffering from a great variety of injuries and ailments. MAST has brought the extensive and sophisticated medical facilities of a large urban area within reach of injured and ill persons in rural, outlying areas where only severely limited medical care is available—when it is available at all.

The speed and efficiency of the MAST personnel have saved lives and prevented much unnecessary suffering on the part of many persons.

#### CHAIRMAN HAMPTON OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AIMS FOR EXCELLENCE IN CAREER FEDERAL SERVICE

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Chairman Robert Hampton of the Federal Civil Service Commission is a man of action—and an article in the current issue of Government Executive points out that "things are really happening over there" in this Commission which he heads.

Bob Hampton is able, genial and innovative. His leadership has carried forward the progress in improving the quality of the Federal civil service employee.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the work of this most important Commission, I place the article from the Government Executive in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION'S HAMPTON AIMS AT ACHIEVING AGENCY "RESPONSIVENESS"

(By Samuel Stafford)

Over the years, the U.S. Civil Service Commission (CSC) has drawn as much criticism for its real or imagined failings as any Fed-

eral agency and probably has been the target of more brickbats than most.

It still has its detractors on Capitol Hill and in Government agencies, Federal employee unions and the media since modern personnel management still is an inexact and controversial science, but the critics seem—perhaps it is only the imagination—both less numerous and less belligerent than in former years.

As one longtime critic told *Government Executive*: "I hate to admit it, but things are really happening over there."

"Things" have been happening, of course, ever since the first three commissioners and their entire staff of four aides opened for business in a \$3-a-day room in Washington, D.C., in 1883, for the essentially negative purpose of curbing rampant political patronage and corruption in public service.

Beginning in the 1930's, the CSC's role—paralleling the rapid growth and increasing complexity of the Federal Government—slowly began shifting in the positive direction of building an effective modern personnel administration system for the Federal establishment.

During the last decade—and particularly during the Johnson and Nixon Administration under the leadership of former CSC Chairman John Macy and present Chairman Robert E. Hampton—the commission has, say the veteran CSC-watchers, made impressive gains in meeting tough new Federal personnel challenges. Significantly, the spurt of activity in an agency with a longtime musty image of a paper-shuffling, foot-dragging bureaucratic bottleneck has paralleled the rapid growth of Federal employee unionization and general social and technological ferment in this country.

Among the solid advances made in fairly recent years: liberal revision of the Federal Merit Promotion system, extension of the Federal Employee Health Benefits program, firm establishment of the principle of pay comparability with the private sector, growing sophistication in dealing with labor-management and equal employment opportunity problems, establishment of new programs to recruit and train Federal executives and broad Federal involvement for the first time in inter-governmental programs to upgrade the quality of state and local personnel.

To CSC Chairman Hampton, 48, who was a Civil Service commissioner for eight years before assuming his present post in 1969, the "new look" in his agency is here to stay, and, with continuing White House and Congressional support and policy-making involvement, however amiable, of employee unions, the prospects for future innovative personnel management advances are bright.

"The first thing I initiated after becoming chairman was a review of every operating program of the commission—rules, regulations, laws and so forth—in the light of contemporary problems," Hampton said.

"I always got the impression that here was a great big piece of granite . . . that everything revolved around it and had to adapt itself to the system.

"So one of the points stressed in our review was to make the system responsive to the needs of today—the idea that merit principles do not have to equate with rigidity—that they can be flexible principles. We didn't lose sight of the main idea which is that the hiring and promotion of employees should be done on the basis of their qualifications and their contributions.

"Looking at the system in this light, we asked ourselves: 'Is it responsive to the needs of management and the needs and interests of employees and the public? And in general, what is the environment around us in which personnel policies are made?'"

"So our reviews indicated that there were a number of items that required new legislation or changes in Executive Orders and we

placed these in an order of internal priority, realizing that it was impossible to achieve major reform in one great big package in a program that had been modified by law and Executive Order for nearly 90 years. Actually, we came up with some 44 requirements for changes in the law and 77 indicated Executive Order changes.

"These are basic reforms. Some are bread-basket issues and some are aimed at setting up a methodology and a machinery whereby we get where we want to go."

Hampton said: "The second thing we did of significance, I believe—and something that ties into the idea of agency responsiveness—concerned a reexamination of our institutional attitudes."

"You know, we don't really need somebody always telling us how and where we went wrong. Our attitude should be that we are our own severest critics . . . that we have the machinery available to us to collect the views of the users of the system and to learn about and correct flaws rather than saying there are no deficiencies or lamely trying to defend them. In other words, we have to recognize our problems and move boldly toward really solving them."

"In this connection, we have no information in the commission that is classified or otherwise to be kept from the public except for internal working papers such as inspection reports, medical records, investigative files on individuals and documents submitted to the President on which he has not yet acted."

"We approached the problems of making reforms on an open basis. We established methods of consultation with most of the Government unions and before policy matters become issues we go to the unions and give them a draft of what we have in mind and say: 'Here it is, now take a shot at it—let's have your views, what's right and what's wrong about it?'"

"The unions have responded very well and their criticism of documents we've given them for consultation has been constructive. Of course, they don't lose sight of their objectives and there are some tough struggles on various points, but this is to be expected."

Following his first year as chairman Hampton listed these gains, among others, in areas of CSC activities:

Institution of new or substantially changed programs, Government-wide, in equal opportunity, labor-management relations and merit promotion.

Adoption of new recruiting methods affecting college graduates, worker-trainees and others.

Opening of new Federal information centers with the General Services Administration, expansion of Federal executive boards, and establishment of the first "listening posts" in large cities in line with the CSC aim of becoming more "responsive."

Takeover of the entire Post Office examining system.

Among other accomplishments last year, Hampton said, was the setting up of a framework of the labor-management system called for by Presidential Executive Order, retirement system improvements, a beefed-up employee health benefits program with the Government's contribution raised to 40 percent and assured automatic adjustments each year, an overhaul in grievance and appeals procedures, passage of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act providing for aid to states and localities, and passage of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970.

Of these, several have been hailed as "landmark" advances by many.

One of the most far-reaching is the pay comparability legislation which takes classified pay setting out of both Congressional politics and Presidential politics.

Under the new system, data on private enterprise pay will be related to Federal salaries. There will be consultation with union

officials and any differences will be resolved by an objective third party committee.

If the President agrees with the findings, he will order the adjustments into effect immediately. This is seen as eliminating a customary lag of a year or more in effecting such pay adjustments.

Should the President propose smaller or later raises as during "national emergencies," he must send his plan to Congress, which may veto it by a simple majority vote.

Passage of the legislation, which gives employee unions a larger voice in pay recommendations, tells much about both Robert Hampton's stewardship at the CSC and about the prevailing Federal labor-management climate.

Many, if not all, of those who have worked with Hampton in hammering out legislation see him as more candid and open than the usual bureaucrat and a man who is flexible enough to work toward a meaningful compromise if this is indicated as the best solution.

The pay act in which Hampton engaged in the final give and take with John Griner, president of the AFL-CIO American Federation of Government Employees, Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) and others, was such a compromise.

Hampton told Government Executive: "I think this legislation will go a long way toward establishing a more professional pay-setting methodology free of the political process and the pressures that can either escalate or de-escalate or otherwise dictate what the pay should be."

A task force meanwhile is conducting a two-year study of job evaluation and pay practices in Government, with a preliminary report of findings due this Spring and a legislative proposal expected to be ready next year.

Of the task force's work, Hampton said: "One of the things I think is essential is that we have a coordinated system within the total Federal picture of how you price a job and there are a variety of systems for doing this in both industry and the Government."

"What our task force is trying to do is to find the best methodology they are able to find for evaluating job classifications in the Federal Government."

Hampton sees the continual assessment of labor relations problems as "something that will be with us for a long time."

As part of the general review of CSC operations early in the Nixon Administration, a review was made of a former Executive Order bearing on labor relations. An earlier review had been made at the end of the Johnson Administration and rather than rehold hearings, Hampton's aides reviewed findings from those hearings and "added in problems that had come up in the intervening period." Following the review, they wrote another Executive Order which was approved and issued by the President.

"About that time," Hampton said, "there was a postal strike and a sickout by air traffic controllers and many critics were quick to say that the Executive Order was obsolete, but we could not agree with this assessment."

He said: "Labor relations in the public sector is an evolving situation similar in many ways to that which evolved in the private sector, but also quite different."

"I personally don't believe that the Federal Government at this time can interpose an across-the-board collective bargaining system. Management in the Federal Government isn't ready for it and the unions aren't really ready for it."

We have extreme difficulty in arriving at appropriate bargaining units—who does the bargaining and how do you go for a quid pro quo.

"But we had to have a beginning framework and I think the Executive Order gives

us that. It's difficult even to administer this Executive Order because it sets up new relationships—new give and take—on both sides.

"Leadership of the program is vested in a Federal labor relations council rather than the commission, but the commission, Labor Department, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and others, including an impasse panel have specific responsibilities."

"The head of an agency lost some of his autonomy for one thing. And we do have third-party involvement . . . we're beginning to have third-party precedents established in labor-management situations. I think people are beginning to realize the benefits of being able to go to an impasse panel as they now can do as well as having the Assistant Secretary of Labor involved in elections, determining bargaining units, things like that."

Hampton thinks it is "possible" that there will be Government-wide collective bargaining some day, though not in the near future.

"But looking at it pragmatically," he said, "you'd still have labor tensions even with collective bargaining."

"I think you have to look at the long record of relative labor peace in the Government. Look at the pay increases, changes in fringe benefits—retirement and so on that have been obtained by Federal employee unions. And the pay act which gives labor a greater voice than ever before. So there is something in the system that has given it some stability."

"What I'm saying is that this is an evolving situation. We're learning and the labor unions are learning."

He added: "There are differences in the motivations of people toward public service today than was true formerly. I'm not saying employees are less public service minded today, but I do think they are much more aware of the necessity of being treated similar in terms of pay and working conditions to people in the private sector these days."

"I think that in many cases the Government was remiss in not recognizing this and moving faster to do something about it."

The CSC has a central staff dealing exclusively with agency labor-management problems and 10 labor relations experts in regional offices ("our eyes and ears").

"But we haven't really developed a model in labor relations," Hampton said: "We really need to do more pioneering thinking. In the near future we will probably have formulated a labor relations policy in terms of our goals and possible methods of achieving them."

The Executive Assignment System, drawn up and established over the past two Administrations, envisioned a data bank or inventory of 25,000 or more high-level Federal executives from which agencies could draw as the need for specialized talent arose.

Other programs aimed at upgrading and making the best possible use of the Federal executive manpower pool include a university fellowship program for young executives, executive seminar courses at Kings Point, L.I., and Berkeley, Calif. (with a future seminar program slated for Oak Ridge, Tenn.), and a Federal Executive Institute.

How has the Executive Assignment System talent bank operation been working? Has it fostered mobility among the executive force? And have agency managers tended to draw too heavily from those in their agencies on the list to the detriment of outsiders?

"Agencies have been using the talent bank," said Hampton, "but I think it's been minimal. As for managers drawing heavily from their own agencies, I think it's difficult to say categorically that this is detrimental to the program."

"I personally think there should be more mobility, more movement across agency lines but mobility seems to be something that is highly personal with an executive."

"All in all, the agencies are coming to us more than they did formerly."



"We have a staff proposal on this that hopefully will be part of the Administration's legislative package. Essentially, it moves from a position-oriented system to more of an individual rank-in-the-man system and would provide for greater freedom of movement in the use of these (executive) resources within the system. And it also faces up to the controversial issue of tenure—there has been some feeling that there might be abuses in terms of job transitions—that people might be moved out of jobs because of political reasons or cronyism. This is not our purpose."

He added: "The whole area of executive development needs some real attention—not only in terms of who is coming into the system but also who is already in the system. There has to be a more orderly development of executives, recognizing the need. In Government, you have a multi-billion dollar operation—one of the biggest in the world—and you simply must have people who are well qualified and up to date if the Government is to function properly."

Among other points made by Hampton: The CSC's first-time involvement in a grant-in-aid program under intergovernmental personnel legislation providing for grants to states and localities to upgrade public service there "is in line with the President's concept of federalism because if this concept is to work, it has to be underpinned by a first-class personnel system at the grassroots."

Under the program, he said, the CSC will take over from the Labor and Health, Education and Welfare departments merit system functions they have been performing in connection with other grant programs.

His aim, he said, is "a minimum of red tape and a maximum amount of the available money for the actual grant part of the program."

Revisions of Hatch Act provisions regarding political activity by Government employees probably will be forthcoming.

"Sex discrimination issues are very difficult to deal with. There is discrimination by managers, of course, but I don't think there are as many instances of it as the critics would have us believe."

"Regarding public service in general, if you were to include state and local government, I'm not sure that our educational system is producing enough talent with the right skills."

Does Hampton believe that the old stereotype of Government service as a refuge for shiftless paper shufflers is dying out?

"It's hard to say," he said, "I think our image is better, but we'll always draw criticism. It's ingrained in Americans to continually reexamine their governmental institutions."

"I don't want to seem callous about this, but while image is something we constantly try to improve, it's not necessarily a good measure of whether you're accomplishing your purposes."

Summing up his feelings about his two years as top man at the CSC, Hampton, a native Tennessean who likes to golf and hunt, said: "I'm particularly pleased at the progress we've made in moving basic reforms along. And I'm proud of the way our staff has taken up the challenge to make the agency more responsive—to leave no doubt that we are what we should be—the servant of the people."

#### FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

#### HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the

United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a voice of democracy contest.

It is my pleasure to insert the speech by the winner of that contest from the State of Nevada, Miss Debbie Austin, of Sparks High School, Nev. Miss Austin is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Martin Austin of Sparks.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert Miss Austin's speech at this point in the RECORD:

#### FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(By Debbie Austin)

When my eyes first rested upon it, my breath was suddenly cut short—a chill shot down my spine trying to sting a tear from my eye. There, way above the trees, was a flag, furling proudly. A huge, brilliant American flag, adorning the sky and bringing warmth to my heart. It inspired me. I was moved by a sense of pride like I have never felt before. No, it was not flying over a state capital or adding grace to an old courthouse. That flag was hoisted by a new service station. Yes, just an ordinary service station, on an ordinary day—but it was no ordinary flag. The American flag is a constant reminder of our heritage—man's greatest desire—man's greatest need—freedom. Our founding fathers based this country on the fundamentals of liberty, equality, and justice—a perfect foundation. However, man is not a perfect being, so free men (men who have fought for their own freedom) have ironically denied liberty to other men causing ever constant struggles for freedom within a free society. Is this not the most beneficial way, though? Men who fight for their freedom to worship hold it so much more dearly than if they could take it for granted. A Negro's strife for equality makes him more aware of his potential—more intent upon self-improvement—a drive many "free whites" forsake. A woman demanding her rights, her recognition as an equal, can never be called a totally unworthy cause. Good or bad—they have a right to crusade for their grievances. Student dissenters demanding their freedom of expression, their right to be heard. Their need to see action.

Many may regard these struggles for freedom as paradox to the basic concepts of our society, but aren't they the very things upon which our country is based? If within your heart you feel something with enough conviction to earnestly strive towards obtaining it—or perhaps even to lay your life down for it—then it is certainly well worth considering.

Of course, when these demonstrations come to the point of innocent manslaughter and infringing upon other people's freedoms, they can't be tolerated, but by the same token they can't be ignored—or hushed. Ours is a country born from rebellion and strong from change and acceptance of new universal ideas. If we are to maintain our strength, we have no choice but to keep changing—keep re-evaluating. But that doesn't mean we should protest every concept laid down by the establishment just for the sake of protest, or just to buck the establishment. Those who rebel and dissent should only feel qualified to do so if they have a feasible replacement or alternate plan for what they are disputing.

Throughout the years, since the first settlers landed in America, millions of immigrants have flocked to our shores for relief and the free enterprise system. There surely must be something worth preserving if so many have fled to it for one promise of a better life—of hope!

We have taken our freedom for granted—too many have forgotten what it means to be free—too many can't conceive of what the alternatives are. Our nation provides more freedoms than have ever before been seen on the face of the earth and surely will not be found existing anywhere else in this troubled modern world. Women have cried

for it. Men have died for it. This ambiguous term, freedom. We are all so involved in freedom, we cannot even recognize it. It is here—it is now—we are free. Let's not lose the thing upon which men thrive. Let's not lose this thing—freedom.

#### THREE BILLS TO PASS APPROPRIATIONS MEASURES ON TIME

#### HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing three pieces of legislation which should collectively result in Congress passing the regular appropriations bills on time each year.

The first bill provides that the fiscal year of the U.S. Government coincide with the calendar year. The second requires continuous sessions of the House whenever an appropriations measure has not passed by the beginning of the fiscal year. The third is a resolution which would permit appropriations measures to be considered 30 days prior to the commencement of the next fiscal year even if authorizing legislation has not been passed by that time.

Conversing the fiscal year to the calendar year should generally result in the timely passage of appropriations bills. However, it would not necessarily do so and that is why I have introduced the other two parts of this legislative package. The specter of continuous sessions should serve as a sufficient incentive to pass the appropriations bills on time. Allowing the consideration of appropriations during the last month of the fiscal year, irrespective of the passage of authorizing legislation, would make consideration by the end of the year practicable.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of coinciding the Government's fiscal year with the calendar year is not a new one. As a matter of fact, the two did coincide until 1842 when the present fiscal year was adopted. In 1842 it made good sense to utilize a July 1 to June 30 fiscal year because Congress was then a part-time body which finished its legislative business early in the year. It was extremely difficult to project the monetary requirements of the Government many months in advance, and Congress decided that by commencing the fiscal year in July, expenditures and revenues could be anticipated on a more accurate basis. It was never a problem to pass the appropriations bills on time in the 19th century because Congress invariably finished all of its business and adjourned sine die prior to the first of July.

Even as there were good reasons to adopt our present fiscal year in 1842, there are good reasons to now establish the calendar year as the fiscal year. As we well know, Congress now stays in session most, if not all, of the year. The Federal budget has grown enormously in both scope and size. Appropriations bills require more study and preparation. Six months would probably not be enough time to enact all of the appropriations measures under the most favorable of

conditions. In the 91st Congress, for example, not one single regular appropriations bill had been signed into law by the beginning of the fiscal year involved. The past four Congresses have considered 102 regular appropriations bills. Only eight of those had become public law by the beginning of the fiscal year to which they pertained.

It is unfortunate, from a number of standpoints, whenever an appropriations bill is not passed on time, but it is a critical national problem when, as it has over the past 8 years, Congress passes 92 percent of the appropriations bills after the beginning of the new year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can overestimate the importance of having regular appropriations made by the beginning of each fiscal year. Two separate types of governmental waste occur when continuing appropriations resolutions, providing for a continuation of programs at the previous year's levels, are passed pending enactment of the new regular appropriations bill.

The first type of waste comes about when Congress ultimately increases a program's funding over the level of the previous year. In this case, the administrators of the program are forced to operate at the lower level for part of the year. Suddenly they find themselves fully funded. Of course, the administrators are anxious to at last commence programs which had been authorized by Congress. But, all too often, the money cannot be spent efficiently during the balance of the year. Nevertheless, the decision will be made to spend all of the money because of a fear that Congress will be reluctant to refund a program which did not consume its full appropriation in the previous year.

The second type of waste occurs when Congress ultimately decides an appropriation cut is in order. Here, the department or agency will have to cut back on programs which had been funded on the basis of a continuing appropriation resolution. One result in this type of situation could be the discontinuance of much work already under way and thus, the wasting of the money already spent. Another possible result, and one which is just as bad, could be that Congress would be hesitant to kill genuinely wasteful programs simply because they had been allowed to go into the new fiscal year under a continuing resolution.

Few areas of endeavor have felt the havoc wrought by operating the Government on the basis of continuing resolutions more than education. In fiscal year 1970, appropriations for the Office of Education were not signed into law until March 5, 1970, more than 8 months late. In the interim school districts were using guesswork to determine budgets and mill levies. Although educators have been able to cope with this situation remarkably well, a haphazard situation has nevertheless resulted. After all of the sophisticated analysis and planning is completed, school officials are required to complete their budgets on the basis of their best guess as to how much Federal assistance Congress will provide. The waste of the taxpayers' money under these circumstances is inevitable.

I introduced an identical legislative package in the 91st Congress, Mr. Speaker. Following the introduction I asked a number of school officials in Colorado to advise me of their reaction. A number of responses follow:

COLORADO FEDERAL LIAISON OFFICE,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: I have read with interest your remarks relative to the bills and the resolution through which you propose to bring appropriations action in the Congress into a more reasonable relationship with the fiscal year in which funds are to be spent.

As I have said to you when we discussed this matter, it is my judgment that the problem you have attacked is the most serious problem we face in terms of establishing an efficient system for planning, both from the viewpoint of the Congress and from the viewpoint of the administrative departments.

It would seem to me that the greatest single obstacle to be overcome would be the need to appropriate actually for an eighteen month period in the initial appropriation.

You are to be commended for moving to resolve a very serious and a very basic problem.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. HINKLEY,  
Executive Director.

ADAMS COUNTY/SCHOOL DISTRICT 14,  
Commerce City, Colo.

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BROTZMAN: I feel that the education of children should be the nation's number one priority, not only in name but in fact. Quality education is predicated upon enlightened educational planning, committed implementation, sound evaluation, and the necessary financial resources to accomplish the task. The local district, the state, and the nation ultimately benefit from such an educational program. However, when any step of the process is disrupted, all suffer.

I have reviewed your proposals and concur that, if adopted, they would greatly alleviate some of the problems that occur when federal funds are not appropriated in sufficient time to derive maximum benefit from dollars spent. If the schools could know the amount of funding available for the next school year, planning could begin immediately, the best teachers recruited, and sound evaluation techniques devised to the betterment of all. I feel it would offer stability to American education.

If I personally could be of assistance to you in your effort to correct the present funding situation or help with the concept of forward funding please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WIGGINS,  
Director of Federal/State Relations.

BOULDER VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Boulder, Colo.

MR. DONALD G. BROTZMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter concerning the legislative package you have introduced into the House of Representatives.

The resolution and legislation are, as you stated in your remarks, desperately needed. Ever since the advent of significant federal funds for public school use, the problem of late appropriations has been a nightmare. Efficient and effective use of funds demands careful planning, and planning is almost impossible when we have to estimate what our federal revenues will be.

A case in point, of course, is the matter of

PL 874 money for this year. In our district this amounts to over \$500,000 of a \$17 million budget. This is a significant amount and has a direct bearing on the mill levy which the Board of Education must set in the district. It would have been most helpful to the Boulder Valley Board of Education if we had known exactly what we could count on before having to have our budget certified.

You are to be commended for your concern in this area, and if there's anything that we can do at the local level in getting action on your package, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL E. SMITH,  
Superintendent of Schools.

JEFFERSON COUNTY  
SCHOOL DISTRICT R-1,  
Lakewood, Colo.

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROTZMAN: Thank you for your letter. I am certainly happy to see that you understand the problem. We have budgeted our 874 money and still have no assurance we will receive it. The same is true of ESEA and other federal funds.

It really appears to me that the federal government should attempt to do their planning a little bit ahead so that they don't make us all break the law, as we are now having to do to live within their actions.

Thanks again, Don, for your efforts. I hope something comes of it.

Sincerely,

W. DEL WALKER,  
Superintendent.

ST. VRAIN VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Longmont, Colo.

MR. DONALD G. BROTZMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROTZMAN: I would urge you to pursue with determination your position on the legislative package you presented concerning the fact that educational assistance be designated and passed into law for the beginning of each fiscal year.

As a school administrator I want to thank you for your efforts in our behalf.

Sincerely,

JACK O. POPE,  
Assistant Superintendent For Instruction.

DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Denver, Colo.

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: The educators in the greater metropolitan area are most appreciative of your many fine efforts in behalf of the education of our youth.

I heartily concur with you that there is a great need to get the matter of the federally impacted school area decided to give an opportunity to revise the formulas that are of great concern to all of us.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD L. JOHNSON,  
Deputy Superintendent.

THOMPSON SCHOOL DISTRICT R2-J,  
Loveland, Colo.

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROTZMAN: Thank you very much for writing to me in regard to your proposed legislation concerning Congress' failure to enact the appropriations bill for educational assistance by the beginning of the fiscal year.

I am certain that a definite date for making appropriations would be most helpful to schools in planning the budgets for the



next year. I realize that it is difficult to have such a date definitely established, but the advantages far outweigh the problems, in my opinion. At best, predicting revenues for budget building is a risky business. We must use estimated increases in assessed valuation, estimated enrollments, and estimated revenue from non-tax sources throughout our planning. This leads to inconsistencies with the actual picture when the final budget is determined. Many times programs are planned and must be cut drastically when the revenue to finance them is not forthcoming.

The proposal for having the Federal funding on a calendar year basis would certainly be helpful to Colorado School Districts, since it would then coincide with the calendar fiscal year in such Districts. However, I feel it important to point out that Colorado is only one of several States that does have a calendar fiscal year, and there are many States which still operate on the July 1st through June 30th fiscal year. I am not certain as to the appropriateness of this proposal to such districts. So long as the appropriations were made for the calendar year, it would at least give even these districts the advantage of knowing what their revenue would be from July through December of the budget year which they are building. This is certainly an improvement over the present situation where they are more than six months into their budget year, and the appropriations have not yet been determined.

It appears to me that the change of House rules to allow consideration of appropriation measures, irrespective of authorizations, would be a necessary procedure to establish a definite date for appropriations. In addition, it appears to me that this would provide a stimulus to the passage of authorization measures well in advance of the established appropriation date.

I would certainly encourage you to continue in your efforts to see such legislation enacted.

Sincerely,

C. E. STANSBERRY,  
Superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the statements from the Colorado educators which I have just included point out the importance of passing appropriations bills on time. Hearings should be held at an early date so that legislation can be passed in time to prevent the experiences of the past few years from recurring indefinitely into the future.

#### PRESERVE COMPETITION IN FUELS INDUSTRIES

#### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, a growing number of oil companies have acquired substantial financial interests of one sort or another in the coal and uranium industries, a trend that could all but end effective competition between the oil, coal, and uranium industries. The traditional interfuel competition, which has been the most effective weapon for business and consumer protection in the energy field, is seriously threatened by this design toward economic concentration which could, eventually, lead to the complete

domination of the fuels industries by the vast oil corporations.

A 1970 study by a Washington, D.C., research firm revealed how alarming the penetration is by the oil companies into the other fuels industries. Of the 25 largest oil corporations, 11 have holdings in coal and 18 have uranium interests. These acquisitions have taken various forms, such as the purchase of reserve holdings, the buying of existing companies in the other fuels industries and the establishment of new ventures either alone or jointly with other companies within or outside the petroleum industry.

In the coal industry, four of the Nation's largest 11 coal operations now are oil company subsidiaries, and oil-owned coal production by these four firms, in 1969, accounted for approximately 20 percent of the country's total bituminous coal output. The four controlling oil corporations, with their percentage of the total bituminous coal production, are Continental Oil with 9.6 percent, Gulf Oil with 1.4 percent, Occidental Petroleum with 5.7 percent, and Standard Oil of Ohio with 2.2 percent. Other petroleum companies with coal holdings are Standard Oil of New Jersey, Texaco, Shell, Atlantic Richfield, Sun Oil, Ashland, and Kerr-McGee. The Nation's largest oil company, Standard Oil of New Jersey, through its major domestic affiliate, Humble, owns substantial portions of coal reserves which reportedly make it one of the two largest owners of coal reserves in the Nation.

In the uranium industry, the oil companies already have a large stake in the mining and milling stages and are expanding rapidly into the other areas of the uranium fuel cycle. The petroleum corporations account for one-sixth of the uranium production, hold about 45 percent of all known uranium reserves and make more than half the new discoveries. Kerr-McGee is the single largest producer in the uranium industry, accounting for 23 percent of the total uranium milling capacity directly and another 4 percent through half ownership. Humble is planning a mill equivalent to another 8 percent of current total U.S. capacity, for full operation in 1973. Kerr-McGee is one of two companies in the business of converting uranium oxide into uranium hexafluoride— $UF_6$ —a compound used in the uranium enrichment process. Atlantic Richfield will be one of two companies with capacity to convert slightly enriched recovered uranium to  $UF_6$  and has the only present capacity for converting highly enriched recovered uranium to  $UF_6$ . In the reprocessing field which involves taking spent nuclear fuel and preparing it for further use, five plants are in existence or under construction. Oil companies own four of them. In addition to Kerr-McGee, Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Atlantic Richfield, other large petroleum companies with uranium interests include Texaco, Gulf, Mobil, Standard Oil of Indiana, Shell, Phillips Petroleum, Continental Oil, Sun Oil, Union Oil of California, Cities Service, Getty, Standard Oil of Ohio, Pennzoil United, Inc., Amerada-Hess, and Ashland.

Mr. Speaker, the oil industry has long held a privileged economic position in this country, and it has benefited and prospered from such Government policies as the oil import quota and the 22 percent depletion allowance. Now, the oil industry, unimpeded, is consolidating its grip on the other fuels, which will give the petroleum companies a strangle hold on all segments of the economy that depend upon the various fuels for their sources of energy and that traditionally relied upon competition within the fuels industry, particularly between oil and coal. Despite legitimate antitrust questions that arise from these oil ventures into the other fuels, the Department of Justice has remained strangely silent. However, we know from past history that economic concentration can lead to collusion, agreements for price fixing and sharing of the market. This must not be allowed to happen in the fuels energy market, nor must this critical sector of our economy be dominated by one force—oil. In order to preserve competition among corporations engaged in the production of oil, coal, and uranium, I am introducing, today, legislation to declare it unlawful for any oil company to acquire any coal or uranium asset, and to require the divestiture by the oil companies of all coal or uranium assets within 1 year following enactment of this measure.

#### LESSONS OF THE CONFERENCE

#### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the New York Times of February 20, 1971, gives us some interesting insights into the Soviet system of government. Mr. Eugen Loeb, former Minister of Foreign Trade in Czechoslovakia and now an instructor at an American university, points out that the "de-Stalinization" carried out under Khrushchev was simply a change within the system advancing the security of the individual members of the Politburo. A one-man dictatorship was replaced by a dictatorship of a handful of men.

Mr. Loeb also points out that the renewed courtship of the Soviet Union by free world politicians will again result in free world losses.

The article follows:

#### THE LESSON OF "THE CONFESSION"

(By Eugen Loeb)

When my American friends saw the film, "The Confession," they asked only one question: Were the real prisoners of the Slansky trials treated as brutally as the characters are treated in this film? I was disturbed to learn that they were surprised by the brutality that exists in the Soviet bloc.

I answered their question by saying that the real torture and sufferings were far worse than those depicted in the film. Arthur London, the author of "The Confession" and the film's hero, told me that although he had been in many capitalist and fascist prisons and had been tortured many times, he had never confessed. But a "socialist" prison broke his resistance.

London's personal tragedy is similar to the tragedy of thousands of revolutionaries who were forced to "confess" in Soviet Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish and Czechoslovak prisons. All of these confessions and trials bore the signature of Soviet intelligence interrogators who applied the methods used in the famous Moscow trials in the nineteen-thirties to the satellite countries after the war. This, in itself, indicates that torture and imprisonment are a fundamental part of the Soviet system.

I expected Americans to ask: why were innocent revolutionaries and devoted members of the Communist parties imprisoned, tortured and forced to confess treason? And, why were the victims then rehabilitated by the same party and the very same system?

I will try to answer these questions from my own knowledge about the Slansky trials. I was the first of the defendants in the Slansky trials to be imprisoned (I was imprisoned in November, 1949, and London at the beginning of 1951).

After the Czechoslovak Communist party came to power in 1948, its leadership decided to bow to Soviet pressure and accepted the Soviet "offer" to "detect" Yugoslav and Anglo-American agents in its rank and file. It allowed the creation of a special Soviet security group which took control of the Czechoslovak Ministry of Interior. Within a few months every member of the Government and party leadership became dependent on these "advisers."

In this way Czechoslovakia fell under Soviet rule. Any political action that was not in line with Soviet policy was condemned as high treason. Thus in essence the trials were a condemnation of the policy of an independent road for Czechoslovak socialism.

Under Soviet pressure, the party leadership betrayed their own political program, then betrayed the independence of their country, and finally, threw overboard those who had carried out their orders. Although the Slansky trials had fourteen formal defendants, in truth, Czechoslovakia was on trial. After the trials, those in charge of the Communist party became the tools of the Soviets.

Stalin's one-man dictatorship of the Soviet Union created a situation where no one, even in the highest echelons of power, could be certain that he would not be purged. The book, "Khrushchev Remembers," explicitly describes the feeling of permanent danger that accompanied the purges. When Stalin died, the party leadership took steps to prevent the concentration of power in the hands of one man. Beria (head of the secret police and the most powerful man in Russia after Stalin's death) was murdered by the majority of the Politburo in order to forestall the rise of a new Stalin. To justify his murder and prove their "innocence," the new leadership declared that the crimes perpetrated by the Soviet system were, in fact, the crimes of Stalin, Beria, and their followers. Naturally at least some of the victims of their excesses had to be rehabilitated.

The reform that followed Stalin's death, "Khrushchevism," is widely misunderstood in the West as a liberalization of the Soviet system. In reality, Khrushchevism was little more than the distribution of power among the members of the Politburo so that it could not be turned against any of those in power. The activities of the State Security organs and their arbitrariness were also curtailed. But, these changes represented reform within the system, not a change of the system. The arbitrary rule of one man was replaced by the arbitrary rule of a handful of men. The restriction of the rights of the Soviet citizens and the crushing of the Hungarian revolt under Khrushchev were consistent with the worst aspects of Stalinism.

Stalin justified the purges with the philosophical claim that class struggle becomes more intensive after the realization of socialism. On Nov. 18, 1970, at a meeting in Prague, Mr. Starikov, secretary of the Soviet Embassy there, repeated Stalin's claim and stated that the last 14 years had proven that Stalin was right. Mr. Starikov said that he expects that the next Party Congress in Moscow will confirm this thesis.

This system still exists; the changes have been peripheral. The prospect of the humanistic regime in Czechoslovakia became a threat to the Soviet Union, and despite solemn promises to respect Czechoslovakia's sovereign rights, the Red Army led the invasion that occupied Czechoslovakia.

Despite its crimes and repressive activities the Soviet Union remains a highly respected world power, courted even by American politicians. Despite his rise to power at the height of the purges, Khrushchev is described as a man "good for his country and the world."

History teaches us that those who are not able to learn from the past will have to learn in the future. It also teaches us that as time goes on the price of these lessons is higher and higher.

## THE DEBUNKING OF A MYTH

### HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House the lead editorial in the Washington Post of February 19. It begins:

It is with mixed emotions (chiefly envy and chagrin) that we call your attention to an article by Edward Jay Epstein in the February 13 issue of the New Yorker—envy because it is a work of debunking we wish we had undertaken ourselves, and chagrin because, For Your Information, we are among those newspapers whose careless perpetuation of an untrue statement Mr. Epstein has rightly seen fit to criticize.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, then goes on to acknowledge that the Post and other news media—including the New York Times, AP, and UPI—have for some time been accepting at face value the statement of Charles R. Garry, an attorney for the Black Panther Party, that 28 of his Panther clients have been deliberately murdered by police.

The New Yorker article to which the Post Editorial refers examines in depth each of these 28 cases and the author concludes that:

There are two cases in which Black Panthers were killed by policemen whose lives were not being directly threatened by those men—The Panthers.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Internal Security, which I have the duty to chair, held an extensive series of hearings on the Black Panther Party during the 91st Congress. We concluded long ago that the Panthers were not the innocent victims of police brutality but rather that they were a group of armed terrorist thugs.

Mr. Epstein's New Yorker article is a thoughtful, well-researched analysis of those deaths referred to by Garry as "po-

lice murders." We owe him and the magazine a debt of gratitude for the revelation. As to the article itself, I refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, where it was inserted by the Honorable H. R. Gross of Iowa.

However, I would direct the attention of the press to a speech made by Assistant Director of the FBI, William C. Sullivan, on October 12, 1970, which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 30, 1970, wherein Sullivan laid down the facts of the alleged panther killings. This information has been available to the press for months. Apparently the press did not lend any credibility to the speech of Mr. Sullivan.

I would now like to enter the Washington Post editorial confessing its role in perpetuation of this myth that police have been hunting down and deliberately slaying Black Panthers:

F.Y.I.

It is with mixed emotion (chiefly envy and chagrin) that we call your attention to an article by Edward Jay Epstein in the February 13 issue of the New Yorker—envy because it is a work of debunking we wish we had undertaken ourselves, and chagrin because, For Your Information, we are among those newspapers whose careless perpetuation of an untrue statement Mr. Epstein has rightly seen fit to criticize. The statement in question was apparently made in December of 1969 by Charles R. Garry, counsel for the Black Panther Party. In a week which saw struggles between police and Panthers in Chicago and Los Angeles, Mr. Garry was reported to have claimed that the two Panthers who had died in the Chicago gunfire—Fred Hampton and Mark Clark—were the "twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth Panthers" to have been "murdered by the police." The assertion (with a more neutral formulation, such as "killed by" or "died in clashes with") was picked up by the press and by a number of public figures in their comments. Attribution to Mr. Garry—or anyone else—tended to vanish. Thus, it soon became part of the "factual" background of stories and expressions of opinion concerning the Panthers and the police that "twenty-eight" Panthers had died as a result of armed conflict with the police. Mr. Epstein demonstrates this assertion to have been extravagantly untrue.

The Washington Post's role in reinforcing this misconception was twofold, involving first a sin of commission and then a sin of omission. On the first count we did in fact fail to provide any attribution or qualifying "reportedly" or similar conditioner in a news story of December 9, 1969. Three days before, on the 6th of December, we had reported:

"Jay A. Miller, executive director of the ACLU in Illinois, said it is 'absolutely imperative' that the facts be explored promptly [concerning the Chicago deaths] and that the public be given a complete report . . . He said 28 Panthers have died in police shootings since January, 1968."

The next day, on the 7th, we reported: "Twenty-eight Panthers have died in police shootings since January, 1968, according to Charles Garry, San Francisco attorney and general counsel for the Panthers."

On the 9th, in a story put together from news dispatches and added on to another such story dealing with the Los Angeles raid that had just occurred, direct attribution was dropped. Thus:

"Jay Miller, Illinois director of the American Civil Liberties Union, asked for an inquiry into a whole range of reported Panther slayings. A total of 28 Panther members have



died in clashes with police since Jan. 1, 1968."

The source—or one of them anyway—was lurking right up there a sentence away—but the statement, inexcusably, was asserted as a bald fact.

So far as our inkstained plunge into the clips has been able to indicate (and so far as Mr. Epstein charged), that the one occasion on which The Post presented the allegation as fact, rather than as someone's version of the fact. With attribution, however, the figure darts in and out of subsequent material in The Post, and that brings us to our sin of omission, which seems to us, at the very least, to be as grave: in the weeks and months that followed, albeit with attribution, we reprinted this charge without ever subjecting it to scrutiny, without—in short—doing what Mr. Epstein, to his great credit, now has done.

You will have wondered at what point, summoning our endless resources of self-pity and understanding of the difficulties of our trade and sensitivity to even slightly unfair criticism of our performance, we would choose to sob a little in our own behalf. The answer is, Now. So as not to be too embarrassing about it, we will run through the case for the defense quickly. We note first the fact that we deal each day with a new torrent of conflicting and/or suspect assertions (the front page on the day of this writing, for example, presents a Calley version, a Stans version, a Udall version, and a presidential version of various facts and events under challenge). And in this connection we note that, by Mr. Epstein's own account, some six to eight months were required to produce his attempt to straighten out the faulty record and that even with time, checking and re-checking, his article is not wholly free of misimpressions as to who said what when. Again, we suspect that Mr. Epstein is somewhat too dismissive in his attitude toward police-Panther encounters that have not ended in Panther deaths or any deaths, but which nonetheless have occurred and make an important part of the background that caused so much anxiety over the Chicago and Los Angeles encounters and their meaning and effect. Borrowing a page from the Vice President's book, we go on to observe that many of the quotations from The Post were cited in a way that made them sound more culpable than they were. Finally, we would invoke the ease with which a busy, pressured deskman could have produced that unattributed quotation in an amalgam of dispatches on December 9th.

Having thus functioned as counsel for the prosecution and the defense in our own case, we might as well complete the process by weighing in as jury. The verdict takes no time to reach. It is that the press of business, a slip of the hand, and the difficulty of getting to the bottom of a complicated assertion represent an insufficient defense on all counts. There is no adequate excuse for making this kind of error in the first place and none for failing to pursue the truth behind the phony "facts." In short, we find ourselves guilty and—with some reservations concerning Mr. Epstein's presentation of his case and his manner of quoting—we commend him for his effort to set the record straight.

#### FISH FARMING ACT ENDORSED

#### HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the American Fish Farmer contains an impressive editorial in sup-

port of the Fish Farming Act of 1971 jointly sponsored by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PICKLE, and myself.

With clarity and eloquence, editor James T. White discusses the need for consolidation of Federal assistance to the fish farming industry. I would like to underscore Mr. White's assertion that the Griffin-Pickle proposal in no way contains criticism of Federal personnel who have worked in this field so efficiently and effectively. They have rendered great public service, but we feel that it is best for efforts and activities in this area to be placed in one Government agency.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues Mr. White's comments, which follow:

#### COMMENTS ON THE NEWS—VIEWPOINT

It is likely that in a philosophical argument among anthropologists about the relative importance of the invention of the wheel and the invention of the fence, the wheel would win. The wheel has received more publicity, for one thing. However, if the argument was over the importance of the fence and the bow and arrow, we think that the vote should go to the fence as being more important to mankind. As long as man depended on the bow and arrow to secure his food, he had to look forward to a long and arduous chase with an uncertain outcome at its end. But when some prehistoric genius figured out that building a fence around a cow might make it easier to catch her, the human race made progress. After that, it didn't take too much of an intellectual leap to conceive of building the enclosure and then putting the animal inside where it could be fed, bred, fattened, and easily caught.

The invention of agriculture has, in fact, made modern civilization possible. Our present social structure could not exist without it. In view of this, it is truly amazing that it has taken man so many thousands of years to begin to apply these same principles to the aquatic environment. It is only in the recent past that we have "built the enclosure and put the animal inside" when the animal was a fish or crustacean. And even in our more or less enlightened age, most people still think that fish either come from the capture of supposedly limitless ocean stocks or from the leisure-time efforts of folks who enjoy dangling a baited hook in a lake or stream.

The fact is, however, that there is just as much difference between the "long and arduous chase" of wild fish in streams or oceans and the controlled farming of fish as there is between depending on the capture of wild animals for meat and the controlled farming of cattle. And the analogy between the two is precisely the same. Aquaculture is farming in every sense of the word.

In view of this, it is indeed gratifying to learn that two Southern Congressmen, J. J. Pickle of Texas, and Charles Griffin of Mississippi, have proposed legislation that will treat all forms of fish farming as a specialized branch of the nation's agricultural complex.

If this proposed legislation is passed and effectively implemented, it will provide a much-needed consolidation of the research and development efforts that are presently scattered in several governmental departments. This is not, of course, to sell short the splendid efforts that have been made by personnel of the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the USDA's Soil Conservation Service, the Environmental Protection Agency and others. The services that these groups have rendered to aquaculture have, to a very large extent, made possible the present state

of the fish farming art. Furthermore, there has existed an atmosphere of cooperation between these diverse agencies and bureaus that is seldom found in the ordinary functioning of our government.

The point is that none of these agencies have the advancement of aquaculture as their basic goal. Their missions are aimed toward other areas, and therefore programs to assist, promote or develop aquaculture have all too often been accorded the status usually given an unwanted and somewhat embarrassing stepchild. Drawing aquaculture programs together into a Farm Fisheries Bureau in the Department of Agriculture is a proposal that makes sense from the standpoint of efficiency; but more importantly, it is a proposal which will advance aquaculture to the status given the other bona fide contributors to our nation's farm productivity.

The Fish Farming Assistance Act will bring about two much-needed results. First, it will consolidate and add significantly to the impact of the research that is being done in aquaculture by channeling the results of that research through the department that is directly responsible for the conduct of agriculture. Second, the bill will bring greater financial stability to the industry by making it possible for fish farmers to receive the same financial assistance that is presently extended to other farmers.

The fish farming legislation proposed by Congressmen Griffin and Pickle makes good administrative sense. And, it is also a far-sighted proposal in that it is wisely structured to cover all phases of aquaculture. The farming of several useful and potentially profitable aquatic species is now beginning, and as it is worded, the Fish Farming Assistance Act will provide the climate for rapid development of these areas of aquaculture.

The Fish Farming Assistance Act is a vital proposal for all who are engaged in aquaculture in any way, and it deserves the vigorous support of all who are thus engaged. It is, in fact, a legislative proposal which provides the means by which fish farming can come of age.

#### HOW DO YOU SHIFT GEARS?

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, it is universally agreed that countryside America is in need of help and that has been my top priority since I have been in Congress.

Sometimes it is hard to make people understand what needs to be done, what can be done, for the countryside.

A recent editorial in the Wheaton, Minn., Gazette explained the condition of the countryside and offered some commonsense solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I urge all of my colleagues to read it:

#### How Do You Shift Gears?

Finding the ways and means to bring new life to rural communities really isn't such a major problem. There are two basic means for getting the job done, as we see it. Perhaps there are more.

Basically, all people need is an opportunity for employment. With a job in a rural community, most of the other problems like housing and pollution will take care of themselves.

Rural areas need two things—more industry and better conditions for agriculture.

Let's talk about industry. With transportation as it is today, industry can operate very effectively and very profitably in small towns. What added costs may develop for transportation can readily be more than offset by better and cheaper labor than that found in the cities. All overhead, as a matter of fact, will come down.

So how do you get industry to rural towns? The surest way the government can help is to provide an incentive—and incentive starts with a dollar sign. We're talking about a tax benefit. If a real tax benefit were offered for industry to locate in a town of say 5,000 or under 10,000, you would see new life in this field. People would start moving back out of the cities to the rural towns. The economy of rural areas would be bolstered. Pollution, if not cured, would at least be spread.

And then there's agriculture. This, in an area such as ours, is so much more important than industrial development you almost hate to talk of the two at the same time. As the populations statistics indicate, the loss of people in outstate areas such as our own is totally due to the loss in farm population. People are leaving the land. As they do, fewer people can find opportunities in the services communities of the rural areas. So some of them must leave. As agriculture goes down the drain, so also does the entire rural community. It's that simple.

How can the government play a part here? That's nothing particularly difficult to figure out either. They've already shown how the job can be done—by doing directly the reverse.

The federal government has been concerned for many years now with keeping the cost of food down for the people of this country. There was a time, not very many years ago, when Americans paid about 25 percent of their income for food—the cheapest in the world. But as farm prices dropped the inflation soared, bigger paychecks for other segments of the economy brought a decrease in this percentage. Soon the American working man was paying about 20 percent of his check for food. Then it dropped to below 18 percent, crept down below 17 percent. And now the latest figures we've heard indicate that in 1970 Americans dished out only about 15 percent of their money for food.

This type of thing is unheard of anywhere else in the world. To add to the wonder of it all, you must consider that while the economy of the nation as a whole has been in an upward whirlwind, a multitude of industries directly involved in the provision of food have also been affected. A great number of firms in allied industries, such as processors, transporters and the like have kept in step with the times. Their costs have gone up—but at the same time, the proportionate cost of food has not. This means that the whole load has come right back down on the initial producer, the farmer. He has carried the burden of the nation's cheap food all by himself.

The government has controlled it, let there be no question about that. Support prices have been established not to control production but to control food costs. And right now we see yet another drop in the support prices. Imagine that! Yet another drop in support prices when costs of everything else skyrockets upward.

Well, this is the way the government has controlled income for farmers. They can very simply reverse the trend and provide reasonable support prices. The added cost for the finished food product would be virtually unnoticeable. At the same time, the economy of the rural area would benefit like no industry could ever make it benefit.

Quite frankly, we're sick of hearing about all the problems of the city. We think the

rural area, with the slightest bit of help from the governmental bodies, provides an answer to a multitude of problems in our nation at a cost that would look like a weak candle beside the beacon light of city rebuilding costs.

## A POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE URBAN AREAS

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the urban areas of our Nation have already reached the critical stage, a fact that is well known to all of us in the Congress. The expectation, moreover, that our population will increase by as much as 75 million in the next 30 years, with most of that increase being absorbed by the cities and suburbs, makes it all the more urgent that we find practical solutions.

One possibility that has been widely discussed is the creation of new cities, in varying sizes, in parts of the country remote from the most heavily populated areas. In a recent speech to the Regional Plan Association in New York, Mr. David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, outlined a proposal to finance the development of 110 such new cities. He suggested bringing the resources of the private sector into a cooperative effort with Government in order to raise the necessary \$10 billion, acquire the land and implement this long-range plan.

I believe that Mr. Rockefeller's proposals merit the serious attention and consideration of this Congress, and I therefore include the text of his speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY DAVID ROCKEFELLER

I appreciate enormously the generous recognition that has been given this evening to the things I've tried to do toward improving this city that we all love so much. Even though it causes us anxiety.

To be singled out for acclaim by the Regional Plan Association is a heartening tribute, indeed, and I am most grateful to you, Rusty Crawford, and all your fine associates.

I should warn you, though, that you may be establishing a dangerous precedent at these annual dinners. My brother Nelson was the speaker at last year's affair, and I myself have that honor tonight. I just wonder whether you are aware that there are three more Rockefeller brothers!

Actually, father was a strong supporter of this Association. At one time, he stipulated that funds he provided for land acquisition and an extension of the Palisades Interstate Park System in the area north of the George Washington bridge be used in accordance with the First Regional Plan of 1929.

When Nelson originally ran for Governor, I suspect he had occasion to feel sorry that father was so self-effacing. He found to his dismay that the name most frequently associated with Palisades Park was Harriman!

Seeing David Frost here this evening as Master-of-Ceremonies reminded me that my place on the program this evening had improved considerably since we last met. On that occasion, David invited me to appear on his TV show, and of course I was happy to accept. I didn't mind so much waiting in

the wings while he interviewed two famous Hollywood actors—but I did think David carried the "upstaging" bit a little too far when he then brought on the Prime Minister of Sweden!

As Rusty Crawford can testify, it is particularly reassuring these days for a banker to hear anybody say nice things about him because, frankly, in these inflationary times, we have been getting far more brickbats than bouquets.

From time to time, I am asked what I think about inflation, and I've never been able to improve upon Milton Berle's definition. Inflation, he said, is when people's money won't buy what it did during the Depression when they didn't have much of it anyway!

Bankers have been forcefully reminded of inflation's impact by several recent developments, including the soaring cost of building and outfitting new branches—and you know how many of those are opening up all the time. One survey showed recently that our Avenue of the Americas now has more banks than bars!

Some people, I'm afraid, would not look upon that as a forward step in regional planning!

Some friends and I were discussing urban planning recently while watching the television coverage of Apollo 14. One of the group raised the question why, since we can put men on the moon, we cannot solve our urban problems which are so much closer at hand. "The explanation is simple," said another. "We know where the moon is!"

In reflecting on this comment, I couldn't help feeling that it pretty well summed up the difficulty we have in coming to grips with that tangled complex of problems we call "the urban crisis."

As the Regional Plan Association found out early in its very useful life, the urban crisis is not just a single problem. Rather it is a kind of witches' brew blended from all the major ills of our time—inadequate educational systems, hard-core unemployment, poverty in the midst of plenty antiquated transportation, shameful housing, insufficient public facilities, and all the rest.

This evening I'd like to touch briefly on some of the problems we face—problems that have been starkly delineated in the association's recent and the comprehensive Second Regional Plan. Then I'd like to explore a concept of development and financing that seems to me to have application not only to our urban areas but also to the exciting development of "new towns" and "satellite cities."

I should tell you at the outset that I personally am not a devotee of the new fashion of urban pessimism. This is the dispirited and disillusioned cult that never ceases to predict an early end to all our cities. Such an attitude, in my judgment, does much less than justice to the thousands of dedicated civil servants, determined businessmen and concerned citizens who have opted for enterprise and ingenuity as their response to a troubled era. To me, it would be both impractical and unthinkable to surrender to frustration at a time when there is so much constructive work to be done.

I spoke earlier of how difficult it is for the average citizen to see the urban crisis in perspective. Perhaps it helps if we think of the United States as two broad geographical areas.

One is rural America, a region so huge that, if it were a separate country, it would rank in area as the world's ninth largest. Yet, at the same time, a region so low in income that, by itself, it would be the world's sixth largest underdeveloped nation.

This Rural America contains the highest proportion of our poverty, the lowest average per capita income, the most inequitable distribution of educational opportunity, and the bulk of America's inadequate housing.

The second geographical element consists



of six large urban-and-suburban sprawls: The Boston-Washington corridor down the Atlantic seaboard; from Buffalo along the Great Lakes beyond Chicago; the spill-out of Los Angeles engulfing over half the California Pacific; the Florida spread; the Atlanta-Piedmont crescent; and the Fort Worth-Dallas-Houston complex.

Statistics confirm the pattern that this Nation's urban areas accommodate 70 per cent of all Americans on about 10 per cent of the land.

Thus, in our rural areas, we have more room than people—more than enough space to expand, together with a need for the advantages that business and industry can provide.

On the other hand, we have the urban areas with far more people than room. In these areas, we have seen haphazard growth in which social ills tend to multiply.

Given these disparities, it is only natural to ask: Why don't we get people to move from congested metropolitan centers to sparsely settled rural areas?

In a regimented society that might be a good way to do it, but it is hardly the American way.

Though romantics may still dream of the glories of small-town life, thousands of Americans continue by preference to pour into our great urban regions to take advantage of the unparalleled opportunities they do, in fact, offer. To the country lover it may seem surprising that nearly all the increase in our national population, over the past decade, took place in metropolitan areas—in the central cities and suburbs.

In view of this trend, and because of the huge investment we have in our existing cities, it is the height of folly to think—as some do—that we can ignore the refurbishing of our present metropolitan areas in favor of creating new cities away from the congested corridors. Realistically, we have no choice but to do both.

Today we have a population of some 206 million. Projections show that we are likely to add as many as 75 million more people by the end of this century—less than 30 years away. While this represents a lower rate of population growth for the U.S. than in the past—and is substantially lower than that of the developing nations—it still means that we must assimilate vast additional numbers of people in our country. In short, our urban problems will grow, not diminish, in the remaining decades of the 20th Century.

Seldom does a day pass that we don't hear the question: "What's the solution?"

But I wonder if a more realistic query wouldn't be: "What's the best approach to these problems?"

Experiences I have had in relation to Morningside Heights, Lower Manhattan and urban activities of our own Bank in recent years suggest that the right approach is all-important.

I might add, parenthetically, that this lesson on the proper approach was reinforced at least in my own mind, when I tried to convince some of my associates, at our friendly little loan company, to decorate their offices with contemporary art! That's a job that definitely calls for the right approach.

At any rate, in approaching urban problems, it is absolutely vital to gain the cooperation of three elements: private business, Government, and the local citizenry. Unless these three can reach a broad consensus, even the finest plan will become nothing more than a blueprint for failure.

I believe that the basic task of urban rehabilitation is one for private enterprise. But it must be a co-operative venture. Government must lend support through zoning, through supplying essential services, and through tax incentives. Furthermore, the goodwill of the local residents and their concurrence in the program is an indispensable ingredient.

Clearly, the business and financial community has a growing stake in the economic health of our cities. Good zoning, traffic control and adequate water supply are essential to the entire community, but they also bear directly on the successes of business located there. To attract and retain top talent willing to live and work in our cities, business needs progressive community leadership that is alert to the problems which exist and is prepared to do something about them.

Conversely, cities need the help of business if they are to expand job opportunities and generate an adequate tax base. During this decade of the Seventies, we must create jobs in the United States for about a million-and-a-half men and women who will be entering the labor force every year. Since most of these jobs must be in metropolitan areas where the population is concentrated, a basic function of any city must be to encourage and support the business and commercial activities that provide its economic base.

It goes without saying that in performing its primary role of producing goods and services efficiently, business is accomplishing a vital function of great public importance. Beyond this, however, more and more businesses are coming to recognize that they have a responsibility to assume a larger share of the social burden as well, hand-in-hand with Government. A notable recent example of business initiative which went beyond the conventional role of a strictly profit-oriented project was the case of nine commercial banks which are cooperating with the city in providing nearly \$75 million for the construction of the Waterside Housing Development, to accommodate some 1,500 low- and moderate-income families, on a novel six-acre platform over the East River.

This is just one example of an expanding corporate trend toward direct participation in community improvement that is becoming nationwide in scope. I am not suggesting, of course, that business singlehandedly—without Government assistance—can solve the problems of our cities. However, it can take—and is taking—a livelier interest and is playing a larger role. And I believe it will do even more as it becomes convinced that its efforts will receive encouragement and support from Government and the community.

One promising area for future collaboration between public and private sectors is in the exciting planning and development of "new towns" and "satellite cities."

I say exciting because this represents a dramatically new concept of urban building. Look at any of our present towns and cities and you can see unmistakable reflections of the way they were built—piecemeal.

How much better it would be to have an overall concept of the community which can shape the development right from the outset. That, in essence, is the new town idea. An imaginative builder comes in with a comprehensive plan and works out the details in cooperation with local government.

The location of the community center is carefully selected. You don't have the situation many of us are familiar with today where one municipality waits for its neighbor to provide the shopping and community facilities for both. Housing is planned to meet the needs of all those who will be working in the community. You don't run into situations where one municipality drags its feet, hoping the next town will provide the low- and middle-income housing, while it accommodates only the well-to-do.

In recent years, there have been about a dozen communities started which can be classified as "new towns"—that is politically new and independent units with a wide range of options for housing, employment, worship, education and recreation. Perhaps the outstanding example of a new town in this country is Columbia, Maryland, halfway between Baltimore and Washington. Because Chase Manhattan participated in its construction

financing, I have followed this particular "new town" with special interest.

Columbia was started in 1963 and is expected to be completed in 1980. By that time the population—now about 10,000—should reach 110,000. Of its 14,000 acres, about half are for residential use. A quarter of the land is for open space, while another quarter is for commercial and industrial purposes.

A core community is surrounded by what ultimately will be a dozen tree-shaded villages. Each village has been subdivided into racially integrated neighborhoods of about 1,000 families, with homes in a variety of styles and prices, clustered around churches, shops and schools. There are transportation loops around the villages that connect with Columbia's central core. Industrial sites are situated on the outskirts but with easy access routes to residential and shopping areas. The city is designed to be a balanced community with recreational and social facilities to satisfy the human needs of urban living, in addition to the businesses which provide employment and the economic base.

Seeing Columbia evolve, one can readily understand the growing support for new towns which is springing up all across the country.

As an example, The National Committee on Urban Growth Policy has recommended the creation of 100 new communities the size of Columbia and, in addition, ten new cities of at least one million people each.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 set up a Community Development Corporation to handle the financing of new communities, and provided some of the funds to get them started. These steps are very much in the right direction, but the funding presently available is still far below the waterline of adequacy to get the job done.

I have been giving considerable thought as to how the process of promoting new towns can be expedited. I have come to the conclusion that additional legislation will be required as well as added financial support. Specifically, it seems to me that two steps are needed.

One is a mechanism to help in acquiring land so that sufficiently large and contiguous tracts can be put together. In the case of Columbia, a few parcels could not be acquired and in the end the planners just had to design the city around them. If more parcels had been held out, or if they had been in more critical locations, this could have undercut the whole project. The chanciness related to land acquisition is much too great as things now stand.

The other need is for new sources of financing to provide the enormous sums required before new towns get underway and begin collecting revenue on their own.

To take care of both these needs, I would suggest the creation of two corporations nationwide in scope—one public, the other private or quasi-public.

To deal with the problem of land acquisition—and perhaps provide guidance in terms of national land use planning—we need either a new Federal agency or an existing agency supplied with special additional powers for planning and obtaining sites for new towns.

Such an agency might well require the power of eminent domain. But sufficient flexibility and safeguards should be built in so that the rights and desires of those already living in proposed sites would be protected and so that there would be no improper infringement on states' rights. Whether it be an Executive Branch mechanism or a creation of Congress should be a matter for sober reflection. But the plan would call for a Federal agency with the ability to determine sites and projects in a manner consistent with the economic needs and goals of the communities involved as well as those of the Nation. Thus a single

agency would handle land acquisition and site location.

The second agency, either private or quasi-public, would be organized to provide the financing. Possibly a new kind of bank could be devised which would seek its capital from commercial banks, insurance companies, industry and other sources. To do so, the new bank would need to offer long-term investment opportunities in the form of equity or debentures that would make possible full development of a new town, and be sufficiently remunerative so as to assure a continuing flow of capital for other new towns. If the new communities are well conceived, there is no reason why the bulk of the capital should not come from private sources.

The two agencies would need to work in close cooperation to see that the site locations of new towns not only meet the public standards desired for national growth but also to make sure that they would be attractive to residents and to industry.

Working together, these two agencies could create a whole series of new independent communities, providing adequate housing at reasonable cost and bringing together both the white and blue-collar work force required for industrial expansion.

Aside from the building of new towns, the plan I have outlined could readily direct investment into existing core cities where our national growth policy determined that programs of redevelopment or rehabilitation were desirable.

Perhaps the greatest benefit would be the harnessing of private financing sources, which up to now have not been attracted by urban investment, and directing them into responsible urban developments that are not only profitable but that enhance the environment as well.

Obviously, the building of new towns is an expensive venture. One recent study estimates that a community the size of Columbia might cost as much as \$50 million in pre-development charges alone—in land acquisition, planning and management, and infrastructure such as streets and utilities.

These start-up costs are the very ones that the developer finds so burdensome under present conditions and the ones that the proposed new financing agency would be designed to handle. As a new town project moves ahead, it can obtain funds in the conventional money market or—in case of lower income housing—from various government programs or the new National Corporation for Housing Partnerships. But the pre-development costs are the big road blocks.

If we use this \$50 million as a base figure, then the recommendation of the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy for 100 communities of Columbia's size, and ten of one million people each could cut cost in the neighborhood of \$10 billion.

Standing by itself, this is an imposing figure, indeed. Yet it is less than half of what we have already spent on the man-in-space program. And as great as the benefits from that program have been, I believe that the advantages of new town development—certainly in human terms—could be incalculably greater.

In conclusion I would like to suggest that in tackling urban problems, we should keep five points in mind:

First, that because these problems are so closely interrelated, they call for the establishment of overall national goals and guidance.

Second, that federal and state assistance must be closely coordinated to stimulate responsible local action and serve the best long-run interests of the overall community.

Third, that the amount of state and local building and rebuilding required is so vast that it will make necessary the expenditure of a steadily increasing share of our total

national income. Both private and public funds will be required. Since states and municipalities are already straining their taxing powers, I believe the federal government will have to bear a larger share than in the past. That is why I personally applaud President Nixon's proposal for what he calls "general revenue sharing." The idea of giving local governments greater flexibility in spending a larger portion of federal tax revenues on urban development is eminently sound, and I would hope that the President's approach would eventually find the broadly-based support it deserves on Capitol Hill.

Fourth, that it is imperative for any new town or redevelopment project to include enough profitable activities whether in housing, commercial development or industry to generate tax revenues sufficient to make the project viable with a minimum of public subsidy.

Fifth and finally, that the task of refurbishing our existing core cities and building new towns can best be accomplished if public and private efforts are creatively combined in such a way as to win the support of the community.

In shaping our cities of the future, we are limited only by the intensity of our concern, the reach of our inquiring minds, and the strength of our determination to provide a better life for all our citizens.

#### CANCER: A CURE WITHIN REACH THIS DECADE

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have joined as a cosponsor in introducing legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 27 on January 22, 1971, calling for a national commitment to be immediately undertaken in hopes of achieving a cure and control of cancer within this decade.

Not that the mere introduction of this legislation will result in an instant or magical cure, but the fact that President Nixon, the administration, and the Congress are committed to conquering this dreadful disease and are willing to put themselves on record by supporting this legislation providing adequate funding cannot but help in the battle to save lives.

Each year cancer is among the leading causes of death in the United States—ranking second only to heart disease. There are few families within our Nation who have not lost some relative or close friend as a result of cancer.

Sixteen percent of all deaths in the United States, representing some 329,000 persons, were caused from cancer in 1970. This year the American Cancer Society estimates the cancer death toll will climb even higher to 335,000. This is about 920 persons dying a day from cancer—or more than one every 2 minutes.

As far as cancer fatalities are related to population, the U.S. ranks 18th among the 40 nations reporting mortality statistics, according to the American Cancer Society.

More than 52 million Americans now living will eventually have cancer. This is about 1 in 4 persons, according to pres-

ent population. Over the years cancer will strike 2 of 3 families.

In the 1970's alone, it is estimated there will be 3.5 million cancer deaths, 6.5 million new cancer cases and 10 million under treatment for the disease.

It has been projected that in the State of Michigan alone, there will be 13,800 deaths from cancer this year, and 26,000 new cases reported.

As shocking as all these figures are, some progress has been made in the fight against cancer. In 1960, 267,000 people were victims—representing more than 17 percent of the death rate.

Back in 1930, the hope of survival for a person who was stricken with cancer was less than 1 in 5. Today the odds have risen to 1 in 3.

However, despite today's odds—which are still heavily weighed against the victim—the success that has been achieved lies primarily in the early detection of the disease, as opposed to any strikingly new "cure" treatment or breakthrough discovery. True, there have been some wonder drugs and therapy treatment that have prolonged the life of those sufferers.

But early detection, which has to a great extent been made possible through the public and private educational programs of various interested groups, has been primarily responsible for today's 1 in 3 odds of survival.

It has been unfortunate, indeed, that there has been a lack of what could be termed an actual major medical breakthrough toward a cure in combating and controlling cancer.

But, funds for research have been limited in past years. Congress appropriated for fiscal year 1969 some \$185.2 million for the National Cancer Institute. The American Cancer Institute had a 1968-69 budget of about \$61.5 million—about \$20 million which went for research. A large remainder went to public and professional education.

Therefore, I think it important that we increase the amount appropriated for cancer research. Our Nation's leading medical authorities have almost all agreed that we probably can, through proper research, control cancer within this decade—provided we provide the funding.

This bill will not only provide the type of vital funding, it will also establish a new national agency for centralizing the administration of cancer research funds. It furthermore provides for the construction of five new critically needed research institutes in the United States during the first 2 years of appropriations.

#### SMALL OIL SLICKS RISE, POSE A WORSE THREAT THAN MAJOR BLOWOUTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the February 10, 1971, issue of the Wall



Street Journal, Mr. James C. Tanner wrote a very thought-provoking article regarding the fact that it is the small and often unnoticed oil spill that eventually results in the most far-reaching damage to our environment. These spills, when taken together, are a far more serious threat to the environment than the occasional spectacular incident.

It is estimated that over 3 billion gallons of oil a year are presently released into the oceans of the world, and Mr. Tanner's article points out that many pollution experts feel the problems may be even more serious.

Mr. Speaker, it is requested that Mr. Tanner's article appear in the *Record* at this point.

I include the article as follows:

**SMALL OIL SLICKS RISE, POSE A WORSE THREAT THAN MAJOR BLOWOUTS—DAILY SPILLS, DRIPS AND LEAKS BY PIPES, BOATS AND BARGES SEEN CAUSING BIG DAMAGE—SICK BIRDS AND SOILED BEACHES**

(By James C. Tanner)

NEW ORLEANS.—It is a sunny, cloudless day in this delta city as A. L. Prechac Jr. and a pilot take off in a Cessna plane. As the small craft climbs toward the southwest, a lush carpet of green marshes laced with bayous and spotted with lakes opens up below. The waters of beautiful Lake Salvador gleam in the distance.

But those gleaming waters bother Mr. Prechac, who is head of the antipollution-enforcement section of the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission. He points out to a passenger that part of the gleam is caused by the sun's bouncing off a spreading oil slick. A few miles further, over some marshes and waterways, brilliantly colored rainbows reflect off oil creeping along the surface of canals. Beyond that, an oil slick oozes over part of an inlet.

Before the Cessna returns to New Orleans, Mr. Prechac will have observed, and duly noted, enough violations of the state's antipollution laws to warrant issuing 18 or 20 citations to companies and individuals. Few, if any, of these violations will receive any widespread publicity, however. For unlike dramatic tanker collisions and massive oil-well blowouts, the slicks here, when considered individually, are far too minor to arouse public indignation.

#### A SERIOUS THREAT

Yet, taken together, these small slicks are a far more serious threat to the environment than are the occasional spectacular blowouts, conservationists say. "It's the small but chronic discharges that are the most debilitating," says Kenneth E. Biglane, a marine biologist who directs the division of oil and hazardous materials of the Environmental Protection Agency, the new federal antipollution agency.

The smaller spills can be blamed on a number of factors, including minor leaks in wells, deliberate dumping by ships, routine transfers of oil and minor accidents at sea. But whatever the cause, the small spills are difficult to detect; and despite new laws and harsher penalties, they are often impossible to prevent.

The amount of oil going into the seas around the world now is estimated at three billion gallons a year. Some authorities say that during the past five years more than one million gallons of oil have been accidentally leaked into the waters off the Texas coast. This figure is more than twice the amount spilled in California's Santa Barbara Channel in January 1969—an accident that provoked a major ecological uproar.

But many pollution experts maintain that petroleum problems are even more serious in-

land. They say oil in increasing amounts is being leaked, dripped, spilled and poured into lakes, streams, marshes, bayous and bays. "Soon there will be oil all over the water, and that will be that," one pollution fighter glumly predicts.

#### CHASING PETROLEUM POLLUTERS

Recognizing the problem of small spills, Clark M. Hoffpauer, director of the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, in mid-1969 established a special pollution inspection force made up of game wardens. About 30 agents for the commission now spend much of their time chasing petroleum polluters, rather than game poachers.

Mr. Hoffpauer's inspection force, armed with Polaroid cameras, photograph whatever pollution violations they find. There's no lack of subjects. Mr. Hoffpauer suggests, in fact, that the oil companies should consider mining some of Louisiana's lake bottoms. "There is more oil in that mud than in oil shale," he says.

Mr. Prechac's recent flight over Lake Salvador illustrates the magnitude of Louisiana's problems with "small" spillage. After commission pilot Leo Rodriguez has flown a few miles beyond the apparently faulty rig operated by Texaco in Lake Salvador, Mr. Prechac spots five wells and one crude-oil waste pit that seem to be leaking into the marshes and waterways of Texaco's Lafitte field.

The plane heads south toward the Gulf Coast. About 10 miles offshore, a 22-well Shell Oil Co. platform has been blazing out of control since last Dec. 1, and a silvery sheen of oil is seen stretching along five miles of the beach front. As the Cessna turns to trace the sheen, however, it's seen that the source of pollution isn't the burning platform at all. Rather, it seems to be a tugboat pumping its bilge into the water.

#### TAGGING A TUG

The pilot swoops low over the tug, and its name is jotted down by Mr. Prechac. Regaining altitude, the plane passes over Port Sulphur, on the Mississippi River, and the captain spots on oil barge dripping petroleum into the waters of nearby Lake Washington.

Across the river in the Black Bay oil field, small slicks are spreading away from three producing platforms and oily rainbows fan out from several rigs. Mr. Prechac, busily taking notes, says most of the offending installations are operated by Gulf Oil Corp.

After his flights, Mr. Prechac usually radios his agents responsible for the aerially surveyed territories. The agents then go out in boats to collect additional evidence. More often than not they find what they're looking for; citations have been averaging about 100 a month. On this day, however, rather than issuing citations Mr. Prechac calls the oil companies and tells them what he has seen and warns them to clean up the situation.

The citations, however, carry an initial penalty of only \$100. Furthermore, few oil polluters are fined. Louisiana courts appear reluctant to prosecute petroleum producers, some observers say, since oil is the state's major producer of revenue.

This isn't to say that the oil companies don't respond to Mr. Prechac's citations. Most major producers, increasingly concerned about ouster from ecologists, attempt to avoid adverse publicity by quickly correcting pollution offenses. "If we can get with an oil spill right away and get it cleaned up, it doesn't get into the newspapers," says an official of one large oil company.

"There is no way, when you're working over an old well or a new one, not to spill a little oil," says a spokesman for Gulf. "We contract for people to work over the wells, and it's awfully hard to get good workover crews."

A Texaco spokesman says his company is "concerned as much as anyone, maybe more than most, about situations like this. We

do everything we can to prevent even the smallest sheen. We work very closely with the Louisiana authorities and the little mishap is taken care of on the spot."

The Texaco spokesman doesn't deny that Texaco gets a lot of citations in Louisiana, but he insists that the oil spotted by Mr. Prechac should be called "sheens," rather than "slicks." "There is a big difference between a slick and a sheen," he says. "Sheens can be caused by outboard motors."

Over and above bad publicity, the companies are becoming concerned by the increasingly tough stance of federal regulators regarding spills in coastal or navigable waters. Early last year, following a big spill in the Gulf of Mexico by Chevron Oil Co., a Standard Oil Co. of California subsidiary, the federal government charged nine companies with failing to follow proper safety precautions in offshore drilling. Thus far, eight of the offenders have paid fines totaling more than \$2 million.

The Chevron spill is also credited for speedy congressional enactment last year of legislation providing stiff penalties for petroleum pollution. The penalties, which reach a maximum \$10,000 fine for each violation, are imposed on any concern that knowingly discharges oil into the water or that fails to report accidental spills.

But those U.S. agencies charged with enforcing the new federal restrictions aren't yet sufficiently geared up to be fully effective. "We cannot control the (spills) situation," says an official of the Environmental Protection Agency, "but perhaps we can mitigate the damages."

The extent of such damages isn't yet known. Gulf Coast resort operators have been increasingly grumbling about globs of oil they claim are spoiling their beaches. And environmentalists note with despair that pelicans and other coastal birds from Florida to Louisiana are often found dying from oil soakings.

Conservationists, however, believe the harm done to the birds and beaches is but a small segment of the total pollution picture in Louisiana. Throughout the state, they say, formerly beautiful and fertile woodlands have been laid waste by the seepage of oil and brine from nearby petroleum fields. They add that some swamps and water bodies have become almost devoid of marine life because of oil runoffs.

Oil is important to Louisiana's economy, but the state's waters—sustaining vast fish, oyster and shrimp industries—are also major producers of revenue, some Louisianians note. Hardy oysters usually purge themselves of oil within a few weeks, but some species of fish continue to carry an oily taste long after contact with spills. And some shrimpers are complaining their catches are down because of the oil leakage problem.

The oil companies reply that the industry's antipollution spending has reached \$1.5 million a day—more than double the figure of five years ago. In addition, they say, the American Petroleum Institute has a 1971 budget of \$3.5 million for its drive against air and water pollution. The largest single item in this budget is \$1.3 million to study the best means for cleaning up oil spills.

The oil companies, in fact, are currently financing extensive research in the control and prevention of petroleum pollution. Shell's research laboratory in Houston is so highly regarded that Mr. Prechac plans to enroll some of his agents there for courses.

For Louisiana's waterways, however, the immediate future is clouded. Research aside, executives of the oil companies say they can't operate without a certain amount of spillage if they are to meet rising petroleum demands. "Railroads can't operate without derailling some cars," says one philosophical oilman. But that argument doesn't soothe a lot of people.

THE VOICE HAS NOT DIED WITH  
THE MAN

## HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1971, Lawrence S. Fanning, one of Alaska's most outstanding citizens and one of the Nation's finest journalists died. His death was a shock and a great loss to the people he loved and for the people he worked with.

Tributes to Mr. Fanning have come from the people who have had the good fortune to work with him and from people whose lives he so deeply touched. Journalists across the Nation, in numerous articles, have expressed their admiration and respect for Lawrence Fanning. Perhaps one of the most moving of those articles was written by the staff who served with him at the Anchorage Daily News. I would like to insert this editorial into the Record as a tribute to Mr. Fanning and to demonstrate in the most eloquent words his profound influence on his friends and staff:

## THE VOICE HAS NOT DIED WITH THE MAN

Larry Fanning is gone, but he left a legacy that will live on in this newspaper and its employees.

His was a resonant, compassionate voice for the liberal, progressive ideals which to him epitomized the best in our nation and state. He championed the poor, the weak and the oppressed; he had an abiding faith in the young ("Most of my generation has spent too damn much time talking and not enough time listening."); he abhorred social injustice, corruption and bigotry.

When he acquired control of The Daily News in 1967, Larry Fanning let the community know right away what it could expect. "The Anchorage Daily News will be a politically independent newspaper," he wrote in an editorial in the first edition of the paper under his ownership. "We expect to be outspoken on issues and candidates. As a consequence, no political organization or power structure is likely to applaud our efforts consistently. Our purpose is to serve the interests of all the people and to provide a forum for dissent as well as consensus."

And that is the way he ran the newspaper—to the delight of some and the chagrin of others.

As time passed, many residents came to know Larry Fanning well, for his door was open to all, and readers of the paper became familiar with his philosophy through scores of punchy editorials.

Two subjects in particular cropped up time and again in his editorials: the need for a generous and honorable settlement, with state participation, of the century-old Native land claims; the necessity of protecting the spectacular Alaskan environment as development proceeds. Neither subject has been particularly popular with a majority of Alaskans. But both fired Fanning's imagination. And when aroused, his displeasure could sting.

Following the Prudhoe Bay oil lease sale, when many Alaskans were deploring the interest the rest of the country was showing in Alaska, he wrote:

"Most Alaskans welcome the boom and look forward to the benefits that prudent and concerned development of our natural resources will bring. But some members of our community want it both ways. They're all for development, but they're becoming increasingly sensitive over the loss of privacy."

"In response to the awakening national

interest in the Great Land, they trot out the shop-worn shibboleth of 'Alaska for Alaskans. Outsiders go home' to do battle against visiting, frequently critical journalists . . .

"This type of attack may have been good form when the only outsiders who cared about our state were high school geography students or desk men at the Department of the Interior. It won't do now . . .

"It is all too easy to lapse into a false sense of security based on reading or seeing only that which pleases. The list of those who have paid the price for self-delusion is too long to print here."

After three and a half decades of devotion to a demanding craft, whose pressures and constant contact with the seamy side of life have turned many a flaming young idealist into a cynic by middle age, Larry Fanning retained an undiminished faith in people and the democratic process.

"He was the only man I ever met who, after talking to him, always made me feel better," one friend said this week.

An editorial from the fall of 1969 shows why.

"The great lesson of last year's national election was that participatory democracy still worked," Fanning wrote. "Even in this age of computers, faceless cities and a burgeoning population, individuals made themselves heard. Eugene McCarthy's campaign showed that the hard questions could be asked of our leaders and fair answers demanded as the price of their re-election . . .

"The lessons of the past year have not been lost on some Alaskans. Last spring saw the inspiring Blafra walk as well as the formation of Democrats for Issues and Answers, a group determined to bring rational investigation to partisan issues. The Alaska Citizens Concerned about the Deployment of the ABM proved that not all Alaskans welcomed a poorly rationalized, questionably conceived weapons system."

"More recently the League of Women Voters has turned its not inconsiderable talents with wit, charm and energy to the structure of Anchorage area government. And the Save our State Committee performed a valuable service by focusing attention on the Amchitka nuclear test shot."

"These people are concerned Alaskans, newcomers and pioneers alike, who at considerable personal expense and time are helping to ventilate the key issues of the day . . .

"Free discussion cannot hurt Alaska. The state is already subject to pressures which tax the intellectual and physical resources of our small population and relatively short modern political history. Yet our ability to deal imaginatively and progressively with the challenges of rapid development depends on Alaskans being involved in everything that's going on."

"The simple fact is that the government that governs best does not govern least, but rather governs with the greatest participation of its citizens. Abuse and corruption are the companions of disinterest. Participation, relevance, involvement are the keys to a healthy democratic society."

People were always the key.

And to the young people of Anchorage, many of them distressed by the direction of society, there was this bit of advice in a 1968 editorial:

"Remember always, the struggle is half won, not half lost; the glass is not half empty, it's half full."

And when his long-time friend Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, died in 1969, Larry Fanning penned a tribute that in many respects could apply as well to himself:

"An extraordinary man died . . .

"A man who left an indelible mark on the land he loved;

"A man who wrote the kind of passionate prose that produced miracles of change and reform;

"A man of courage, integrity, wit and compassion."

"(He) was a newspaper writer and an editor. (He) was also a publisher, but he had no appetite for that title. It made him uncomfortable.) . . .

"As a writer, and as a man, (he) answered to his own instincts. And because he did, a generation of writers found their voices."

"... loved by his friends, respected by his enemies, (he) spoke out in a time when 'it took guts to have guts.'"

"Let those words be his epitaph."

There is no way to fill the void that Larry Fanning left at this newspaper. Gone will be the special grace that illuminated everything he touched. But his concerns—social equality and justice in a Democratic society—remain with us as an enduring legacy. We will continue to espouse them.

The voice has not died with the man.

PITTSBURGH SITE OF FIFTH INTERNATIONAL  
CONFERENCE ON  
URBAN TRANSPORTATION

## HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh has had the honor of hosting the first four International Conferences on Urban Transportation beginning in 1966.

This coming September 8 to 10, 1971, Pittsburgh will again be the meeting place of some of the most knowledgeable men in the field of mass transportation, as the fifth international conference convenes.

The participants will seek out the problems and search for the solutions necessary to the safe and comfortable mass movement of people. It will be a unique international confrontation, which we hope will lead to breakthroughs in transportation advancement. Innovative plans and ideas in mobility will keynote the conference.

As a time when all of us in Congress, as well as many other concerned citizens are seeking solutions to the urban transportation crisis, the International Conference to be held in Pittsburgh can bring concrete programs to view for all the world to see.

It is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following formal announcement of this conference:

E. D. Brockett, Chairman of the Board of Gulf Oil Corporation, will head the Fifth International Conference on Urban Transportation, to be held in Pittsburgh, September 8-10, 1971.

The Pittsburgh Urban Transit Council (PUTC) will sponsor the conference. Mr. Brockett was recently elected chairman of this organization. The Transportation Research Institute (TRI) of Carnegie-Mellon University and the Gulf Oil Corporation will act as co-sponsors to this year's conference.

Conferees will include transit system designers and builders from all over the world as well as government and civic leaders interested in mass transportation.

The conference will focus attention on mass and rapid transit problems and generate ideas for the future, with emphasis on the economic, ecological and social benefits good transportation can provide.

"Efficient urban transportation is one of



the most important goals our society should be seeking in the 1970's," Mr. Brockett said. "If cities are to remain important as centers of commerce, culture, medicine, education, religion—the fundamental elements of our society—they must be both beautiful and accessible."

"I don't believe we can make cities attractive to people merely by filling new super highways with more and more cars and by leveling more downtown areas for parking lots."

"Because we are involved in the business of moving people, I and the oil company I work for, believe we have a social responsibility to work for the best total transportation programs to benefit all, to keep our cities viable, to free people to move about, which I feel is one of our principal freedoms."

He said the PUTC, TRI and various Pittsburgh companies in the transit business have established Pittsburgh as "the international transit center."

"Generally, Pittsburgh's transit technology is five to eight years ahead of any other concentration in the industry. The area has the techniques, skills, people and money to build transportation systems on a big scale," Mr. Brockett said.

"The Fifth International will give us the chance to share our knowledge with others, as well as receive guidance on future applications and developments of that technology."

Past conferences, which began in 1966, have attracted transportation officials and experts from all over the world, including Russia. Attendance has exceeded 1000 each year as participation has continued to grow.

Other speakers have included Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, 1969; New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, 1968; Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, 1967; and Alan S. Boyd, Department of Commerce Undersecretary for Transportation, 1966.

## BRAINWARPING IN THE NEW AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, well educated and conscientious people—many holding top positions in our National Government—are being forced to submit themselves for psychological reeducation because they are too human and individualistic for roles in the new American revolution.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on January 13 notified some 200 employees of the National Center for Health Statistics—NCHS—that:

They must attend intensive training and working conferences designed to develop the racial and cultural awareness and skills necessary in applying EEO policies, goals, and practices to their own immediate circumstances.

These conferences, billed as equal employment opportunity but obviously designed to give preferential treatment to one minority, are scheduled for 3-day sessions to be held the weeks of February 22 and March 1 in Fredericksburg, Va. The EEO Organizational Development Conferences are to be conducted by Curber Associates, Inc., which had earlier handled the similar sensitivity

training conferences at Gaithersburg, Md., and Harper's Ferry, Va.

The Acting Director of the National Center for Health Statistics in his memorandum states that these conferences are not "sensitivity-type," yet the announced goals and the reports of past EEO conferences tend to indicate otherwise. Perhaps the Acting Director is confused as to what sensitivity training is.

The cost of these two conferences is reported to be high: \$75,000 to the U.S. taxpayers and denial of individual freedoms to the Federal employees.

Thus far, the sensitivity training craze has been restricted to the civilian area of Government employees, but the program is being readied for the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force with meetings apparently to sensitize our officers so that they will associate guilt and immorality with any thought of winning wars or victory.

Sensitivity training has advanced a long way from the prisons of Red China, North Korea, and Russia to where it is now devised as a process to control and manipulate our Nation's public servants by breaking down their motivations, desires, and initiatives.

Only those nations which are free suffer prejudices. Those nations which do not tolerate individuality are totalitarian. Egalitarianism, and absence of discrimination, however desirable or idealistic they may be made to appear, can never be fully attained in any society—be it totalitarian or free. Even in Communist countries, supposedly set up to achieve these theoretical goals, discrimination and inequality are still rampant. Note the persecution of Jews and other minorities in Russia. The only difference in this regard is that in Communist countries the people have lost all individual freedom. If all values of individual superiority, cultural differences, and natural prejudices are ever eliminated in our country, it can only be done by denying liberty to all of our people.

The so-called equal employment opportunity is a political appeal by the President, who has written that:

Equal employment opportunity must become an integral part of the day-to-day management of Federal agencies and be interwoven with every action which has an effect on employees.

The unanswered question remains: Does the President intend equal employment opportunity as an appealing slogan rather than the destructive program being forcefully administered as if sanctioned by his orders.

Apparently, under the New American Revolution, the bureaucrats of the elite category have decided that training sub-employees for promotion is too slow and emotional; so, they have devised a faster method for downgrading the superior employee—psychological training to bring on guilt neurosis. And if one of the more superior employees objects, he is to be regarded as being a troublemaker, uncooperative, and as standing in the way of the New American Revolution. He must be purged. This is one way to create a vacancy to be filled by the subemployee. This is the way equal employment opportunity is being carried out.

It is strange that one never hears of a sensitivity training seminar to indoctrinate the minority so that it understands the problems of the majority.

The sensitivity method being pushed by the NCHS for the promotion and demotion of Government employees as groups rather than individuals employees is endemic to a collectivist form of government and is foreign to the government of a free country. It can but lead to a deterioration in services rendered to the public. Government jobs should be filled on the basis of the education, training, competency, and suitability of the individual applicant and not on the basis of a consensus of persons having undergone a brain-warping conference.

I include the memorandum from HEW, related newscippings, and a report on a report on a previous sensitivity training seminar as reported in the HSMHA World, the publication for the employees of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration of Health, Education, and Welfare:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION,

January 13, 1971.

Subject: EEO organization development conferences.

To: All employees, NCHS.

As I have previously informed you the HSMHA Administrator had directed that "all headquarters, regional and field program managers and supervisors shall participate in intensive training and working conferences designed to develop the racial and cultural awareness and skills necessary in applying EEO policies, goals and practices to their own immediate circumstances." These conferences, now being organized by HSMHA programs, are known as EEO Organizational Development Conferences.

NCHS is now arranging for its conference under the direction of an ad hoc planning committee chaired by the NCHS Executive Officer. Two separate sessions will be held for NCHS since the Center is too large for a single effective training session. The conferences will be three-day sessions held the weeks of February 22 and March 1 and will be held in Fredericksburg, Virginia.

All employees GS-12 and above and all supervisors (with three or more employees under their direction) will be expected to attend. In addition, certain other minority and non-minority employees not in these categories will be expected to attend.

The EEO Organizational Development Conferences will be conducted by Curber Associates, Inc., the firm which handled the previous HSMHA EEO conferences at Gaithersburg and Harpers Ferry. This group is working with a NCHS planning group which has representation throughout the Center. This group consists of Edward Minty, Chairman, James Baird, Marshall Evans, Eugene Jackson, William Jenkins, Robert Israel, Talaria Stevenson, Laciola Washington, Elijah White. Questions you have concerning the conferences may be directed to members of this committee.

In order to give you some idea of the flavor of the conferences a list of the goals of the conferences as prepared by Curber Associates follows:

"The overall goal of the conferences is to effect the necessary changes that would result in true equal employment opportunity within the National Center for Health Statistics.

Within the framework of the overall goal, it is Curber's intent to assist participants in the conference to grow both as individ-

uals and as group members within NCHS. Specially, the Curber training staff would focus upon the following areas:

1. The instilling in all conference participants of:

a. Greater understanding of and support for the EEO program;

b. The willingness to accept cultural differences without bias;

c. The understanding that EEO will benefit all employees, rather than only members of minority groups; and

d. The desire to change behavior and become an advocate of equality within the EEO Guidelines.

2. Development of an agency commitment to eliminate discrimination and create a workable environment of mutual trust and acceptance.

3. Creation of an atmosphere which will enable the conference participants to freely and honestly discuss racism and EEO problems.

4. Increased personal awareness of and sensitivity to instances of unequal employment practices and existence of unwritten policies of unequal opportunity.

5. Greater realization of the individual's potential to take effective action steps and greater willingness to risk taking action.

6. Greater ability to explore and develop alternative styles of organizational and personal behavior to replace traditional win/lose behavioral styles.

7. Development of productive individual and group processes leading to action alternatives through shared ideas, shared decision-making, and shared problem-solving.

8. Broadening of channels of communication between individuals, thus increasing the ability to win others' trust and to trust others.

9. Development of the ability to diagnose problems, suggest strategies, set goals, and implement action-steps—individually and as a team.

10. Development of greater ability to reduce tensions and to utilize conflict and confrontation constructively.

11. Identification and analysis of existing interpersonal and organizational support structures, and discovery of ways to build new supports.

The overall objective of these conferences is to effect the necessary changes that will result in true equal employment and opportunity within NCHS. Achievement of this objective cannot help but prove to be of benefit to all of us. Within this context, it should be noted that these conferences are not "sensitivity-type."

As planning progresses we will be forwarding conference details to participants.

Both Mr. Woolsey and I want all of you to cooperate fully in making these Conferences a great success.

PHILIP S. LAWRENCE, Sc. D.,  
Acting Director, NCHS.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune,  
Dec. 20, 1970]

U.S. GOVERNMENT FLIRTING WITH SENSITIVITY  
TRAINING—SOME DEPARTMENTS HAVE STAFF  
TAKE COURSE

(By Paula Dranov)

WASHINGTON—The federal government is flirting with the far-out field of sensitivity training.

Several departments are running employees through short-term courses in an effort to make them more sympathetic to people than paper work.

A few advocates of the movement see it as a tool that could humanize the faceless governmental machine. They've been calling in sensitivity coaches for problems ranging from racism to slow-moving memos.

But the government's approach so far has been pretty tame. None of the bureaucrats are crawling around under blankets, taking

off their clothes or baring their souls. Mostly, they just talk.

The existence of sensitivity programs came to light recently when a Health, Education and Welfare worker sued the National Training Laboratories for \$500,000, claiming she was injured when she was flung to the floor in a demonstration of aggression and hostility during a government-sponsored program.

#### SUIT NOT MENTIONED

NTL, the pioneer of the movement in the United States and an affiliate of the prestigious National Education Association, doesn't talk about the suit or sensitivity training and the government in the same breath. "It's equivalent to a swear word," says trainer Cyril Mill.

The phrase itself conjures up images of California's controversial Esalen Institutes' experiments with "sensory awareness," often in the nude. But these days, sensitivity training encompasses a whole range of activities from Esalen's flamboyance to NTL's staid "participatory learning."

All of it is an outgrowth of the "human potentials" movement which focuses on the idea that man's latent resources can be tapped through exploring his relationships with others.

The government latched on to the idea in its own cautious way as a means of sharpening the awareness of its officials, particularly those in personnel and management work.

#### STREAMLINING

The State Department was one of the first to call in NTL—to help streamline administrative procedures and find out why it took a memo three months to move from one official to another down the chain of command.

NTL also worked with a group of junior Foreign Service Officers to find out why so many young people abandoned State Department careers. It turned out the junior officers were upset at getting so little responsibility in policy-making.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has used some sensitivity training techniques on equal employment opportunity counselors. And the departments of Labor; Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Peace Corps; the Army, and even the Internal Revenue Service have called in sensitivity training consultants to help solve management, personnel and human relations problems.

Understandably, the agencies are rather sensitive about their ventures into this controversial field. "At the Internal Revenue Service, they were always a little fearful about what would happen if their superiors found out what was going on," one coach recalls.

#### BRAINWASHING

Right wing groups have labeled sensitivity sessions "Communist brainwashing" and contend they promote sexual promiscuity.

Indeed, one HUD official started a minor bureaucratic fuss when he came back from a training program in Atlanta and announced he had been subjected to "Communist brainwashing."

He had spent two weeks at Project Cornerstone, a program designed to let government employees know what it is like to live in a black ghetto. Participants spend two weeks in a rundown house, eating what their neighbors eat, living under uncomfortable conditions and surveying the impact, if any, of government aid to poor people.

The HUD official complained about the discomfort, the language of the Cornerstone staff, the bad food and the availability of only one bathroom for 12 participants.

Most government sensitivity activities far more structured than Cornerstone are aimed at resolving a single problem through such techniques as encounter sessions of work-

shops using some sensitivity training methods.

OEO took 100 new Equal Improvement Opportunity counselors to Fredericksburg, Va., last month for a week-long encounter.

"We felt that anyone who was going to counsel others should be aware of himself—who he is, why he reacts certain ways, why he, like all Americans, is a victim of racism," says Frank Kent, director of OEO's human rights division.

#### CONFLICTS

OEO also has used the encounter technique to resolve conflicts among the poor. It recently sponsored a three-day workshops in Paterson, N.J., aimed at reconciling differences between black and Puerto Rican groups which were feuding over available anti-poverty money.

Sensitivity training techniques aren't restricted to the civilian area of government. Amid charges that racism has been institutionalized in the Army and fostered by commanding officers, chaplains decided to tackle the problem and called in NTL to help.

NTL's Cyril Mill conducted one session and recalls that his first job was getting the participants to trust one another. "They were worried about whether anything they said in the program would later be used against them by other officers," he explained.

"At one session," he said, "they had to send for a black chaplain to review their list and help them decide if they were on the right track. They were amazed at some of his experiences with racism in the Army."

While the chaplains are described as "receptive" to this type of training, the reverse is more common in the government, some NTL officials feel.

One trainer found an "incredible resistance and highly developed defense mechanism" among state department employees.

"Look," he adds, "These people are used to defending themselves against ( ). If they can resist him, just think how they can resist me."

The same trainer sees the federal government as an unlikely market for even the tamest brand of sensitivity training.

Adds another trainer: "Basically, what we are about is change. But government people know the system is bigger than they are and pretty much resistant to change."

"Most of all, they just don't want to rock the boat."

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 11, 1971]

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL SESSIONS BETWEEN RACES SCORED

(By Joseph Young)

Another invasion of government employee rights—psychological confrontation sessions between blacks and whites—is charged by Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights subcommittee.

Ervin says that outside psychologists are being used to stir up conflict and confrontation between federal top-management officials and their minority group employees.

The ostensible purpose of these sessions, says Ervin, is to promote equal employment opportunity practices in federal agencies by laying bare the resentments and suspensions between the races and trying to solve them through psychology.

"But it is tyranny over the mind of the grossest sort to subject employees to a probe of their psyches, to provoke and indeed require disclosure of their intimate attitudes and beliefs during emotionally charged situations which are deliberately set up by psychologists for the manipulation of human emotions," Ervin said.

Ervin added that when some officials and employees have protested such sessions, they have been accused of insubordination and the information has been computerized in their personnel data files.

Participants have been told that the con-



frontation sessions are intended to change management and supervisors' attitudes toward blacks and also their attitudes toward "cultural" differences between the races, according to the Senate subcommittee data.

Those participating in the program are federal managers in grades GS-12 and above and supervisors with three or more subordinates, plus a selected number of minority group employees in the lower grades.

The extent of the program throughout government is not yet known by the Senate group which now is engaged in determining how widespread it is. One department involved is Health, Education, and Welfare, Senate Committee sources said.

Civil Service Commission officials said they, too, are investigating.

As described by Senate subcommittee sources, a typical confrontation session seeks to bring out the resentments of whites against blacks and vice versa and then to reconcile the differences.

One had a white "agitator," rehearsed in advance for his role, say, "I live in Chevy Chase and don't want any black bastard living next door to me."

This provoked heated retorts from blacks and intensified the conflict.

In another instance, one black after another would drink out of a Coca-Cola bottle and then pass it to whites to see if they too would drink out of it, Senate subcommittee investigators report.

#### NEW PROGRAM

The Civil Service Commission has started a new program to facilitate voluntary service by federal employees in community projects.

The program will be nationwide and is based on a model program recently developed for federal employees in the Washington metropolitan area.

The CSC said the program here has been very successful. In a three-month period, more than 300 federal employees here have accepted volunteer assignments from 109 different voluntary agencies. These were in urban service centers, community schools, hospitals, and playgrounds, and included, among other things, tutoring, teaching arts and drama, community action, service to the handicapped, sports and recreation, and services to children.

In cooperation with the local Health and Welfare Council, the CSC has opened a small office which maintains lists of volunteer opportunities.

#### EEO TRAINING SEMINARS

(By Irving Weinstein)

It was Sunday and it was hot and humid outside the Washingtonian Motel in Gaithersburg, Maryland. Inside, a wedding reception was in progress and there was much festivity. Elegantly dressed men and women were dancing to music supplied by a five-piece band. Others were conversing, laughing, drinking, or consuming hors d'oeuvres.

In the adjoining room persons from HSMHA were participating in the first of three Equal Employment Opportunity Training Seminars. It was the first day of the meeting and the HSMHA people had gathered in general session to report on what they accomplished in small work groups.

The spokesman for a group which had been discussing the subtleties of discrimination had the floor. He was saying his work group had been distracted and inconvenienced "by the noise from the Jewish wedding next door," when he was abruptly interrupted by a Seminar participant who asked why he had prefaced the word wedding with the adjective Jewish.

The spokesman laughed and said, "Who else can afford such a wedding?"

He was shocked, as were many others, when a person who knew the bride stood up and said, "But it is not a Jewish wedding.

The bride and groom are not Jewish. They are Polish. This is a Polish wedding."

The spokesman learned something that day about attitudes, perceptions, and about himself. He learned he had arrived at an erroneous conclusion because his premise was not based upon fact but upon a stereotyped image of a minority group and his caricatured conception of that group.

Each of the nearly 400 HSMHA employees who attended the three separate but interlocking EEO Training Seminars learned things. They learned things about themselves about other persons, and about Equal Employment Opportunity. They learned whether they were dealing with or falling with their attitudes, perceptions, and life styles as they relate to minorities and to the EEO program.

Participating in the Seminars were persons from the HSMHA Personnel offices, both field and headquarters, and Deputy EEO Officers and EEO Counsellors from each Center, Service, Institute, Regional Office, Hospital, and Indian Health Area. The Seminars were sponsored by HSMHA's Office of Equal Employment Opportunity together with the Office of Personnel.

The goals, enumerated in materials distributed to each Seminar participant, were:

To develop and increase the commitment of Equal Employment Opportunity and Personnel staffs to an assertive Equal Employment Opportunity Program.

To develop good rapport between the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and the Office of Personnel.

To increase the skills of Deputy Equal Employment Opportunity Officers and Counsellors.

To develop cohesion within the entire HSMHA Equal Employment Opportunity structure.

To identify EEO and Personnel policy and procedural issues requiring followup action at HSMHA and Program levels.

Three Seminars were called instead of one by the Seminar co-hosts, Lonis Ballard, HSMHA Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, and Ralph Reeder, Acting Director, Office of Personnel, because lodgings were not available with sufficient "break-out" rooms to accommodate an extremely important ingredient in the Seminar planning—small work groups.

Although each Seminar was different, with its own highlights, each was a highly emotional and remarkable learning experience. In addition to the small work groups and general sessions, participants met in agency groupings, separate Personnel and EEO groupings, and, at one point during the second Seminar, in a separate black-white grouping.

Each small group contained a professional facilitator who assisted in moving the discussions along. Among the many subjects discussed in the work groups were the objectives of EEO, the role of Personnel and its image, the role of EEO Counsellors and Deputy EEO's, procedures, risk-taking, racism, Personnel actions, the Merit Promotion System, commitment, and recommendations to help make equal employment opportunity a reality throughout HSMHA.

Participants were kept informed throughout the Seminars on what everyone was doing, thinking, and saying through a daily newsletter, printed reports, and verbal reports at the general sessions. These communications helped each person present to deal better with personal problems and problems affecting the full development of the EEO Program.

The first Seminar was attended by all HSMHA Deputy EEO Officers from headquarters and top level staff from the Office of Personnel. It lasted two days and served as a prototype and prelude to Seminars 2 and 3. Participants in Seminar 1 also participated in one or the other of the latter Seminars.

Prior to the conclusion of Seminar 1, Personnel staff and the EEO group met in separate meetings. The Personnel group returned from its caucus, according to Ralph Reeder, "as a united body cemented together by a new and inspiring feeling of mutual trust."

The Personnel group reported it would and could now become more effective in relation to EEO. It indicated its people would aggressively take the initiative and go to EEO Program offices in order for the EEO Program to become more effective.

Among the highlights of Seminars 2 and 3 was a visit from Dr. Vernon E. Wilson, HSMHA Administrator. Dr. Wilson told participants that Equal Employment Opportunity is a matter of highest priority both for him personally and for all persons in HSMHA. He assured Mr. Ballard of his full support.

"The task you are addressing here," Dr. Wilson said, "is essential to the accomplishment of HSMHA's purpose. Our mission is to improve the physical and mental health of all the American people. We can carry out this mission successfully only if our staff reflects the racial and ethnic composition of the population we seek to serve, and only when all our staff members are able to use their skills and fulfill their potential to the utmost."

Dr. Wilson told the seminar participants that HSMHA's top management had recognized and declared, during the Airline House EEO Conference in February, the need for change in our policies and practices and had begun the process of change. These training seminars, he said, constitute one important step along the road we must travel.

"I consider it one of my fundamental responsibilities as your new Administrator," he said, "to make the policy of equal employment opportunity a reality throughout HSMHA."

Dr. Wilson said HSMHA program directors are similarly committed to the same goal and that the seminar participants had a vital role to perform in assisting them and him in making EEO a reality.

He concluded by saying, "I look forward to the recommendations from these seminars and to the effective performance of your EEO duties, which should be their most important outcome."

Seven HSMHA agency directors and one deputy director also visited the seminars, as did Dr. Robert Laur, consultant to the Administrator and Mr. Samuel Hoston, Director, Equal Opportunity Staff, HEW.

Mr. Hoston sparked one of the general sessions, telling the participants that although each President since Franklin D. Roosevelt had issued an Executive Order dealing with Equal Employment Opportunity, "the problem still exists and we still have discrimination."

He stressed the need for understanding and rapport between EEO people and Personnel people and the importance of their attitudes in dealing with others. He spoke of commitment and concluded by describing a conversation between a chicken and a pig.

"The chicken and the pig," he said, "were looking at a platter of ham and eggs. The chicken said to the pig, 'Look at the magnificent contribution we have made. Doesn't it make you proud? Doesn't it make you happy?' The pig looked at the chicken and said, 'No, not really. You see, yours is a contribution; mine is a total commitment.'"

During Seminar 2, the blacks walked out of a general meeting to caucus in an attempt, as one of the leaders later said, "to find our own wave length." The remainder of the participants were left to ponder the reason for the walkout in a white caucus.

After dinner that evening, partially as a result of the walkout, the blacks and whites reconvened and went on to participate in the most fruitful activities of the meeting.

On the following day, Mr. Ballard told the

counsellors and Deputy Equal Employment Opportunity Officers that if they couldn't cry over the plight of minorities in this country, if they had no awareness of what it meant to be a black or a Chicano they could be of no use to HSMHA as EEO Counsellors or Deputy EEO Officers.

"I want the kind of people," he said, "who are sensitive and daring . . . the kind of people who know the job that needs to be done and who will do the job. They will be humble when needed, aggressive when needed, and will beg if needed . . . but they will always be cognizant of EEO and what it means. I want the kind of people who know they are in the business of keeping our nation alive because without them, I don't know how long we can endure as a nation."

In addressing the Personnel staff, Mr. Reeder said, "We in Personnel have been the scapegoat for a great deal of anger and frustration both here at the Seminar and wherever it is we work."

He told the group it could either accept this image employees have of Personnel or change it. In order to change it, he said, "employees must know we are working for them as well as for management."

"We have a responsibility to the EEO Program," Mr. Reeder said, "and we can contribute a strong input to help make it succeed."

He reminded his staff that he had told them on two separate occasions during the Seminar exactly where he stood in his commitment to the EEO Program and that he expected each of them to fully support the program both at headquarters and in the field.

He informed them that the Personnel Office had received approval for its recommendation that employees and supervisors be rated on their performance in relation to EEO. "I expect to apply this to my employees in headquarters and I expect every Personnel Officer in field stations to do the same."

Mr. Reeder said, "We need to expand our sensitivities and awareness and learn to know persons in minority groups better than we do."

"We are in the business," he said, "of delivering health and mental health services to the American people and HSMHA cannot succeed in its mission without the input of minorities."

He concluded by saying that Personnel had the resources to help get minority input into HSMHA and to see that the HSMHA programs do succeed in their mission.

At Seminar 3 the issue of race, which was not quickly dealt with in the preceding Seminars, was brought out into the open immediately.

Dick Shapiro and Bert Phillips, the Conference coordinators, asked the participants to deal with the way they really feel and to be honest with themselves and others. "These days together," they said, "are not to be used solely for ingesting information. They are also to be used for giving information and for giving of yourselves. This is a participatory conference."

They told the conferees that although an agenda has been prepared, it was flexible and open to change if the participants wanted change. Participants were told that this Seminar offered an opportunity for honesty. It offered an opportunity for them to sit and talk together as human beings about problems existing in HSMHA and in this country and to logically determine what could be done to resolve them.

This Seminar featured a panel discussion dealing with racism; a question and answer session with Mr. Ballard and Mr. Reeder responding to questions from the floor; and input from Indians, who comprised about 25 percent of the participants.

For one full day, the EEO group subdivided into three separate groupings, Lon Ballard

met with the Deputy Equal Employment Opportunity Officers; Mary V. Gelsbert, Mr. Ballard's Deputy, met with EEO Counsellors who had received formal training as counsellors; and Isalah Russell, EEO Specialist on Mr. Ballard's staff, met with the counsellors who had received no formal training.

When the question of race came up, tied to the issue of racism, Mr. Ballard said he would utilize the full power of his office to discipline and possibly even remove persons intimidating or threatening EEO Counsellors in the performance of their duty. He said the nation could no longer tolerate bigots and racists and neither could HSMHA and he received a thunderous ovation.

At the same time Ralph Reeder and the Personnel group discussed the image of the Personnel Office, methods of communicating Civil Service rules and regulations to EEO staff, and the kinds of information EEO personnel need in order to better do their jobs.

On the morning of the third day representatives from the Indian Health Service requested time in the afternoon so that they could meet separately as an agency to seek solutions to their own problems.

One of the problems voiced by the Indians throughout the Seminar was "the need to be able to keep our own culture, without accepting the white man's ways."

Several Indians had also indicated they were sick and tired of being studied by anthropologists and of being told how to live by whites of other professional disciplines.

As a result of the Indian Health Service's request to meet separately, other Seminar participants indicated by a show of hands a strong desire to convene that afternoon in agency groupings. They, too, wanted to discuss problems unique to individual agencies and to develop recommendations that would help move the EEO program forward. And they did.

The next day, during the last session of Seminar 3, spokesmen from each HSMHA constituency presented their agency's recommendations. Some of the finest recommendations were submitted by the Office of Personnel and drew tremendous applause from the floor.

Among the recommendations proposed by all agencies were the following:

HSMHA should request of the Department that a job preference act for all minorities—similar to the Veterans Preference Act and the Indian Preference Act—be introduced in Congress.

Specialized recruitment efforts should be undertaken to include provision of selection authority to joint EEO-Personnel recruitment teams.

The job descriptions of all managers and supervisors should contain a section dealing with EEO responsibilities.

A day care center should be established at the Parklawn Building.

Deputy Equal Employment Opportunity Officers should be considered as part of the executive management staff of each agency and should report to the Director and participate in all staff meetings.

Program directors should report regularly to the Administrator concerning the status of their affirmative action plans.

A pool of positions should be established within the Office of the Administrator and headquarters of each Service, Center, and Institute to be used to reward programs which recruit and upgrade minority staffs.

In addition to these recommendations, many more were proposed in both Seminars 2 and 3 and at the time of this writing Mr. Ballard and Mr. Reeder were reviewing the proposals and preparing them for presentation to Dr. Wilson.

The participants in Seminar 3 reacted spontaneously and dramatically to each proposal. Some recommendations received standing ovations.

The last spokesman, a young black woman, delivered her agency's recommendations and then looked at her audience and said extemporaneously, "I want to thank you. I came to this meeting with despair. All my life I have been exposed to racism and I had lost all hope. But you have given me some here, I think some of you were sincere in what you said."

Her voice quivered as she said, "I have been let down so many times. I have heard so many promises. Please . . ."

The young woman's plea evoked tear from many in the audience, and the emotion that pervaded the room created a sense of unity that had not existed when the seminars began.

Mr. Ballard sensed the cohesiveness of the group as he closed the meeting. "I think history has been made here," he said. "People are concerned. They're moved. They are moved to tears."

## JAMES RESTON QUESTIONS THE PHILOSOPHY OF EXPANDING THE WAR

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article, Mr. James Reston, the distinguished columnist for the New York Times, questions the wisdom of extending and expanding wars even when some objectives appear to be justifiable.

Reston's thesis is that the chain of events which such expansions may cause, often leads to consequences that cannot be predicted or foreseen.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I insert Mr. Reston's column in the RECORD.

[From the Miami News, Feb. 11, 1971]

THE WAR TO END WAR—WHEN WILL WE EVER LEARN?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—In this latest crisis in the Indochina War, when we are being told once more that the latest adventure into Laos will surely put an end to the long agony, it may be prudent to look back at the record.

Last time, only last spring, it was the invasion of Cambodia that was going to destroy the enemy's sanctuaries and let us go home. Before that, it was destruction of the enemy's forces in the Tet offensive that was supposed to have broken the back of the opposition. And before that, it was American air support, then American air power itself, then the U.S. search-and-destroy missions, then the bombing of the North, each in its own turn, that was going to be "decisive."

It is a very old story, underscoring a long forgotten lesson, Herbert Butterfield pointed it out long ago. "However hard we have tried in the 20th Century to make allowances in advance for the unpredictable consequences of war," he wrote, "we have always discovered that the most terrible of these had been omitted from our calculations or only imperfectly foreseen. One of the examples of the fact is the loss of liberty in Eastern Europe and the Balkans—the very regions whose freedom was the primary issue for which we were supposed to have undertaken two world wars."

The First World War was probably the most tragic example of this kind of miscalculation. Believing that there could never be an aggressor so monstrous as Germany under



the Kaiser. The Allies fought that ghastly war in the West to the point of "total victory." And in the process created two much more formidable menaces for ourselves, Nazi Germany and Communist Russia.

There is, of course, a certain military logic to the invasion of Laos, and even a moral justification for attacking an enemy sheltering and gathering in a neutral country for an attack on South Vietnam. The Administration's policy is that it will use air power anywhere in Indochina where enemy forces may "ultimately" threaten the security of our own troops.

There was a certain logic, too, in all those other moves, as seen from the Pentagon. Who could logically suppose that a small enemy country, operating over long lines of supply and without air power, could stand against half a million Americans, equipped with all the modern weapons of war, and in complete control of the air and sea? Yet events did not quite work out as the Pentagon planned.

Now the assumption here is that Hanoi is down to its last supply route along the Ho Chi Minh trails (and that if these are cut, the enemy will be crippled at least long enough to let us get out, and the South Vietnamese, by that time, will be able to fend for themselves).

It is a reasonable assumption if you also assume that the Soviets and the Chinese will not give Hanoi new weapons to match the mounting fire power of the Allies. Maybe the enemy will accommodate us this time, stand and fight and be destroyed, while Moscow and Peking watch patiently on the side. But this is no sure thing, and time and geography are on their side.

What happens if the enemy merely retreats into the jungle and regroups later in North Vietnam. Do we then resume the bombing of the North on the ground that troops there might "ultimately" threaten our command? And if we do cut the supply trails to the north and get out in a year or 18 months, what is "decisive" about that?

The theory of "a war to end war" went out with Woodrow Wilson. When we finally leave, if we do, it will be said that General Giap in Hanoi expelled the French from Indochina and fought the Americans to a compromise settlement. This cannot hurt or depress Giap in what will then be a struggle with Saigon.

Accordingly, the war may very well go on being as unpredictable as before. The President has clearly won the battle of public opinion in the United States. He didn't even feel obliged to talk to the American people about his aerial invasion of Laos, and the reaction of the people was comparatively mild.

NBC took a poll the other day and found that 46 per cent of the people were convinced, despite the Administration's statements to the contrary, that there actually were American ground troops fighting in Laos. In short, even when the Administration was telling the truth, it wasn't believed by almost half of those polled.

The popular view seems to be that it is all right to attack a neutral country occupied by the enemy so long as our casualties are not too high, that if the enemy invades a neutral country, it is reasonable for us to do the same.

This is the logic of our latest adventure, but what if the Russians or the Chinese assumed that since we were giving air support to Saigon, they would give air power to Hanoi? Or new longer range rockets? What then would happen to our logic and our assumptions?

"I wonder," said Butterfield, "if it could not be formulated as a law that no state can ever achieve the security it desires without so tipping the balance that it becomes a menace to its neighbors . . . and this gives us one of the patterns of those terrible dilemmas which seem always to be confronting us in international affairs."

## SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENTS

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the President announced on February 17, that he is "not going to place any limitations upon the use of airpower," save for the use of nuclear weapons, in Southeast Asia. Now the rhetoric matches the actions of the administration—all of Indochina is the battlefield. On the ground, Asian troops, funded, supplied, and supported by the United States, will fight. In the air, U.S. planes will fly, wreaking devastation.

It is apparent that the administration really has no plan for bringing this tragic war to an end. An illusive military solution is still being pursued, while there is no serious attempt at a political solution.

Tom Wicker, in a column which appeared in the February 21 edition of the New York Times, expresses, to my mind, the outrage so many Americans feel regarding the President's action. As Mr. Wicker says of the administration's policy:

It is a policy of indiscriminate aerial warfare and blind firepower on the ground that means death and destruction wholesale, not just body counts of enemy dead, but a slaughter of innocents—women and children and old people—villages destroyed, the earth ravaged, refugees in their miserable thousands wandering homeless and hungry. For the people of Indochina, it is a wanton lie that this Administration is "winding down" the war; it is spreading the war like a holocaust.

The administration must not be allowed to continue the death and destruction which afflict the people of Southeast Asia. The Congress must act. It must act to cut off funds for the war; it must act to pass legislation, of which I am a sponsor, to bring this war to an immediate end.

I commend Tom Wicker's column to my colleagues:

#### A SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENTS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's news conference of Feb. 17 made clear what skeptics have long believed. His Vietnam policy is by no means one of steadily withdrawing Americans from South Vietnam, then letting the people of Indochina work out or fight out their own affairs. It is instead a policy of escalation by American air power and South Vietnamese manpower, with the aim of military victory.

"I am not going to place any limitations upon the use of air power," Mr. Nixon said, excepting only the use of nuclear weapons. And if South Vietnam invades North Vietnam across the demilitarized zone—"to defend their national security," in the President's Orwellian lingo—Mr. Nixon openly left standing the possibility of sending American air power to support the invasion.

Mr. Nixon was careful at every turn to lay down, as a basis for an unlimited air war, the doctrine that he would be acting only to protect the lives of American ground troops. This blatant deception was used to justify the Cambodian invasion and is being used to justify the current extension of the ground war into the Laotian panhandle. But it was exposed as a fraud by Mr. Nixon himself, who claimed that the fighting in Cambodia

had cut one North Vietnamese "lifeline" and then said of the march into Laos:

"This action would either cut or seriously disrupt the other pipeline or lifeline . . . the Ho Chi Minh Trail into the north half of South Vietnam. Therefore, we expected the North Vietnamese to fight here. They have to fight here or give up the struggle to conquer South Vietnam, Cambodia, and their influence extending through other parts of Southeast Asia."

Those are the words of a man seeking a showdown. The clear threat to turn loose the South Vietnamese to invade North Vietnam, under a protective umbrella of American planes and behind a destructive barrage of American bombs, may be in part psychological warfare. But if the President cannot get his victory in Laos, as he could not get it in South Vietnam or in Cambodia, there is only one other place to seek it, and every reason to believe that Mr. Nixon will do just that.

It should be noted well that this President, who was elected promising to end—not win—the war, has effectively jettisoned the Paris negotiations. Not only did he say that American representatives would continue to participate only in hopes of making an arrangement concerning prisoners of war—not the war itself—but he also said flatly that "we are not going to make any more concessions."

Not content with this demotion, Mr. Nixon went further and reiterated the fact that he has also abrogated the only fruitful results of those talks—the October, 1968 "understanding" by which the bombing of North Vietnam was ended.

That understanding was entered in good faith by the previous Administration and by Hanoi. Now Mr. Nixon has asserted without convincing supporting evidence that attacks on American reconnaissance planes over Hanoi constitute a North Vietnamese violation of the understanding that releases him from it; further, Mr. Nixon insists that he will bomb North Vietnam any time he decides anything happening in that country threatens American lives.

So the talks are dead, interred by a President who charges the other side with making no concessions despite having made none himself on any point that matters; and the important understanding those talks produced is also dead, broken by the second American President who failed to honor an arrangement with Hanoi; and the war has been carried by air and invasion to two more countries, with the threat poised of the invasion and aerial devastation of a third.

This is a policy calculated to bludgeon North Vietnam to its knees, without appalling American casualty lists, it is also a policy that risks retaliation elsewhere—in northern Laos or in Thailand—and might bring Chinese entry into the war. But above all, every American, every citizen who loves his country, every man who honors humanity should understand the cost of this policy in life and suffering.

It is a policy of indiscriminate aerial warfare and blind firepower on the ground that means death and destruction wholesale, not just body counts of enemy dead, but a slaughter of innocents—women and children and old people—villages destroyed, the earth ravaged, refugees in their miserable thousands wandering homeless and hungry. For the people of Indochina, it is a wanton lie that this Administration is "winding down" the war; it is spreading the war like a holocaust.

In a forthcoming article in The New York Review of Books, Daniel Ellsberg cites Senate reports showing that more than a million Cambodian refugees have been "generated" in the last nine months; that in Mr. Nixon's first year in office about 50,000 civilians were killed, and in his second, more than 70,000. No one knows how many there will be in his third, or what number of innocents will die in Laos, or how many more will be made refugees.

But they will be many, and every one an ineradicable stain upon the once-proud name of the United States of America.

#### ABOLISHING HISC

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, since 1938 there has been an un-American activity in Congress, a threat to the Nation's real security—the security based in the fundamental precepts of democratic philosophy of free speech and free political thought. The House Internal Security Committee continues to subvert these American ideals as did its predecessor, the House Un-American Activities Committee. I have introduced today a resolution to abolish this unjustifiable squandering of Congress' resources.

Today few fear the HISC subpena. An investigation by the committee is often greeted with scorn. Have the students who dissent from mainstream American political opinion been cowed since the HISC spent thousands of tax dollars hearing testimony on the Students for a Democratic Society? Is there any less likelihood that blacks may organize to express disapproval of political and economic subjugation since the HISC spent weeks collecting evidence about black panthers?

In the last Congress the HISC performed no responsible functions which could not be better carried out by legitimate law enforcement agencies or by regular committees of the Congress. Any legitimate legislative or investigative functions of the HISC should be transferred to the proper jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. In my judgment, conducting politically motivated investigations of controversial organizations is not a worthwhile function for a congressional committee. If these groups do engage in subversive and illegal activities we already have adequate laws and agencies to deal with them.

Meanwhile this anachronistic committee is one of the largest congressional committees with 38 staff employees. It received \$850,000 in the last Congress. That is more than three times greater than the authorization for the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The 91st Congress allocated three times more funds to the committee which harasses those who oppose the inhuman war in Vietnam than it allocated to the committee concerned with the veterans who have fought in that tragic conflict. These veterans face new and urgent problems—an unemployment rate double the national average, readjustment, and a frightening unswing in drug addiction. The Veterans' Affairs Committee has a staff of merely 18 and a budget of \$195,000 in the last Congress.

Equally ludicrous is the comparison you can make with authorizations and staff between HISC and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. That committee, with 16 employees and a budget in the last Congress of \$185,000, is

charged with major conservation and environmental responsibilities.

Can Congress give due attention to the problems of the Indian, to the problems of pollution, when the appropriate committee is hobbled in deference to a committee that pollutes the very democratic process? Is not our congressional attention—attention which goes where the money goes—grossly misdirected?

The House Internal Security Committee is a frivolous and harmful hindrance to a Congress increasingly concerned about the proper and economical organization of its work.

#### YOUTH'S ROLE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech by Stephen Echsner, a perspicacious young man whom I am proud to claim as one of my constituents. Mr. Echsner resides in Columbus, Ind.

The speech follows:

#### YOUTH'S ROLE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS (By Stephen H. Echsner)

Pollution is everywhere. People are everywhere. People are polluters. People are responsible for the pollution of our land, air and water. People are the ones who make ghetto areas, who lay waste the land with strip mines, and automobile junkyards. People build our giant plants of industry that belch "bad breath" into the air. People are responsible for the dumping of garbage and sewage into our rivers and streams.

The situation is growing worse. We must search out the reason why people are doing these things. Certainly it is not natural for people to pollute. Even a cat buries his own dirt.

Our material environment is discussed a great deal today in almost every newspaper and magazine. Equal concern should be given to our nonmaterial environment—to the spiritual pollution that is taking place in our great country. Herein lies the problem—the crisis of the environment—and youth must be able to do something about it.

People aren't inherently bad. Many times they don't think, they forget, they adopt the idea of "let George do it," they shirk personal responsibility. People adopt the idea that if they don't get caught, it's O.K., they take the easy way out. But there is no easy way to develop respect for nature, and the answer to our environmental problems ultimately will be respect. Respect for the rights of other men and the laws of nature.

Some aboriginals and other uncivilized tribes consider the time when a male reaches adolescence as one of the most important occasions of his life. After passing arduous tests and suffering intense pain, the young man receives new privileges and responsibilities. What these people recognize is the need for youth to grow up and to become mature, independent human beings. We have no counterpart in our society today and to a large extent, the extreme behavior of some of our young people is witness to the lack of this kind of initiation. For example, the papers have been full of publicity recently about the killings at Kent State, and the bombings on the campus of the University of Wisconsin. Why are people doing these

things? What morality do they have, what goals have they set for themselves and others? Where is their sincerity, their honesty, their reasoning?

To the degree that the great majority of youth are successful today in achieving maturity, there are present numerous corollaries or substitutes corresponding to these primitive customs alluded to previously, such as, a well-formed conscience, a social awareness, a moral responsibility and a set of norms. By this, I mean a conscience that is right and just and full of self-identity, a social awareness that dictates an involvement in social issues, moral responsibility that means doing right and avoiding wrong, and lastly, norms that we are all familiar with—individual code of ethics, civil guidelines and laws, and religious directives. These things one doesn't get by accident. The responsibility for the preparation of youth for a better tomorrow lies with parents, schools, churches, organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America, and society as a whole. Youth looks to these sources for knowledge of society as it is today. They should be able to identify the problems of poverty, racism, bigotry, environmental pollution, totalitarianism, class distinction and crime. Once these areas are defined, reasonable, practical and human goals must be initiated. The realities must be faced and the difficult steps must be taken to solve these problems. Coping with the pollution of our air, land, and water for instance, will necessitate cooperation with others, personal sacrifice, and above all, a commitment to its solution.

But solutions just don't happen. One doesn't get to his destination by just any old road. The directions that lead to human betterment have existed for ages. They have been found since ancient times, in our own conscience, in the natural laws, the Decalogue—God's own laws, in the Magna Charta, the English Common Law, the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

The truth inherent in these directives will insure justice for all men; food, clothing and shelter for everyone; racial equality; religious cooperation; an unpolluted world; free societies; and a society relatively devoid of crime.

Paul Tillach, noted Protestant theologian, said that it takes more than the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule to cover concrete situations. It takes a lot of hard thinking and right feeling to cope with the problems youth face today—in other words, a right conscience.

The job for a better tomorrow to produce a better world cannot be solved by demonstrations, demands, and violence that have no substantial directive force for progress. Youths' awareness of its' role in the coming generation plus an adherence to the principles of respect for others and respect for nature and the law, will produce a future world free of material and spiritual contaminants.

All of our shortcomings, our failures, all of our progress, our achievements, will be measured by our habits—our way of acting. And so it behooves the youth of our country to act in such a way as to bring out the best in them. For a better youth today, makes way for a better environment tomorrow.

#### RELIEF SOUGHT FOR NONSMOKERS

### HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill requiring that



airliners, trains, and buses provide a protected area for nonsmoking passengers. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation, aimed not at attacking the rights of the smoker but at protecting the rights of the nonsmoker.

My bill would require that the Secretary of Transportation establish regulations for protected nonsmoking areas in public carriers operating in interstate commerce.

The bill places no burdens at all on the smoker, but does provide relief for the person who prefers not to be exposed to exhaled smoke or smoke from the burning end of a fellow passenger's cigarette. The nonsmoker is entitled to an area where he can escape for relief and protection.

I am not going as far as U.S. Surgeon General Jesse L. Steinfield, who recently called for an outright ban on smoking in confined public places. For those determined to smoke—fine. That is their business. But I am saying that nonsmokers should not be forced to breathe the noxious fumes as well.

The buildup of smoke in a confined atmosphere is extremely distressing to the nonsmoker, and dangerous to his health.

Health officials list eye and nose irritation, headache, cough, wheeze, sore throat, nausea, and dizziness among the effects of secondary smoke inhalation.

Studies at Texas A. & M. University, reported by the American Cancer Society, revealed that only 30 minutes in a smoking environment caused measurable effects on a group of children age 6 through 13. These effects, the report said, included increased heart rate, adverse blood pressure, and increased amount of carbon monoxide in the blood. In fact, the report concluded, except for the reduced scale, the effects were the same as on smokers themselves.

Each person must make his own decision on whether to smoke in the face of growing evidence of damage to the smoker's health. However, I am sure the smoker does not want to discomfort others and endanger their health.

It is absurd that one branch of our Government is trying to discourage the habit by labeling cigarette packages and banning TV advertising, while other branches do nothing to deter the practice in spaces under their regulation.

The nonsmoker on trains used to be able to stay out of the smoking car. But this is no longer possible on today's planes and buses. Enactment of my bill will make relief available for those who seek it.

#### FLORIDA JAYCEES ADOPT RODEHEAVER BOYS RANCH

#### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Rodeheaver Boys Ranch near Palatka, Fla., is truly a great institution.

Today, some 30 boys call the ranch "home" and they follow all of those who have since its founding in 1950.

Today, its future looks even brighter for service to lost and needy boys—giving them a new chance for hope and happiness.

The Florida Jaycees have voted to adopt the Rodeheaver Boys Ranch as a statewide project. This means that every Florida Jaycee organization will be encouraged to establish programs of support—either financially or materially—for the further development of the ranch.

As my good friend, Putnam County Sheriff Walt Pelicer, stated:

The greatest benefit from the Jaycee support will be the attention which can be focused on the Ranch by these young men of action.

The ranch was founded in 1950 in the latter years of the long career of Evangelist Homer Rodeheaver. A nonprofit corporation—deriving nearly 90 percent of its operating funds from friends and supporters—the boys who come to the ranch to make a home get a chance at life.

Ed MacClellan is the new director of the ranch and this dynamic young man is doing a tremendous job. It was he who spoke to the Gainesville Jaycees about 6 months ago about the opportunity for service that exists at the ranch. The drive to pass the resolution was spearheaded by the Gainesville club under the direction of Don Petricci.

Palatka and Gainesville Jaycees took on a group project in January—a barn raising project to replace an old barn that burned last summer.

It is an interest in projects like this, as well as financial support, that the sponsoring jaycees hope to generate throughout the State.

Another workday, for example, at the ranch's new cottage has been set for March 13. St. Augustine and Crescent City Jaycees will join the first two groups.

The ranch will be working with the executive committee to work out plans for future projects.

The Jaycees do a tremendous job in public service. I feel very strongly that their taking on the Rodeheaver Boys Ranch as a project will be such an opportunity and that the jaycees will be effective in further developing what has become a truly outstanding program of service.

As a director of Rodeheaver Boys Ranch, I express my personal appreciation to them. Young men in years to come will find their lives changed because of this service—homeless and destitute youngsters will receive a new lease on life.

It is a tremendous tribute to the jaycees and to those who worked so diligently and unselfishly in behalf of the ranch.

#### HILLTOPPERS LIST CAMPER WAYS TO FIGHT POLLUTION

#### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, while the formidable array of Federal, State, and local legal guns are being zeroed in

on environmental pollution, Plain Dealer Outdoor Editor Lou Gale has given us a timely reminder that the battle must also be fought, if it is to be won, on an individual basis. In the following article, Mr. Gale reports a list of suggestions put forth by the Hilltoppers Chapter of the National Campers and Hikers Association which all of us who wish to clean up our air, water, and land would do well to heed:

#### ALL OUTDOORS: HILLTOPPERS LIST CAMPER WAYS TO FIGHT POLLUTION

(By Lou Gale)

In their small way, campers, hikers and other outdoor enthusiasts can do something about fighting pollution of the air, water and land around them.

Hilltoppers Chapter of the National Campers and Hikers Association offers this list of no-nos if you care to start saving your little corner of the world.

Don't use colored facial tissues, paper towels, or toilet paper. The paper dissolves in water, but the dye forms a residue.

Use containers which disintegrate easily. Glass containers do not. Bottles made of polyvinyl chloride (PVC) give off lethal hydrochloric acid when they are incinerated. PVC is the soft plastic used to bottle many liquid cleaners, shampoos and mouthwashes.

Do not confuse these PVC containers with the heavier, stiffer polystyrene plastic used mainly for powders.

Use decomposable containers, such as pasteboard, cardboard or paper whenever possible.

Don't buy non-returnable containers.

Don't smoke. But if you do, don't flush filter tips down the toilet. They are proving indestructible.

If you are a gardener, make certain the fertilizer you use goes deep into the soil instead of running off with the first rainfall.

Phosphates cause lake and river algae. Use low or non-phosphate soaps or detergents for the same reason. Use as little detergent as possible.

Avoid buying any DDT, DDD or any other chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. Substitute recommended natural pesticides such as nicotine sulfate, rotenone or pyrethrum.

For one of the most effective brakes on air pollution, switch your thinking and use of automobiles. Walk to work or ride a bike or motorcycle. If that is too radical a change, drive to work daily in a low-powered vehicle. Use your high-powered polluting muscle-cars only for high-speed highway travel.

You can begin conserving our diminishing supply of fresh water with a few changes of home habits. Start shunning the use of your garbage disposal unit. Never flush away garbage you can put into containers collected by the city. You can use coffee grounds and tea leaves in your garden. Give kitchen fats to the birds.

And then there is that new personal anti-pollution tip being offered by most conservation organizations. Stop over-shopping—and producing the world's largest garbage pile and highest rubbish pile.

This could be a start in improving our surroundings.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—53 YEARS OF RESISTANCE

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this observation of the 53d anniversary of the dec-

laration of independence of the Lithuanian people.

Regretably, for too long too many people throughout the world have been unaware of what happened to the people of Lithuania. The Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process.

The Soviets invaded and occupied Lithuania in June 1940, and the Lithuanian people have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for more than 30 years.

This year more than a million Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, as well as their many friends, are marking two very important anniversaries:

First, they will observe the 720th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

Second, they are marking the 53d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

This occasion is not one of joy, of course, for Lithuania has lost its independence and today survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain.

Americans of Lithuanian heritage are proud of their people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. The nation has suffered from the accident of geography which saw the country invaded from the west by the Teutonic Knights and from the east by the Russians.

The U.S. Government has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Six administrations have stated and restated our Nation's nonrecognition policy, although the Congress took an important step in 1966 by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 416 that calls for freedom for Lithuania and the other two Baltic republics—Latvia and Estonia.

Unfortunately, this legislation has not been implemented notwithstanding the continuing appeals from people throughout our Nation.

#### BLACK PANTHERS FUNDRAISING

### HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago a great uproar from certain segments of our society was heard throughout the land when it became known that the House Committee on Internal Security, which I have the honor to chair, was publishing the results of a limited survey on honoraria paid to speakers on our Nation's campuses.

The survey contained considerable interesting and objective information concerning honoraria money earned by radicals through speaking engagements. It has opened the eyes of some civil libertarians and sincere liberals about the plans of revolutionaries in this country to finance their activities by just such

speaking engagements before young people.

I refer to the column page in the January 25 issue of the Washington Post by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak that describes their version of how the Black Panther Party is proceeding to finance its Marxist-Maoist revolutionary movement.

How are the Panthers doing it? According to Evans-Novak they are doing it—I quote the column—through "two dramatically different fundraising techniques: the big-time college lecture circuit and a swelling campaign of burglaries by the party's new underground organizations."

The column describes at some length how the Panthers are conducting fundraising "through the barrel of a gun."

That the Panthers engage in armed depredations to raise funds has long been known to the Internal Security Committee. Our hearings last year into Panther activities on a national level and locally in Kansas City, Seattle, Detroit, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, Des Moines, and Omaha are replete with instances of Panther criminal activity.

After confirming what has already been reported by our committee and in press coverage of its hearings, the Evans-Novak column goes on to delineate how the Panthers, principally their chief mouthpiece, Huey P. Newton, have in the past and plan in the future to earn a not inconsiderable income from campus speaking engagements.

The report of the House Committee on Internal Security in December 1970, on honoraria paid to campus speakers over a period of 2 school years—1968–69 and 1969–70—reveals Panther speakers earned in excess of \$14,000 from 13 individuals making 21 appearances. Panther speakers on campuses were actually far in excess of that and they earned much more money than that revealed by the limited survey made by the House Internal Security Committee.

The survey encompassed only 179 colleges and universities, of which 138 responded. Since the 1970 World Almanac lists some 2,500 colleges and universities, our committee report reflected only about 3 percent of the total.

Now let us, from Messrs. Evans and Novak, look at plans for the future. Newton, the Panthers' so-called minister of defense, intends to make a speaking tour on what the column calls "the lucrative college lecture circuit." Arrangements for the tour, according to Evans and Novak, are being arranged by a Panther front group in New York called Stronghold Consolidated Productions, Inc.

By operating through this front, Newton and his fellow Panthers can receive their pay but still not embarrass a sponsoring group or school by being paid directly from student activity fund checks.

According to the column, Stronghold Consolidated's headquarters is the law firm of Lubell, Lubell, Fine, & Schaap in New York City. Also according to the article, Stronghold Consolidated's key figure is Lawyer David G. Lubell who was identified in sworn 1958 congressional testimony as a Communist Party organizer.

Newton, who is not particularly articulate and whose lectures consist mainly of four-letter obscenities spiced with advice to "off the pigs"—murder authorities—and rally to the banner of Mao Tse-tung, does not come cheap.

He and two other Panthers available for speaking engagements seek \$2,500 plus expenses for a single engagement.

The column alleges that speaking engagements are already booked at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland; Princeton, Columbia, and Syracuse Universities and one is likely to be arranged at Yale University.

If there is no objection, I will insert the entire article in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues in the House, both those who supported and those who opposed my committee's limited survey, I think all will find it most interesting.

The article follows:

#### BLACK PANTHER FUND RAISING

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The Black Panther Party, its treasury no longer filled by conscience-stricken white liberals, is now turning to two dramatically different fund-raising techniques: the big-time college lecture circuit and a swelling campaign of burglaries by the party's new underground organization.

Although Black Panther leaders have publicly denounced criminal activity, Panther-watches are convinced of the party's recidivism toward its former policy of "expropriating" funds through burglary in the old Bolshevik tradition. The new Panther underground, not regular party chapters, has been given this task.

While in overall command of these underground activities, Panther Leader Huey P. Newton is also launching a new lecture tour aimed at radical white students at prestigious colleges and universities. The Panthers, not very impressive in organizing such activities, have taken on an old-line communist with experience in student-organizing to run Newton's tour.

These two wildly opposed methods of fund-raising reflect the two faces of Black Pantherism. Although at heart a revolutionary organization of 1,000 armed black militants with tremendous appeal among jobless and nihilistic Negro slum youth, the Panthers have always relied for support from well-meaning but glib white liberals, a trend that reached its peak late in 1969 in the ludicrous session with Black Panthers in Leonard Bernstein's Manhattan apartment.

In fact, the decline in white liberal support that followed the Bernstein fiasco has coincided with the party's return to violent rhetoric. "We have to begin to draw pictures that will make people go out and kill pigs (police)," says Emory Douglas, Panther minister of culture, in a recent edition of the party newspaper.

Nor is this mere rhetoric. Panther lawlessness has been rising, both in attacks on police and with the Panther underground resorting to crime to support its financial requirements. In the past four months, party members have been arrested and charged with 15 separate robberies and burglaries across the country—in Charlotte, N.C., Cleveland, Memphis, Buffalo, Winston-Salem, N.C., Dallas, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle and Toledo.

But those 15 occasions may only be the tip of the iceberg. Nobody knows how many Panther crimes in the same period have not resulted in arrests or how many other arrested suspects are in fact covert Panthers. That's because the Panthers, since Newton's release from prison six months ago, have been perfecting an underground organization



functioning in isolated units of two's and three's.

In sharp counterpoint to this is Newton's new plan to cash in on the lucrative college lecture circuit after an unsuccessful tour last fall. Arrangements for the new tour are being handled by a new Black Panther front incorporated under New York law in September as Stronghold Consolidated Productions, Inc. Thus, a university can write a check for a Newton lecture to a seemingly respectable front without the onus of a canceled check transferring student activity funds to the Black Panthers.

Stronghold Consolidated's corporate headquarters is the law firm of Lubell, Lubell, Fine & Schaap at 103 Park Ave. in New York. Running the show is lawyer David G. Lubell, identified in sworn 1958 congressional testimony as a Communist Party organizer at Boston area colleges and since then active in the National Lawyers Guild, often cited as a Communist front.

The present road show that Lubell is trying to book does not come cheap: a standard lecture fee for Newton of \$2,500 plus expenses for Newton and two Black Panther traveling companions, David Hilliard and Connie Matthews.

Apart from a date at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, Newton's winter bookings are predominantly at white eastern colleges: Princeton, Columbia and Syracuse. In addition, he will engage in a discussion early next month at Yale, where he also hopes to land a lecture. Surprisingly, Newton's ersatz Marxism and incoherent delivery in last fall's lectures have not greatly diminished his popularity on fashionable college campuses.

Yet, the \$2,500 lecture fee amid the halls of ivy looks like the last vestige of the radical chic phenomenon which brightly blazed until the Leonard Bernstein affair. The lecture tour, therefore, may be only a temporary expedient. The future of the Panthers lies in its new underground organization in the inner city, where fund-raising is conducted through the barrel of a gun.

#### CONGRESSMAN GONZALEZ REINTRODUCES THE MILITARY RETIREE'S RECOMPUTATION BILL

**HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in reintroducing today legislation to reestablish the recomputation principle in the

payment of military retirement benefits, I am asking the Congress to rectify an injustice imposed on our career military personnel in 1958.

Before 1958, increases in retired pay for commissioned and noncommissioned officers corresponded to active duty increases. But that system was suspended and replaced in 1963 by cost-of-living increases that have proven so clumsy and inequitable as to create eight different pay rates for servicemen with identical ranks and years of service who simply retired on different dates.

President Nixon's campaign promise to reestablish the recomputation method was forgotten in the last Congress when the administration announced that retirement increases were out of the question because of a rockbottom Department of Defense budget.

There is no doubt we have betrayed a trust to many of our military men. The career servicemen we have retired to date served in the Armed Forces at pay rates inferior to comparable civilian jobs. They did so out of love and dedication to their country, because of the several unique aspects of military life, and also because they expected decent retired pay. They joined the service at a time when retirement programs in private industry were generally nonexistent and when social security benefits were small, and now, it seems, they are being punished for their foresight.

The legislation I originally sponsored provided for recomputation of retired pay on the traditional formula for all members of the Armed Forces. After consulting with the Retired Officers Association, however, I amended my original proposal to include only military personnel who joined the service prior to 1958. Although I would have preferred the recomputation formula for all servicemen, the limitation on eligibility seems more feasible in light of the administration's contention that the cost of my original proposal would be prohibitively high.

It would benefit all servicemen, who, upon joining the Armed Forces, expected to receive retired pay on the basis of current active duty rates.

I hope and trust that Congress will act on this matter in a way that will keep

faith with our Nation's servicemen who served in the belief that they would receive equitable treatment when they retired from service to their country.

#### CARLISLE FLOYD'S OWN "HIT PARADE"

**HON. DON FUQUA**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Floridians are proud of the tremendous achievements of Carlisle Floyd, professor of music at the Florida State University in Tallahassee, Fla.

There are very few American-born opera composers, and Carlisle Floyd is, in my opinion, the best.

The Florida Times-Union of Jacksonville, Fla., denoted his achievements in an editorial on February 9, 1971. I commend their comments to the Members of the Congress as a fitting tribute to an outstanding American:

#### CARLISLE FLOYD'S OWN "HIT PARADE"

Carlisle Floyd, professor of music and composer in residence at Florida State University, last week set a record roughly comparable to a baseball pitcher turning in two consecutive no-hit games, a playwright having two simultaneous hits on Broadway, or a novelist having two works on the best seller list.

Floyd, one of the most successful and prolific of American-born opera composers, was so busy in Tallahassee supervising the Eastern premiere of his latest work, "Of Mice and Men," based on the Steinbeck novel, that he could not find time to go to Sarasota to attend a performance at the Asolo Theatre of an earlier work, "Susannah," already rated as a solid hit on the grand opera charts.

The number of active American-born opera composers is extremely small. The number that has even a single work produced is even smaller. The odds against having two produced in the same week in the same vicinity are incalculable.

In addition to these two, Floyd has several other performed operas, as well as compositions in other fields, to his credit.

The week's record is not only a tremendous personal achievement for the composer, but a testimonial to the level of fine arts appreciation in Florida.

## SENATE—Tuesday, February 23, 1971

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1971)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

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

Great God, we thank Thee for this land so fair and free, for its worthy aims and generous charities. We are grateful for people who have come to our shores, with varied customs and accents to enrich our lives. As Thou hast led us in the past and covered our sins with Thy forgiveness, so lead us now and in the time to come. Give us a voice to praise Thy name in the land of living men under the divine dispensation of freedom.

Almighty God, Judge of Nations, forgive the pride that overlooks national wrong or justifies injustice. Forgive divisions caused by prejudice or greed. Make us brave to seek Thy will in the land Thou hast given us, lest in our actions we neglect those things which belong to Thy glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 22, 1971, be approved.

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to clear the floor and the lobby of all clerks to Senators when the yea-and-nay vote begins today on the motion to invoke cloture, throughout the vote, and until the vote is announced.

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

#### MINORITY MEMBERSHIP ASSIGNMENTS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.